

Gender and abusive victimization: Gender and childhood family abuse as
predictors of adulthood partner abuse

by

Pat Rycroft

A thesis
presented to the University of Manitoba
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Department of Psychology

September, 1987



Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-37175-7

GENDER AND ABUSIVE VICTIMIZATION:
GENDER AND CHILDHOOD FAMILY ABUSE AS PREDICTORS
OF ADULTHOOD PARTNER ABUSE

BY

PATRICIA RYCROFT

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1987

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ABSTRACT

The current research contrasted feminist theory of woman abuse (Pagelow, 1981) with intergenerational cycle theory of partner abuse (Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980) through an examination of childhood and adulthood abusive victimization by family members. University undergraduate students (119 women and 103 men), who were at least 21 years old, completed a self-report questionnaire which included questions on witnessing physical or sexual abuse between their parents, being physically or sexually abused in childhood, being physically or sexually abused by a partner in adulthood, traditional attitudes towards women, symptomatology, and help-seeking behavior. The hypothesis that gender is more predictive of adulthood partner victimization than is childhood parental abuse was strongly supported by the data. Being female explained a small ($R\text{-square} = .10$) but significant ($p < .0003$) proportion of the variance, while childhood parental abuse did not contribute significantly to the variance of adulthood partner abuse. Although many women experienced childhood abuse and many women experienced adulthood abuse, women victimized as children by family members were not particularly the same women who were victimized as adults by their partners. Sexual abuse, when experienced both in childhood and adulthood, was predictive ($p < .0003$) of higher symptomatology for women, while witnessing interparental abuse or adulthood partner abuse were not. Childhood parental abuse, particularly childhood sexual abuse by a parent, was somewhat predictive ($p < .0379$) of which women sought therapy, while adulthood partner abuse or

revictimization were not. Attitudes towards women were less traditional for women participants who had either experienced childhood parental abuse or adulthood partner abuse, but were more traditional for women who had been revictimized in childhood and adulthood. The results supported feminist theory and did not support intergenerational cycle theory of adulthood partner abuse. Pagelow's (1981) tripartite model of woman battering was recommended for further research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I extend my sincere appreciation and warmest respect to my advisor and thesis supervisor, Ross Hartsough. Ross has been a central support person in the development and completion of this thesis. He has given me room and encouragement to pursue my ideas, while always being responsive to my queries, concerns, and requests for assistance.

Friends have been very important in their encouragement of this project and their support has made a difference. Linda Cantelon, Nukte Edguer, Marjorie Gazan, Len Greenwood, Diane Hiebert-Murphy, Christine Loff, Nancy Meyer, and Cornelia Wicki have spurred me on with discussions, tea, and hugs when I most needed them.

Several colleagues gave expert feedback on the earlier draft of the questionnaire. Many thanks to Marjorie Gazan, Ross Hartsough, Jule Henderson, Kathryn McCannell, Nancy Meyer, and Joanne Wersh for their valuable critiques.

Committee members Ross Hartsough, Kathryn McCannell, and Joanne Wersh were prompt and informative in their feedback on drafts of the thesis. Their suggestions have significantly improved both the conception and the written report of the research project.

Finally, I gratefully acknowledge the generous Studentship (1985-88) financial support from the Medical Research Council of Canada, which has made my continued graduate studies possible.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

page

INTRODUCTION 1

 Defining woman abuse 5

 (a) Serious and/or repeated injury 6

 (b) Physical assault 7

 (c) Physical, psychological and/or sexual violence 11

 Explaining woman assault 14

 Psychopathology, sadism, and masochism 14

 Systems or Interactional theory 15

 Learned Helplessness 16

 Intergenerational Cycle theory 18

 Feminist theory 20

 Childhood abuse: An assumed "risk factor" 24

 Hypothesis 1: 26

 Hypothesis 2: 28

 Hypothesis 3: 30

METHOD 31

 Measurement 31

 Development of survey instrument 32

 Measurement accuracy of sampled population 33

 Symptomatology 35

 Traditional Ideology 36

 Participants 38

 Procedure 39

 Recruitment 39

 Sign-up 39

 Data collection 40

 Retest procedure 42

 Analysis 44

 Sample Size 44

 Statistical Analysis 44

 Hypothesis 1 46

 Hypothesis 2 46

 Hypothesis 3 46

 Computer data entry, coding and analysis 47

RESULTS	48
Sampling	48
Sample Demographics	48
Sample by Lecture	49
Retest Reliability	50
Abusive Victimization	52
Witnessing interparental Physical Abuse	52
Witnessing interparental Sexual Abuse	54
Childhood Physical Abuse	55
Childhood Sexual Abuse	56
Adulthood Physical Abuse	57
Adulthood Sexual Abuse	58
Hypothesis One : Gender is more predictive of adulthood	59
Frequency distributions	59
Regression Analysis	60
Canonical Correlation	64
Summary Results of First Hypothesis	67
Hypothesis Two: Revictimization (i.e., both childhood	69
Frequency distribution of BSI* and THERAPY	69
Regression Analysis	71
Canonical Correlation	75
Summary results of Second Hypothesis	78
Hypothesis Three: Traditional ideology attitudes co-vary	80
Frequency distribution of AWS	80
Regression analysis	81
Summary results of Third Hypothesis	83
DISCUSSION	85
Generalizability of Current Findings	86
Sampling	86
Incidence of Abuse	87
Reliability and Validity	90
Strengths and Limits of the Design	91
Discussion of Findings	92
Gender and Family Victimization	92
Symptomatology and Seeking Therapy	96
Attitudes Towards Women	98
Clinical Implications	99
REFERENCES	101
TABLES	108
Table 1: Frequency of Victimization, by Gender	109
Table 2: Frequency of Offenders, by Gender	110
Table 3: Regression analysis of adulthood abuse by childhood	111
Table 4: Regression analysis of adulthood abuse by childhood	113
Table 5: Canonical Correlation of Adulthood Abuse variables	115
Table 6: Frequency of Help-seeking, by Gender	116
Table 7: Regression analysis of BSI* by Childhood Family	117
Table 8: Regression analysis of THERAPY by Childhood	119
Table 9: Canonical Correlation of BSI* and THERAPY variables	120
Table 10: Regression analysis of AWS by Adulthood Partner	121

APPENDIXES 122

Appendix A: Lecture Handout 123

Appendix B: Consent Form 124

Appendix C: Questionnaire 125

Appendix D: Feedback to Participants 126

Appendix E: Summary of Abbreviations in Text 128

INTRODUCTION

In the quarter century since the identification of the "battered child syndrome" (Kempe, Silverman, Steel, Droegemueller, & Silver, 1962) the assumption that the nuclear family provides a safe and nurturing environment for children has been irrevocably challenged. The identification of physically abused children has been followed by a growing awareness of child sexual abuse (Finkelhor, 1979; Rush, 1980; Russell, 1984) and incest (Butler, 1978; Herman, 1981) within families and neighborhoods of every ethnic, economic, and regional group. Legislation has been passed, creating complex networks that delineate services to protect and care for these child-victims, with police and judicial networks to apprehend and charge the perpetrators of child abuse.

More recently, the women's movement has been instrumental in breaking the silence surrounding the systematic victimization of adult women, focusing on widespread violence of rape and sexual assault by friends, acquaintances, and family members (Brownmiller, 1975; Russell, 1982), and physical assault against wives by husbands (Martin, 1983; Pizzey, 1975; Walker, 1979). Yet, despite the growing documentation of the frequency, severity, and prevalence of violence against women and especially against wives, governments and family social service agencies have been slow, if not counterproductive, in developing adequate identification, support, and economic alternatives for women-victims of violence (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Lewis, 1982; Small, 1979). More typically, services have been developed

and provided by a volunteer grassroots movement of women who have created and run shelters, hotlines, and coalitions for abused women and their children (Martin, 1983; Pizzey, 1974; Schechter, 1982).

Examination of police records in two major cities in Scotland by Dobash and Dobash (1979) indicated that wife assault (76%) was a more frequent occurrence of assault between family members than either child assault (11%), parent assault (7%), sibling assault (5%) or husband assault (1%). Yet many explanations of wife assault continue to focus on the victim, asking "why does she stay?", "why does she take it?". This "blaming the victim" shifts responsibility away from the perpetrator (Ryan, 1976), avoiding the question of "why does the offender batter?". Child-victims are generally not seen as responsible for the abuse; they are not labelled masochistic nor do researchers speculate why they do not leave their abusive parent(s), though victim-blaming of "provocative" girl-victims of sexual abuse has been noted (Finkelhor, 1979; Herman, 1980; Rush, 1978; Russell, 1984).

A theme that recurs in the published literature on battered women is that any abuse experienced earlier in childhood would explain why they would be battered as adults. Thus revictimization has been examined within a theoretical framework of masochism ("it's familiar", "normal behavior"), systems or interactional theory ("victim-prone"), and learning theory ("modeling childhood experience"), and is understood by many researchers and clinicians as a major factor which explains wife-assault (Lion, 1977; Straus et al., 1980). Yet examination of available data indicates weak, at best, evidence for this presumption.

Woman assault can well be described as every woman's concern. Walker (1979) asserts that "as many as 50 per cent of all women will be battering victims at some point in their lives" (p. ix). Estimates of the incidence or prevalence of wife assault are rough at best, often calculated on the basis of police reports, crisis line calls, or requests for shelter at refuges. The best estimate available in Canada is by MacLeod (1980) who concludes that "every year, 1 in 10 women who are married or in a relationship with a live-in lover are battered" (p. 21). MacLeod observes, however, that there have been no national Canadian surveys to determine more accurately the prevalence of wife abuse. She arrived at her own estimate by combining and extrapolating statistics from transition house shelters, divorce applications, social work caseloads, police records and supporting research.

Several major American surveys have provided support for MacLeod's estimate, and indicate that "1 in 10" may be a low estimate. Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980), using data from a randomized national survey of over 2,000 families and couples living together in the United States, report that 16 per cent of the couples had experienced violence in their relationship in the past year, and 28 per cent had during their marriage. Furthermore, they suggest that "it seems likely that the true rate is closer to 50 or 60 per cent who were willing to describe violent acts to our interviewers" (p. 36).

Russell (1982; 1984), reporting on a randomized survey of over 900 women in San Francisco, states that of the 644 women who had ever been married 14 percent had been raped by their husbands and 21 per cent had been beaten by their husbands. Wife abuse, involving wife rape and/or wife beating, was

reported by a total of 25 percent of these women. Wife beating was the major or only problem for 54 per cent of these abused wives while wife rape was the major or only problem for 23 per cent, and both beating and rape was a problem of approximately equal significance for 22 per cent of the abused wives (see Russell, 1982, pp. 87-91).

In another major study, twenty-nine percent (40/137) of a control sample of women had been physically assaulted by their male partners (Frieze, 1983). Although not a strictly randomized sample, these women had been randomly selected as a matched control sample for 137 battered women, so that as Russell (1982) states: "Frieze's study offers us the best estimate of the prevalence of wife beating currently available" (p. 100). Frieze (1983) found that 6 percent (6%) of the women in her comparison control group had been forced by their husbands to have sex, while almost half (45%) had been pressured by their husbands to have sex.

Both Russell's and Frieze's research confirm the earlier, more tentative, findings of other researchers (Hilberman & Munson, 1978; Martin, 1976; Pagelow, 1981; Prescott & Letko, 1977) that sexual assault and rape are prevalent forms of women abuse in both legal and common-law marriages. Frieze's (1983) data suggests that "marital rape is most likely to occur in a relationship which is violent in other ways as well" (p. 535), while Russell's (1982) data indicates:

"that there is a large and significant group of women who experience both wife rape and wife beating, but there is also a large and significant group of women who experience wife beating but no rape, and a smaller but significant group of women who experience only wife rape. Recognizing wife rape requires recognition of a new group of abused wives, as well as another form of abuse suffered by wives whose other abuse already has gained some recognition" (pp. 100-101).

From these studies (Frieze, 1983; Russell, 1982, 1984; Straus et al., 1980), MacLeod's (1980) estimate that "1 in 10" women in a legal or common-law marriage in Canada is battered (defined by MacLeod as physical and/or psychological assault) is probably lower than the actual occurrence, and at least 20-30% of adult women in Canada, or 1 in 4, may be physically and/or sexually assaulted by their husbands/partners.

Defining woman abuse

One explanation for the discrepancies in incidence and prevalence rates between reports is that abuse, assault, and/or battering are defined differently by different researchers. Finkelhor (1984) has identified definitions of abuse as one of several important methodological concerns for researchers in the field of child sexual abuse, and it is also an important concern when attempting to understand and work with assaulted women.

Scott (1974) speculated that the term "battered wife" had been borrowed from Kempe, who first systematically described the physical abuse of children, known as the "battered child syndrome" (Kempe et al., 1962). Medically trained nurses, physicians and psychiatrists have favored a syndrome classification of victims (Parker & Schumacher, 1977). This term has also been used by a prominent psychologist in the field who describes a "battered woman syndrome" (Walker, 1984).

An examination of the data-based literature currently published in the field reveals three major types of definitions being used by researchers to describe battered women: (a) serious and/or repeated physical injury, (b) physical assault, and (c) physical, psychological, and/or sexual assault.

(a) Serious and/or repeated injury

Scott (1974) , a British psychiatrist, appears to have first included the criteria for serious or repeated physical injury by a man to a woman he lives with (i.e., legal or common-law marriage) to identify a "battered wife". Scott further recommended that this "deviant" behavior should be classified for "seriousness" (measured by level of medical aid required), and "timing" (measured as regular, episodic, increasing, or terminal), anticipating that researchers would then find "meaningful correlations" that would, in turn, suggest treatments and prevention strategies.

Gayford (1975), another British psychiatrist who interviewed one hundred battered wives who stayed at Pizzey's (1974) now-famous shelter for battered women (Chiswick Women's Aid), further operationalized Scott's definition by specifying that a "minimal injury was severe bruising". Gayford defined a battered wife as "a woman who had received deliberate severe and repeated physical injury from her husband" (p. 194).

Parker and Schumacher (1977) operationalized what "repeated" meant, specifying that a woman had to receive injuries "more than three times" in order to be considered a battered wife. They defined the "Battered Wife Syndrome" as a "symptom complex of violence in which a woman has, at any time, received deliberate, severe, and repeated (more than three times) demonstrable injury from her husband with the minimal injury of severe bruising" (p. 760).

Hilberman and Munson (1978), two clinicians providing psychiatric evaluation of women referred by other medical staff, also used a definition similar to Scott and Gayford, describing battered women as those

who "suffered serious and/or repeated physical injury as the result of assaults by their husbands/cohabitees" (p. 460).

As these examples demonstrate, the criteria of serious injury as evidenced by bruising or more severe bodily damage, and or a history of repeated physical injury by a man to his woman-partner, has been most often cited by medically-trained researchers to define woman abuse. A limitation with this medical approach to defining battering is that it can covertly support a victim blaming framework by defining the crime of assault by its impact on the victim, and not by the actions of the offender. These definitions dominate the earlier current literature, and predate Straus' (1979) influential Conflict Tactics Scale.

(b) Physical assault

Sociologists, especially American sociologists, have been primarily responsible for a shift in defining wife assault from the criteria of injuries, to defining the act of assault by the assailant. This has led to a focus on delineating and attempting to scale the types and "severity" of acts of assault, ranging from pushing and shoving through to kicking and punching to knifing and shooting. Instead of counting bruises and broken bones, researchers began counting slaps and punches.

Gelles (1974, 1976) developed a ten-point "violence severity" scale to measure physical violence between couples, with 0 = no violence, 1 = pushed or shoved, up to 9 = shot, using this as a count of severity from low to high, and frequency from never to daily. This appears to be a quantification of the two variables recommended by Scott (1974). However,

Gelles measured severity by offenders' actions, and not by victims' injuries.

The violence severity scale used by Gelles (1974, 1976) appears to be the forerunner of Straus' Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS), which was developed for the American national survey by Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz (1980; see also Straus, 1978, 1979). Straus' intention was to develop a way of quantitatively measuring the ways family members settled "conflicts of interest". He hypothesized that "reasoning" (rational discussion, argument, reasoning), "verbal aggression" (use of verbal and non-verbal behavior or use of threats to hurt the other), and "violence" (use of physical force against other persons) were the three main tactics used to settle disputes. Two versions of the CTS, one used in mail-out paper-and-pencil surveys and the other used in face-to-face interview surveys, have been published (Straus, 1979). Items that describe behaviors indicative of each of the three factors (e.g., reasoning: "got information to back up (your/his) side of things"; verbal aggression: "to hit or throw something at the other one"; violence: "hit or tried to hit with something") are arranged in a hierarchical continuum from non-assaultive to verbally assaultive to physically assaultive behavior. Straus et al. (1980) argued that this ordering measures the probability that participants will answer the violence questions, after first answering the more positively valued items.

The Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) have been further analyzed in terms of an "overall violence index", and a "severe violence index". Wife-beating is defined by Straus et al. (1980) as "more serious and dangerous" behavior in the "severe violence index", ranging from kicking, biting, punching,

hitting with an object, beating up, threatening with a knife or gun, and/or the use of a knife or gun. Assaultive behavior excluded from the wife-beating category includes throwing something at another person, pushing, shoving, or grabbing, and slapping or spanking. The CTS has become a popular tool to identify, measure and evaluate abusive physical assault, both by researchers and clinicians. Several modifications of the CTS have been developed (Saunders, 1982; Stacey & Shupe, 1983), and have also been used as pre- and post- treatment measures of therapeutic intervention (e.g., Domestic Abuse Project in Minneapolis, Minnesota; Klinik Community Health Centre in Winnipeg, Manitoba).

Other sociologists and psychologists have defined battering against women as physical assault in the legal sense (Roy, 1977), as in "physical abuse" (Rounsaville, 1978; Star, 1978), or "physical assault" (Frieze, 1983) of an unspecified nature. Others specify particular acts of physical assault (Hauser, 1982; Peterson, 1980; Russell, 1982; Canadian Federal Standing Committee on Health, Welfare, and Social Affairs, 1982), many of which are similar to the acts of violence specified in the CTS.

The Scottish sociologists, Dobash and Dobash (1979) described violence against wives as systematic, frequent, and brutal use of physical force, defined as the "persistent direction of physical force against a marital partner or co-habitant" (p. 11). They asked participants to describe the first, worst, and most recent violent attacks they had experienced, during lengthy interviews with women who sought refuge in shelters for battered women in Scotland. The types of physical force summarized by Dobash and Dobash range from "slap or push/pull into non-injurious object" to "kick, knee, or butt", to "hit with object/weapon" (see Table 7, Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Rape is mentioned but not specifically reported by the authors.

This second category or definition of woman abuse as physical assault is, currently, the most frequently referenced category of definition in the published literature, and appears to be closely tied to legal definitions of physical assault. Assumptions that so-called "more severe" acts of assault and/or more frequent attacks cause more damage or harm to the victim are implied by most of these researchers, yet a few recognize and argue against these assumptions (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Pagelow, 1981; Russell, 1982). Pagelow and Russell are both particularly critical of the CTS and its limitations in the measurement of woman abuse. Pagelow (1981) argues that the intensity of the blows, the severity of injuries (if any) sustained, and the meanings of the acts as understood by both the offender and the victim are important variables omitted by Straus et al. (1980). Pagelow also notes that the Straus et al. study focused primarily on behavior during the previous year, yet prior acts may have had great impact on the relationships. Russell (1982) is critical that Straus et al. did not report on the percentage of wives assaulted within the broader "overall violence index" but subsumed it under violence between couples. Russell argues that the conclusions drawn from the CTS data by Straus et al. are erroneous because their data fail to distinguish between defensive and offensive violence, between men's and women's typically differential strength and fighting skills, and between the degree of hurt and injury typically resulting from violence done by men and women.

These distinctions are important and impact on both reported incidence and prevalence statistics of woman abuse, as well as on the explanations and suggested remedies for violence against women, although these many definitions of woman battering as physical assault may, at first glance, appear comparable.

(c) Physical, psychological and/or sexual violence

The third category or type of definition of woman abuse is most frequently used by feminist researchers and is currently endorsed by several community and government organizations in Manitoba. Generally, definitions in this category include physical assault, and extend to include emotional, psychological and verbal abuse, and may also include sexual assault.

Walker (1979) defines a battered woman as a woman who is "repeatedly subjected to any forceful physical or psychological behavior by a man in order to coerce her to do something he wants her to do without any concern for her rights" (p. xv). Psychological abuse is described as psychological humiliation, verbal harassment, and/or the threat of physical violence. Walker's definition includes that the couple must go through a violent cycle, which she describes, at least two times to distinguish the behavior as "battering".

MacLeod (1980), a Canadian researcher, defines woman battering as "violence, physical and/or psychological, expressed by a husband or a male or lesbian live-in lover towards his wife or his/her live-in lover, to which the 'wife' does not consent, and which is directly or indirectly condoned by the traditions, laws, and attitudes prevalent in the society in which it occurs" (p. 7). Psychological violence is described as denigration, taunts, purposeful inconsistencies, or threats.

Pagelow (1981) defines battered women as "adult women who were intentionally physically abused in ways that caused pain or injury, or who were forced into involuntary action or restrained from voluntary action by

adult men with whom they have or had established relationships, usually involving sexual intimacy, whether or not within a legally married state" (p. 33). Forced involuntary action and restrained voluntary action means situations such as being tied to a chair, being locked in a closet, room, or house, or being locked out of one's home.

This addition of non-physical assault to the definition of battering is an extension beyond the definition of physical injury ((a) above) and/or physical assault ((b) above). Though Pagelow's non-physical abuse definition is narrower than Walker's or MacLeod's, she acknowledges that non-physical assault may be abusive. Yet the data collected and analyzed by researchers still tends to focus on physical assault (MacLeod, 1980; Pagelow, 1981; Walker, 1979, 1984).

Several organizations in Manitoba, from both the public and government sectors, include aspects of mental, emotional, verbal and/or psychological abuse in their definitions of woman assault in addition to physical assault. The Community Legal Education Association, a non-profit community organization in Manitoba, recognizes wife battering as "physical and/or mental abuse" (in Women in abusive relationships: A guide to the Law, 1985), including behavior such as threats to life or safety, use of vulgar or insulting language, limiting or constricting movement, activity, friendship, or access to financial resources. Rape and sexual assault are also recognized as acts of wife abuse.

The Manitoba Committee on Wife Abuse, a government funded organization which promotes public awareness, advises on development of programs and legislation, and operates a provincially accessible hot line for battered

women, includes physical, emotional, verbal and sexual abuse in their working definition of wife abuse. This definition was also supported by the provincial Manitoba Community Services Department's public awareness campaign in February, 1985 (see, for example, their pamphlet "Wife abuse: Silence hurts"). Included in their definition of emotional abuse is being put down, made to feel useless or stupid, making it hard to get out of the house, name-calling, insults, humiliations, kicking furniture, pounding walls, and throwing things.

Despite some attempts to operationalize definitions of psychological abuse, research methodologies which discriminate presence or absence of such behavior are still at an embryotic stage of development. Hoffman (1984) has recently published a check-list developed from interviews with 25 women, self-defined as victims of psychological abuse by their husbands and common-law partners. Hoffman defined psychological abuse as "behavior sufficiently threatening to the woman so that she believes that her capacity to work, to interact in the family or society, or to enjoy good physical or mental health, has been or might be threatened" (p. 37). Areas of sexual interaction, childcare, financial management, and social interaction were examined for the development of 22 items, with 2-5 aspects per item. Hoffman indicates how many subjects reported each type of abuse listed, but has not developed the instrument beyond this level.

Stacey and Shupe (1983) have published a modified version of Straus' CTS, which they call the Centre for Social Research Abuse Index. Included in their 27 item questionnaire are 15 items which could be classified as probing psychological abuse, 6 items probing physical abuse, and 4 items probing sexual abuse, according to the definitions already discussed. Two items probing contact with police are also included in their index.

Russell (1982) and Frieze (1983), as previously discussed, have developed items to probe sexual harassment, sexual assault, and rape, including marital rape. Finkelhor (1979, 1984) has developed a widely adopted questionnaire to define and measure sexual assault and sexual abuse. Yet none of these researchers has yet systematically integrated and combined these various areas of physical, sexual, and psychological abuse, with operationalized definitions of abuse within these realms of violence.

Explaining woman assault

There is, as yet, little agreement as to why assault is so common an experience for women in marital-type relationships. Several major theories are explicitly and implicitly discussed in the current literature but data to support most explanations appears tentative at best. In addition, some researchers have used new labels for old theories, or have integrated several theories into more complex theoretical explanations of woman assault.

Psychopathology, sadism, and masochism

Assumptions that psychopathological deviation(s) exist in the personality of the husband-assailant and/or the wife-victim of woman assault are common in the current literature, and often refer back to Freudian psychoanalytic theory of aggression (Freud, 1919, cited by Shainess, 1977). One major review of the literature (Stahly, 1978) links Freudian aggression theory with frustration-aggression theory, implying that there is empirical evidence to support this line of reasoning. Other

theorists reference each other (Shainess, 1977, cited by Lion, 1977; Lion, 1977, cited by Shainess, 1977) in circular arguments of support for authoritative, but unsubstantiated, explanations for the "complex interlocking, hostile dependencies between two adult partners", previously specified as "being in that borderline between true medical [i.e., psychiatric] illness and social deviance" (Lion, 1977, p. 127).

Blaming the victim is a central feature of this model and the wife is often held responsible for her victimization by clinicians and researchers who adopt this perspective. Scott (1974), for example, illustrates this:

the wife tolerates physical aggression ... it is possible the wife prefers this to indifference or neglect by her husband; aggressiveness may become to some extent gratifying to both partners; and where there are no bars to escape, and the wife, especially a childless wife, persistently returns to a battering husband, then it is reasonable to look for a masochist element (pp. 436-37).

Examination of the definitions and explanations for marital violence given by physicians, social workers, lawyers and public health nurses in England (Borkowski, Murch, & Walker, 1983) suggested that practitioners tend to dissociate marital violence from their own socio-economic status, and favour personality characteristics of the woman and of the man as explanations for woman assault. Borkowski et al. pointed out a continuation of the clinicians' belief system which guided cursory evidence gathering, confirming and reinforcing over-simplified explanations.

Systems or Interactional theory

Though there are many conceptual overlaps with the previous theory, what distinguishes systems or interactional explanations of woman assault is

that the couple is seen as an interdependent unit which feeds and maintains the violent behavior. Giles-Sims (1983) has published a particularly detailed description of this model (see also, Gelles, 1974; Rounsaville, 1978; Straus, 1973). Giles-Sims describes a "feedback loop" where the wife's response to her husband's assaultive behavior is evaluated as negative or positive feedback which supports and escalates more violence. His responsibility is not addressed. Regardless of whether she fights, withdraws, verbally rejects, or complies, Giles-Sims argues that the wife's behavior supports the violence such that it becomes "an established pattern". While acknowledging that "no response they used would stop the violence", Giles-Sims emphasized the wife's behavior and her contribution to "the system" , and criticized whatever response she made, short of leaving.

Learned Helplessness

Walker (1979) analyzed data similar to that detailed by Giles-Sims and developed a "cycle theory of violence" which departs dramatically from the interactional victim-blaming theory. Based on over 200 interviews with battered women, the cycle begins with a tension building phase which leads to an acute battering phase which leads to a "honeymoon" or calm phase in the cycle. During the honeymoon, the offender may express remorse and promise to never repeat the abuse. This phase is seen as the stage of the cycle which binds the couple together. For battered women, the honeymoon leads to a tension building phase and a repeat of the cycle. Through the cycle of violence, Walker sees the male-perpetrator as choosing violent acts to express anger and frustration, while blaming his wife-victim for his own aggression. The woman attempts to appease and prevent the

violence, but no matter what she does the beating reoccurs. This, Walker explains, demonstrates that the violence is caused by the offender (and not by the woman-victim) because nothing she can do can change his decision to act out his aggression against her. Isolation and lack of economic and social supports are also seen by Walker to limit the option to leave the abusive relationship.

Walker (1979) also described a theory of learned helplessness in battered women as an explanation for why many women don't leave an abusive partner. She hypothesized that, similar to Seligman's dogs exposed to uncontrollable shocks (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Hiroto & Seligman, 1975; Maier & Seligman, 1975), women exposed to uncontrollable violence from their husbands give up and lose hope of escape from the situation. They become "passive, submissive, helpless", and in a state of learned helplessness. More recently, Walker (1984) tested hypotheses of helplessness learned in childhood and in adulthood as predictors of whether a woman was out of or in a battering relationship. Analyses indicated that childhood learned helplessness and adulthood learned helplessness were independent factors that both tended to persist whether the woman had left or still remained in a battering relationship. Runtz (1987) also found that a learned helplessness model was not supported by data from women who had been victimized both in childhood and adulthood. These results seem to indicate that learned helplessness, as defined by Walker, does not well explain the impact of assault on women, and appears not to hold much potential for future research.

Another theory, somewhat similar in dynamics to Walker's learned helplessness, is that of traumatic bonding, described by Dutton and Painter

(1983). Traumatic bonding refers to the strong positive feelings and emotions that can develop for an intermittently abusive and intimidating person by the person receiving the abuse. Dutton and Painter argue that the power imbalance and intermittent nature of wife assault is similar to hostage-captor, cult follower-leader, or prisoner-guard situations which have been seen as conducive to traumatic bonding. No data that specifically supports this hypothesis is known to have been published to date.

Intergenerational Cycle theory

Clinicians and researchers often explain woman assault as behavior originally taught to and learned by children growing up in violent families. This violence is later modeled by the children when they grow up. Patterns of abuse either observed (e.g., woman assault) or experienced (e.g., child assault) in their childhood are replicated in adulthood. This model of learned assaultive behavior purports an "intergenerational cycle" of violence, suggesting that each succeeding generation of children watching parents assaulting parents then repeat the pattern.

Family-learned violent behavior is central to the theories of Straus and his colleagues (Straus, 1978; Straus et al., 1980) and has had a major impact in the family violence literature (Gelles, 1972, 1974; Hilberman & Munson, 1978; Parker & Shumacher, 1977; Peterson, 1980). Other researchers, though not fully supporting this theory, have collected information on child abuse histories and examined this variable as a possible predictor of adult abuse (Pagelow, 1981; Peterson, 1980; Roy, 1977; Walker, 1979). More than half of these studies do not include a

comparison or control group, making it difficult to examine the data within a context of a more generalizable population, and typically gather information from battered women about their own and their husband's families of origin. Fairly consistent across these studies is the finding that women-victims are significantly less likely to have witnessed or experienced abuse in childhood, compared to their husband-abusers. Men perpetrators appear to have witnessed or experienced family violence when growing up two to three times more frequently than their assaulted wives (Gayford, 1975; Roy, 1977; Pagelow, 1981; Walker, 1979). Stacey and Shupe (1983) found their data did not support an "intergenerational transfer hypothesis", summarizing that:

childhood exposure to violence had no detectable effect on those women who experienced it, and most did not, thus we rule out childhood abuse or neglect and seeing parents' violence as important overall causes of the women's adult abuse ... such an approach [intergenerational transfer] to understanding the female victim of violence is fundamentally nothing more than a sophisticated form of blaming the victim in the guise of scientific theory" (p. 45, emphasis in the original).

The national survey of violence in American families by Straus (Straus, 1978; Straus et al., 1980) is frequently cited as strong support for learned behavior and intergenerational cycle theories. This data, gathered from over 2,000 couples, relies on the CTS instrument to measure current and past child and marital violence. Much of the data from this survey has been published as percentages and/or in graph form, making it difficult to get an understanding of the specifics. Also, many statistics are summarized as "couple" violence, so that gender-linked variances are not visible. As previously discussed, Straus et al. reported that 16% of the couples had been violent to a partner at least once in the previous year. Half of these couples (8% of total) reported violence by both husband and

wife. In a quarter of the couples (4% of total) only the husbands were violent, and the other quarter (4% of total) reported that only the wives were violent.

Several major criticisms of these data have been made. Firstly, that no distinction was made between offensive and defensive behavior. Secondly, that the intensity of physical assault and hurt and injury was not measured. Thirdly, that the primary focus of study was a 12 month period, with no distinction between victim or assailant behavior made prior to that 12 month period (Breines & Gordon, 1983; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Pagelow, 1981; Russell, 1982; Stacey & Shupe, 1983). These criticisms may account for the incidence rates reported by Straus et al. (1980) being discrepant from those reported by Frieze (1983) and Russell (1982).

Feminist theory

Feminism, a perspective advocating economic, legal, social and political equality for women and men, indicates that gender discrimination is overtly and covertly practiced against women in our patriarchal society (Ballou & Gabalac, 1985; Dworkin, 1978; Martin, 1983; Rush, 1980). For at least 300 years (Spender, 1982), feminists have been identifying sexism, sex-role stereotyping, and power inequalities in the socialization of girls and women. This functionally limits the social and economic options of women primarily to the unpaid roles of mother and wife, who serve others before self. Careers for women are discouraged or funneled primarily into the low-paid "pink-collar ghettos" of support, secretarial, and maintenance personnel. The classical psychology of men and "mankind", which commonly omits or devalues women, has been challenged and continues to be re-written

for, by, and about women (Gilligan, 1982; Greenspan, 1983; Miller, 1976), underlining the biases inherent in predominant misogynist and sexist assumptions of male-dominant culture.

Central to a feminist theory of wife assault is recognition of the gender-based socially-sanctioned differences in expectations, approval, opportunities and control that shape and maintain male privilege and domination over women both within and outside the family sphere. Hierarchical social structures, which legitimize authoritative power over relationships are replicated in the traditional family hierarchy with husband/father as "head of the household", "king of his castle" who has a conjugal right to control his wife (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Martin, 1983; Pagelow, 1981; Schechter, 1982). "Violence is only one of the many ways in which men express their socially structured right to control and chastise" (Schechter, 1982, p. 219).

Pagelow (1981) proposed a tripartite model for understanding woman-battering, with components which address distinct aspects of this violence. Model I: Development, delineates the patriarchal foundations of the family and the hierarchal power structure that distinguish our social system. These features are described as "traditional ideology" which ranks human beings "based on male superiority and female inferiority, and designates greater status and power for males than females, regardless of other attributes, skills, knowledge, or accomplishments" (p. 40). Pagelow argues that these have become internalized beliefs which lead people to accept the "rightness" of patriarchal-hierarchal order and structure.

Pagelow's Model II: Primary Battering, attempts to account for why all men do not batter their wives and proposes what might distinguish non-batterers from batterers. She hypothesizes that strong traditional ideology, no punishment or condemnation of abusive behavior, and reinforcement of abusive behavior through feelings of increased control and power, as well as previous learning that men can control others by force and violence, are factors which could contribute to the probability that a man will assault his partner.

Finally, Model III: Secondary Battering focuses on why woman assault by a male partner continues over time, and hypothesizes that the fewer the resources, the more negative the institutional and social response to the abuse, and the more intense the traditional ideology of a woman, the more likely the assault will reoccur. Her data indicate that these factors, particularly the factor of resources, do impact on the length of time of victimization by her partner. Walker's (1979, 1984) cycle theory of violence also examined the continuation of assault over time and suggested that the calm and control that the batterer experiences following an acute assault reinforces his behavior, and that the relief and hope for change that the wife experiences keeps her in the relationship, trying to change herself, her husband and their relationship. Walker's learned helplessness hypothesis also attempts to explain this aspect of woman abuse.

Schechter (1982) emphasized that violence in families is not randomly distributed but is systematically directed against women and children victims because this behavior is approved of and sanctioned in many parts of our culture. Schechter argued that the key issue to address is why abuse is directed at women, as a consistent target, and not why particular

men abuse. Schechter's feminist theory of violence against women in the family encompasses historical sanctions, battering as a way to maintain control, women's inferior social status and economic options, and sex stereotyped roles and structures within the family. Schechter also agreed with Pagelow that unsupportive institutions, a poor support network, and fewer resources tend to increase the probability that a woman can not leave an abusive relationship.

Historical evidence, particularly laws which have sanctioned the chastisement of wives by husbands, the exclusion of women from legal recourse, and wives as the property of husbands, has been documented in detail by several authors (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Pagelow, 1981; Schechter, 1982). Yet the question posed by Pagelow's Model II: 'Why are some men batterers and some men not?' remains unanswered by this evidence (Breines & Gordon, 1983; Schechter, 1982). Ideally, a theory of violence against women in the family would integrate individual as well as class, gender, and system behavior.

One useful model has been developed in the child abuse literature by Finkelhor (1981) which specifies four preconditions which need to be met in order for child sexual abuse to occur. These four factors are described as: i) sexual feelings towards children, ii) internal inhibitions, iii) external inhibitors, and iv) resistance by child-victim. Finkelhor also offered numerous variables that may account for each of these four factors. He argued that this model offers several advantages, including that it integrates several previous theories, it emphasises the responsibility of the perpetrator (rather than blaming the victim), and it suggests strategies for treatment and prevention. In addition, this model suggests

testable research hypotheses. Finkelhor (1984) has more recently recommended the use of multivariate analyses which can assess the contribution of many factors and variables to abuse. Breines and Gordon (1983) also emphasized the importance of analysis of the family as a locus of struggle, with age and gender structuring as a source of power differences. Development of a comprehensive feminist theory of assault that incorporates the information known to date, such as Finkelhor has demonstrated in the child sexual abuse field, would be an important development for the field of woman-partner assault.

Childhood abuse: An assumed "risk factor"

An assumption, pervasive in the theoretical research and clinical literature on wife assault, is that childhood abuse in the victim's family of origin is a major "risk factor" or predictor of adulthood abuse. This assumption is discussed by proponents of masochistic theory (Gayford, 1978; Hilberman & Munson; 1978; Scott, 1974), systems theory (Gelles, 1972, 1974; Giles-Sims, 1983; Peterson, 1980) and intergenerational cycle theory (Roy, 1977; Straus, 1979; Straus et al., 1980). Even when data does not substantiate this hypothesis, the assumption appears to persist. For example, Roy (1977) reports:

A large proportion of the women remembered a happy home life and have found their own husbands' acts of violence confusing and perplexing. It is easy to understand why a woman brought up in an atmosphere of violence assumes the role of victim in her own family as an adult. But it is difficult to understand why so many of the subjects interviewed recall their childhood as secure and non-violent" (p.31).

This illustrates a reluctance by some researchers to acknowledge that the majority of victims of wife abuse have not experienced childhood abuse.

This may be due to a bias of explaining violence by focusing on victim characteristics.

The published data on childhood experiences of violence as they relate to adulthood experiences have indicated that systems and intergenerational cycle theories do not entirely explain available data. Perpetrators of adulthood partner/marital assault were more likely to have experienced childhood parental abuse than were their victims (Gayford, 1975; MacLeod, 1980; Pagelow, 1981; Rounsaville, 1979; Roy, 1977; Walker, 1984). Watching violent parents, as a child, is somewhat more predictive of experiencing adulthood partner assault than is being abused by a parent in childhood (Gelles, 1972; Parker & Schumacher, 1978; Schulman, 1983; Straus et al., 1980). Victims of partner/marital abuse were more likely to have not experienced childhood abuse than to have experienced childhood abuse (Gayford, 1975; MacLeod, 1980; Pagelow, 1981; Roy, 1977; Schulman, 1981; Stacey & Shupe, 1983; Straus et al., 1980).

Implicit in most of these data, and supported by police records (Dobash & Dobash, 1979), is the recognition that women are the more frequent and more severely injured victims of marital assault, compared with men. Yet this prevalence of woman assault has been disputed by intergenerational cycle researchers (Gelles, 1974, 1976; Straus, 1979; Straus et al., 1980) and systems researchers (Giles-Sims, 1983) who have suggested that women are as violent to their male-partners, as men are to their women partners.

The current study first examined the gender-linked prevalence of woman abuse, as well as explored the relative contribution of childhood parental abuse to adulthood partner abuse, by testing the following primary hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1:

Gender is more predictive of adulthood partner victimization, in a general population, than is childhood parental abuse.

a) Being female is more predictive of adulthood partner victimization than is being male.

b) Being female is more predictive of adulthood partner victimization than is childhood parental abuse.

c) Women are more likely to have been victims of adulthood partner abuse than to have been victims of childhood parental abuse.

Secondly, the research explored the impact of abusive victimization in terms of somatic symptoms and the seeking of psychotherapy. Women revictimized through partner abuse after having experienced childhood parental abuse, were compared with victims of either childhood parental or adulthood partner abuse.

What is also not clear from the literature is whether the incidence of childhood abuse significantly and systematically varies across or between samples of battered and non-battered women. One problem is that most studies have sampled only battered women, with no comparison group included. Researchers who have obtained a broader sample of people have tended to test intergenerational cycle or interactional theories and have reported data which do not, at times, distinguish gender variances, maintain control group comparison, or distinguish individual from couple behavior (e.g., see Gelles, 1972, 1974; Peterson, 1980; Straus et al., 1980).

Frieze's sample of 137 battered women (B) identified through shelters, social services, and advertisements, were matched with a control sample of 137 women from similiar neighbourhoods in Pittsburgh. A surprisingly high number of the women in the control sample (29%) were themselves battered by their husbands (Frieze, 1980, 1983; Frieze, Knoble, Washburn & Zomnir, 1980). Frieze reported that the control non-battered (C) group were least likely to have observed parental violence, while the control battered (CB) group observed more parental violence and experienced more childhood sexual abuse than the C group, but less than the battered (B) group. The CB group experienced less physical assault in childhood than the B group and a similiar proportion as the C group. The differences noted between these two groups of battered women suggest that significant variance may be observed between samples from different sources.

Similiarly, Gelles' (1974) data indicated variance in frequency and severity of physical assault with families identified through police records, compared with families identified through social service agencies, as well as between their matched control groups.

Hilberman and Munson (1979) indicated that up to 50% of the battered women referred to them for a psychiatric evaluation had witnessed parental violence or experienced childhood abuse, which is much higher than the more usual 25% to 35% of battered women with childhood abuse histories in shelter samples (Gayford, 1975; MacLeod, 1980; Roy, 1977; Stacey & Shupe, 1983).

An alternate way of understanding these data is to consider who would seek what services for what reasons. If victimization by several

perpetrators over one's lifetime (i.e. revictimization) results in higher psychological distress, this group may be more likely to seek psychiatric or psychological help. If victimization by one perpetrator results in proportionately less psychological distress, this group may be more likely to seek shelter, police protection, or legal help, than the revictimized group.

In the current study, this ancillary hypothesis was tested as:

Hypothesis 2:

Revictimization (i.e., both childhood parental and adulthood partner abuse) is more predictive of high somatic symptomatology and/or seeking therapeutic intervention than is either childhood parental or adulthood partner abuse.

a) Women with high somatic symptomatology are more likely to have been revictimized than to have experienced only childhood parental abuse.

b) Women with high somatic symptomatology are more likely to have been revictimized than to have experienced only adulthood partner abuse.

c) Women who have sought significant therapeutic intervention (i.e., at least two or three in-person sessions with a psychiatrist, a psychologist, a social worker or a counselor) are more likely to have been revictimized than to have experienced only childhood parental abuse.

d) Women who have sought significant therapeutic intervention are more likely to have been revictimized than to have experienced only adulthood partner abuse.

The third and final focus of the study was to consider the impact of victimization in terms of social attitudes towards women and women's roles that may vary with past and present abuse experiences.

Traditional ideology was defined by Pagelow (1981) as "an internalized way of viewing the social system and one's own position in it from a traditional frame of reference that endorses the patriarchal-hierarchical family system, resulting in behaviors that conform to this outlook" (p.126). This variable has been suggested as a significant factor that may influence whether women stay in or leave a battering relationship (Pagelow, 1981; Walker, 1984). Pagelow attempted to operationalize this variable in her survey and attributed her non-significant results to poor measurement technique. She recommended that future researchers use the attitudes towards feminism scale (FEM Scale), developed by Smith, Ferree, and Miller (1975), for this variable.

Walker (1984) used the Attitudes towards Women Scale (AWS) (Spence & Helmreich, 1972) to measure traditional ideology, and was surprised to find that the 400 battered women in her sample scored significantly higher (i.e., less traditional) on the scale than the normed sample of college women and their mothers. This unexpected finding may be understood by considering that more traditional women may remain in a battering relationship, while less traditional women would leave. Traditional ideology may inhibit the decision to leave, such that women in shelters may have shifted from more traditional to less traditional attitudes with their seeking shelter. Additionally, the fact of being battered may reinforce traditional ideology such that women who are battered become more traditional in their attitudes with the act of being victimized.

In this study,,the variance of traditional attitudes with childhood and adulthood victimization was explored through the ancillary hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3:

Traditional ideology attitudes co-vary more highly with revictimization than with either childhood parental abuse or adulthood partner abuse.

a) Revictimized women have more traditional attitudes than women who have experienced only childhood parental abuse.

b) Revictimized women have more traditional attitudes than women who have experienced only adulthood partner abuse.

c) Women who have left abusive partner relationships will have less traditional attitudes than women remaining in abusive partner relationships.

The current research study gathered information on childhood and adulthood physical and sexual victimization, as well as demographic information, symptomatology, therapy-seeking behavior, and traditional ideology, in sufficient detail and number to support multivariate analyses of these hypotheses.

METHOD

Measurement

Abuse and assault have recently been measured using paper-and-pencil self reports (Finkelhor, 1978; Pagelow, 1981), in-person guided interview (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Walker, 1979; 1984), or an in-person interview with a standardized questionnaire (Giles-Sims, 1983; Russell, 1982; Straus et al., 1980). Several questionnaires developed specifically for this field of research have been published either in part (Straus et al., 1980; Walker, 1984) or in whole (Finkelhor, 1978; Giles-Sims, 1983; Pagelow, 1981). Many of these data were collected from populations identified as either battered or abused (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Giles-Sims, 1983; Pagelow, 1981; Walker, 1979, 1984), while others have gathered information on abuse from a more general sample of the population (Finkelhor, 1978; Russell, 1982, 1984; Straus et al., 1980).

Self-report procedures involve measurement problems of both the test being used and of the individual answering the test questions. Aftanas (1984) has termed this 'dual process measurement', referring to these two distinct aspects of the self-report measurement process, and has noted issues of stability, validity, and veridicality inherent in this dual process. Retrospective data, i.e., memories of past behaviors or past events, which form the bulk of the current self-report instrument, include unique measurement problems arising from individual variance in attention to the past event and categorization (Feldman, 1981).

Assessment of the accuracy of retrospective self-report data, therefore, involves particular consideration of the stability, veridicality, and validity of these dual processes. Recommendations for assessing measurement accuracy of memories of abusive experiences (Rycroft, 1985) were incorporated into the development of the survey instrument and the procedure of the current research project.

Development of survey instrument

Several studies (Burton, 1970; Meddnick & Shaffer, 1963; Robbins, 1963) have demonstrated that quantifiable variables of directly observable, objectively measureable events are recalled more accurately than qualitative events requiring judgement interpretation or other more subjective filtering. These findings indicate that the veridicality and validity of the measurement of retrospective data is strengthened by items which prompt recall of behaviorally defined events and experiences. Validity can also be assessed through content validity evaluation by judges expert in the particular research field (Aftanas, 1984, 1985). Test-retest procedures are recommended by Aftanas to assess the stability of responses and individual items across individuals, as well as the consistency of intraindividual responses.

Consistent with these recommendations, the current research instrument was refined through pre-testing, review by expert judges, and test-retest procedures before being administered to the main sample (defined in Participant section).

The preliminary instrument ('Draft 1') was sent to experts in the field, including faculty, graduate student researchers, field researchers and field workers in Winnipeg, for evaluation of the proposed content. Concurrently, 'Draft 1' was administered to 30 undergraduate students (15 women and 15 men) from the Undergraduate Pool, Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba on two occasions, two weeks apart. This test-retest of 'Draft 1' was analyzed for stability of responses across individuals, and for the veridicality of consistent responses within individuals. Respondents were also asked for comments and suggestions to correct for item ambiguity.

The refined questionnaire ('Draft 2'), developed from feedback from expert judges and the test-retest analysis was administered to the main sample (described in Participants) following the Procedure (outlined below). Thirty-eight participants (20 women and 18 men) re-answered the questionnaire a second time, at least one week following their first administration of 'Draft 2'. This test-retest sample was analyzed to assess stability and veridicality of the final research instrument.

Measurement accuracy of sampled population

Participants themselves are the second source of measurement error in dual-process self-report procedures (Aftanas, 1984, 1985). The stability, veridicality, and validity of the persons answering the questionnaire also need to be assessed for measurement accuracy.

The stability of individual's recall of past events has been evaluated by a few researchers who report that incidents before a person is three

years old are often not recalled (Sheingold & Tenney, 1982). There is an initial decay in remembering, but further loss of accuracy in recall occurs so slowly that incidents 15 to 40 years old can be remembered as accurately as events several months old (Guttek, 1978). However, it remains difficult to directly assess participants' stability of recall within a research context.

In the current research, the questionnaire prompted recall of behaviorally-defined events, as opposed to more interpretive subjective recall, which should strengthen the inter-person stability of the data (Rycroft, 1985). In addition, the test-retest procedures gave an indication of intra-person stability (Aftanas, 1984). Careful protection of respondents' anonymity was also expected to increase the veridicality of their participation.

The class lecture could have, potentially, encouraged affirmative description of assault and abuse which had, in fact, not occurred. This phenomenon can be considered as a type of biased response to an experimenter's expectations. Markesteyn (1987) has argued that a high proportion of respondents on self-report measures will fake descriptions of victimization when asked if they have ever been victimized.

This potential effect was controlled in the current study, both during the lecture itself and during analysis of the data. A typed handout of main points of the lecture (Appendix A) was given to all classroom students at the beginning of each class lecture. Essentially data-based information, read from the same notes and summarized on overhead projections, comprised the core of each lecture. These strategies were designed to maximize consistency of the lecture, and minimize variance.

A theoretical section, near the end of the lecture, was systematically varied across classes. Lecture A had no theory, i.e., this section of the lecture was omitted, lecture B emphasized feminist theory, and lecture C emphasized the intergenerational cycle of violence theory. These strategies were designed to allow for an analysis of the potential of the lecture to influence participants' responses.

Symptomatology

An inventory to measure psychotherapeutic outcome was initially developed with symptoms commonly observed in psychiatric outpatients (Derogatis, Lipman, Rickels, Uhlenhuth & Covi, 1974). The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL) is a self-report of 58 items such as 'headaches', 'nervousness or shaking inside', 'faintness or dizziness', rated on a four-point scale ranging from 'almost never' to 'very often'. Derogatis and Cleary (1977) later extended the HSCL to create the 90 item Symptom Checklist (SLC-90), and have evaluated the structure, factors, and dimensionality of this instrument. A comparison of five major adjustment scales recommended the SLC-90 as a reliable assessment of individual change over time in adjustment and symptomatology (Edwards, Yarvis, Mueller, Zingale & Wagman, 1978).

More recently, a Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) has been developed from the SLC-90-R, and demonstrates strong test-retest and internal consistency reliabilities, as well as high correlation of comparable dimensions of the SLC-90-R (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983).

Using the HSCL, specific patterns of symptoms have been demonstrated in a sample of women seeking therapy, who have been sexually abused as children (Briere, 1984). Five additional items that distinguish Dissociation, a symptom often experienced by childhood sexual abuse survivors, have been developed by Briere and Runtz (1985).

In this study the BSI plus the five additional items developed by Briere and Runtz (1985) were used to measure symptomatology. Runtz (1987) recommended that the total score of the SCL-90 be used in assessing symptoms when studying abuse variables. The total BSI score + Dissociation score (= BSI*) were used as the symptomatology variable for the second hypothesis.

Traditional Ideology

The attitudes towards feminism scale (FEM scale), developed by Smith, Ferree, and Miller (1975), has been recommended as a measure of traditional ideology by Pagelow (1981). Beere (1979) was positive in her recommendation to researchers in using this scale, noting it is "particularly well developed, has good internal consistency reliability, and evidence of its validity has been obtained. For all these reasons, it is worth considering this scale for use in further research." (p.418).

The FEM scale includes 20 items, such as 'a woman should be expected to change her name when she marries', and 'women have the right to compete with men in every sphere of activity'. Items are answered to indicate agreement on a five-point scale, from 'very much' to 'not at all'. Shorter 10- and 5- item versions have also been developed and are recommended as a reliable option to the 20-item version (Singleton & Christiansen, 1977).

The Attitudes towards Women Scale (AWS) was developed by Spence and Helmreich (1972) to measure the degree to which an individual holds traditional or liberal views of women's roles. Shorter versions of the original scale have also been published (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), and include items which loaded most highly on the main factor of the scale. The short version used in this study included 15 items, such as 'swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man', and 'sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters'. Each item was scored on a four-point scale from 'agree strongly' to 'disagree strongly', and a summated total score determined. Walker (1984) used the AWS to measure traditional ideology and recommended its use in further research with battered women.

Both the 20-item FEM scale and the 15-item AWS scale were included in the initial 'Draft 1' of the questionnaire. The test-retest analysis indicated that individuals scored essentially the same on both scales, proportionally and directionally, across participants. This suggested that both scales were measuring a similar factor, and were providing redundant information. This argument was strengthened by the observation that several items from both scales are almost identical.

Coupled with the researcher's concerns with the overall length of the questionnaire, a decision was made to use only one of the scales to measure traditional ideology. The AWS contained a more balanced directioning of item keying, i.e., a similar number of items were keyed as 'A' or as 'D', compared with the FEM scale. The AWS also offered the advantage of 5 fewer items. For these reasons, the AWS was retained in the final 'Draft 2'

version of the questionnaire, and the FEM scale was dropped from the study. The summed total score on the AWS was used as the traditional ideology variable for hypothesis three.

Participants

Participants were University of Manitoba undergraduate students who were 21 years of age or older. A total of 222 students, 119 women and 103 men, participated in this study. Thirty-eight students, 20 women and 18 men, returned and filled out the questionnaire a second time to allow for a retest analysis.

Most participants received experimental credit for their participation. About 35 participants volunteered for the study from classes where no experimental credit was available, with most of these from classes where class time was given for participation. Far fewer students than anticipated volunteered to be in this study unless incentives of class credit or class time were offered.

A few students who completed a questionnaire were younger than 21 years, and two did not answer the final page of questions about contact with helpers and general demographic information. These were omitted from the data base.

Procedure

Recruitment

Professors were sent a letter by the researcher requesting permission to give a class lecture on family abuse. The researcher then telephoned each professor and arrangements were made to give a 45 minute lecture to undergraduate classes in the departments of Psychology and Sociology, the School of Social Work, and the Faculty of Education. The lecture focused on the incidence and prevalence of child abuse, short and long term effects of abuse, and social services currently available in Winnipeg. A list of recommended readings was available for interested students and questions were answered, both during and following the lecture. At the end of the lecture, the current research project was briefly described. All students who were 21 years or older were invited to participate in the study.

In pilot work for this study, the class lecture procedure led to a very high response rate to a short questionnaire and included a high proportion of non-victims, as well as many victims in the responding sample. The lecture was also an opportunity for potential participants to evaluate the trustworthiness of the researcher, and to have questions or concerns addressed.

Sign-up

A booklet with reminder slips of the study's time and location was circulated following the class lecture. A selection of two- to three-hour blocks of time were available, and participants would come anytime within a

block of time. Interested students chose a convenient time, and tore out a slip reminding them of the date, time, and location of the study, as well as name of the researcher. Confidentiality of participants was maintained by not asking for names, phone numbers, or other identifying information. No contact with participants was made prior to or following participation unless such contact was initiated by the student.

Data collection

Participants met the researcher outside the research room, which was a study area containing over 100 individual study carrels. The participant was asked which class they were in, and their questionnaire was marked with a coloured marker which identified which lecture they had heard (no mark for lecture A, yellow mark for lecture B, and blue mark for lecture C).

Each participant was given a consent form (Appendix B) and told:

This is the consent form. It is important to read it before you begin.

Next, the questionnaire (Appendix C) was handed to each participant and told:

This is the questionnaire. Please answer each question directly on the paper, using either pen or pencil, and follow the directions which are all the way through the questionnaire.

Next, a request for information form was given to each participant along with the following explanation:

This is a request for further information about the results or outcome of the study. It's optional and it's up to you if you want this information. If you fill out this form, it's important to place it in this ballot-type box (researcher pointed to box), separate from your questionnaire so that your name is not attached to your answers.

Finally, participants were told:

Choose an empty carrel space and complete the questionnaire privately, in your own time. If you have any questions, or if there is something you don't understand, please come and ask me. I'll be sitting here. When you are finished, please bring the questionnaire back here. Thank you.

Participants took the materials and entered the study area to find a suitable carrel where they could privately complete the questionnaire. When they were finished, each participant placed their questionnaire and consent form in a box, which held other completed questionnaires. If they had filled out the request for information form, the participant folded this sheet and dropped it into a ballot-type box.

The researcher signed their experimental credit card (if applicable) and thanked the participant for their time. Each participant was then given a written feedback sheet (Appendix D) outlining the purpose of the study and local crisis line numbers which are available for counselling or support.

The researcher was alert to any signs of distress or discomfort which may have arisen from participation, and was available to talk to any participant at any point during or immediately after the study. Few students appeared visibly distressed while participating in the study. Some participants initiated discussions with the researcher about the study or about the field in general. A few people consulted on potentially abusive situations they were concerned about, and were given referral information and support as needed. The researcher relied on her experience as a crisis counsellor to gently probe personal concerns or issues of participants who wanted to talk, and responded appropriately to these needs. Researchers who have gathered self-report information on past assault and abuse experiences have reported that few, if any, participants

find this process aversive, and many report it to be a positive experience (Finkelhor, 1979; Russell, 1982; Walker, 1984).

Retest procedure

A small sample of participants completed the questionnaire a second time, at least one week following their first session. These participants were given additional instructions which would enable the researcher to match their first questionnaire with their second one without knowing the personal identity of the participant.

In addition to the instructions given all participants at the first session (see above), participants who were to return a second time were given an additional instruction sheet, a small blank envelope, and a slip of paper to write down their self-created identification number, and were told:

In order to be able to match your responses today with your responses the second time you come, please follow these instructions to create your own identification number, and write it on the top right corner of your questionnaire. This will let me match your responses without knowing your name or other information which might identify you, and so will safeguard your privacy.

Participants created their own 7-digit number and wrote it on the questionnaire and on the slip of paper which they sealed in the small envelope. They then marked the envelope in some secret, but self-identifiable, way (e.g., nickname, doodle, codename) and dropped their envelope in a large brown envelope when they handed in their questionnaire. The researcher checked that a 7-digit number had been marked on the front of their questionnaire, and noted the date of the first session. Each

participant then chose a second time slot in which to return to the study, at least one week later, and took a reminder slip for the second session.

When arriving at the second session, each participant found their own envelope from amongst those in the large brown envelope and was given another copy of the questionnaire, which had "second session" and the date marked on it. They were told:

I've written down that this is your second session. Please write the number sealed in your envelope in the top right corner of the questionnaire. Then answer the questions, following the directions that are all the way through the questionnaire. Again, choose any carrel space you wish. Please come and ask me if you have any questions, or if there is anything you don't understand, and bring the questionnaire back here when you are finished.

Some participants noticed that it was the same questionnaire as the first time and were puzzled by this and asked if that was correct. If this happened, they were told:

That's okay. Please complete the questionnaire. I'll explain when you have finished.

The researcher checked that a 7-digit number had been marked on the completed questionnaire from the second session when each participant placed their questionnaire in the box. In addition to the written feedback given to all participants (Appendix D), those who participated in the second session were given the following verbal feedback:

About forty students have completed the questionnaire a second time. This will let me do a test-retest of the questionnaire. Because many of the questions in this study have never been asked in exactly this way in research before, I need to examine the validity and reliability of the questions themselves. In the test-retest analysis, the consistency of each individual's responses over time, as well as the consistency of the group as a whole over time will be examined. Your first questionnaire will also be used in the larger group analysis of the content of the answers as described in the written feedback sheet.

Any additional questions were also answered. Participants were again thanked for their time, and their experimental credit card was signed for their additional participation in the study.

Analysis

Sample Size

Authorities differ in their recommendations for a sample size sufficient to support multivariate analysis. Suggestions vary from a minimum of five cases for every independent variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1982) to at least 30 subjects for each independent variable studied (Pedhazur, 1982). Given the five independent variables planned for the major hypothesis, this suggested a sample size of between 25 to 150 participants.

Because the abuse factors which are central to the current research were expected to occur in a minority of the population sampled, a relatively large number of participants were recruited. The total sample size of 222 participants satisfied more conservative recommendations for subjects:independent variables. Gender-group analysis on 119 (women) and 103 (men) participants satisfied more liberal sample size guidelines, but was somewhat lower than the conservative guidelines.

Statistical Analysis

Multivariate analyses, particularly multiple regression analysis and canonical correlation analysis, were used for a priori testing of the hypotheses of the research. Multiple regression analyzes the expected changes or variance of a criterion (dependent) variable with the observed

changes or variance of a set of explanatory (independent) variables. Both the collective and separate effects of two or more predictor variables on a predicted (dependent) variable can be examined.

The general equation in multiple regression analysis describes a linear relationship between the predictor variables (x) and the predicted variable (Y):

$$Y = a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \dots + b_ix_i + e$$

where

Y is the predicted or dependent variable

a is the intercept

b are partial regression coefficients

x are predictor or independent variables

e is the residual, including error.

Levels of significance for each model as a whole, and for independent variables were set at $p < .01$, which is a strict criterion. Models which were marginally significant (i.e., $.01 < p < .05$) were also considered.

Canonical correlation analysis is a generalization of multiple regression analysis with multiple independent and multiple dependent variables. It is particularly appropriate when the criterion (dependent) variables are themselves correlated. The correlation between the two

linear composites of the independent and of the dependent variables is the canonical correlation.

The variables of childhood parental abuse included witnessing parental partner abuse (physical, sexual), as well as being abused by a parent (physical, sexual). Adulthood partner abuse variables included abuse (physical, sexual) by a partner (i.e., boy/girlfriend, lover, cohabitant, spouse).

Hypothesis 1.

For the first hypothesis, the four factors of childhood abuse, and the categorical variable of gender were the predictor (independent) variables. The two factors of adulthood marital abuse were the predicted (dependent) variables.

Hypothesis 2.

For the second hypothesis, the four factors of childhood parental abuse and the two factors of adulthood partner abuse were the predictor (independent) variables. The factor of somatic symptomatology, and the factor of seeking psychotherapy were the predicted (dependent) variables. These two dependent variables were evaluated individually, as well as in combination, as dependent variables in the equations.

Hypothesis 3.

Similar to the second hypothesis, the four factors of childhood parental abuse and the two factors of adulthood partner abuse were the predictor (independent) variables. The predicted (dependent) variable was

traditional ideology. Status of the relationship with an abusive marital partner was an additional predictor variable used to test the final subsection of this hypothesis.

Computer data entry, coding and analysis

Each item on the questionnaire was named as a variable, and the raw data from each questionnaire was entered numerically onto the University of Manitoba AMDAHL computer by the researcher. All variables used in the analysis, except for Gender (which was already coded as a raw variable), were compiled from the raw database by computer. Statistical analyses were primarily conducted using SAS, Version 5, software (SAS Institute, 1985) on the AMDAHL computer.

RESULTS

Sampling

Sample Demographics

Overall, participants ranged in age from 21 years to 46 years of age, with a mean age of 24.6 years and a median age of 23 years. Women, as a group, were slightly older than the men but men and women both had a median age of 23 years. Women ranged in age from 21 years to 46 years of age, with a mean of 25.3 years. Men ranged in age from 21 years to 38 years of age, with a mean of 23.9 years. Somewhat more women (53.6%, 119/222) than men (46.4%, 103/222) participated in the study.

Most participants were single (67.6%, 150/222), while some were married (14.0%), living together (6.8%), separated or divorced (8.6%). Most participants had no children (83.3%, 185/222), while a few had one child (6.3%), two children (5.4%), and a few had more than two children. The majority of participants had been born in Canada (81.5%, 181/222) and spoke English as their first language (86.5%, 192/222).

Slightly more men were single (71.8%, 74/103) compared with women participants (63.9%, 76/119), and slightly more women were married (18.5%, 22/119) compared with men participants (8.7%, 9/103). This was consistent with the women, as a group, being slightly older than the men, as a group. An equivalent proportion of women and men were either living together, separated or divorced, or remarried. Numbers of children were reported proportionally by both men and women.

Slightly more men (84.5%, 87/103) than women (79.0%, 94/119) were born in Canada, and more men (92.2%, 95/103) spoke English as their first language compared with women participants (81.5%, 97/119). However, many women who were not born in Canada had immigrated at an early age such that an equivalent proportion of both men and women were either born in Canada or living in Canada before the age of 14 years.

These statistics indicated that the women and men in the sample represented a similar demographic pool of University undergraduate students, and therefore supported analysis as a combined group, and also as individual gender groups.

Sample by Lecture

Lecture group B was the larger of the three lecture groups. Proportionally more participants (chi square = 11.78, $p < .001$) heard lecture B (98/222) than either lecture A (64/222) or lecture C (60/222). Proportionally similar numbers of women and men participants heard each of the three lectures. Participants were not assigned to each lecture group, but volunteered for the study following their class lecture. That more participants happened to have heard lecture B may be the result of a higher proportion of students who were 21 years of age or older having been in the classes who heard that particular lecture.

Demographic characteristics were similarly distributed across participants, between lecture groups. A similar proportion of participants, between groups, answered affirmatively to major questions about childhood physical abuse, childhood sexual abuse, adulthood physical

abuse, and adulthood sexual abuse. Consistent with this, gender groups had proportionally similar demographic characteristics and affirmative responses to childhood and adulthood abuse questions, across lecture groups.

These observations indicated an absence of first order treatment effect by lecture. Participants who heard lecture A, lecture B, or lecture C were not differentially influenced by the differences between the lectures in their answers on the questionnaire. This supported analysis on the combined pool of participants. The higher number of participants who heard lecture B, compared with the number who heard either of the other lectures, was not considered sufficient reason to limit combined analysis across groups because responses on the questionnaire did not distinguish participants who heard lecture B.

Retest Reliability

Retest correlations of the major variables for the group of 38 participants, who returned after at least a week to complete the questionnaire a second time, indicated good reliability of the survey instrument.

Retest correlations of demographic variables were, on average, $r = .94$. Helpseeking variables were, on average, $r = .93$, and the THERAPY seeking variable was $r = .91$. Retest correlations of the two previously published scales were good. The AWS was $r = .84$, and the BSI* was $r = .92$.

Retest correlations of the family abusive victimization variables were generally good, with the exception of the adulthood sexual abuse variable

(AS). Witnessing interparental abuse was reliable for both physical abuse (PP, $r = .86$) and sexual abuse (PS, $r = 1.00$). Childhood experience of abuse was also reliable, for childhood sexual abuse by a family member (CFS, $r = .91$), childhood physical abuse by a family member (CFP, $r = 1.00$), and childhood physical abuse by a parent (CPP, $r = 1.00$). Childhood sexual abuse by a parent (CPS) was singular, as none of the 38 retest participants reported its occurrence on either questionnaire.

Adulthood abuse by a partner was less reliably reported than childhood abuse. Adulthood physical abuse by a partner (AP) was moderately reliable ($r = .80$), while adulthood sexual abuse by a partner (AS) had poor retest reliability ($r = .37$). The discrete data indicated that one man (1/18) reported AS on the first questionnaire, but not on the second questionnaire. Two women (2/20) reported AS the first time, while one of the two reported AS the second time. A third woman who did not report AS on the first questionnaire, reported AS the second time. Thus, the overall proportion of AS remained similar, across time, but there was inconsistency in who reported which incidents of AS. Both men and women were less than reliable in reporting adulthood sexual victimization by a partner, over time, while they were reasonably reliable in reporting adulthood physical victimization.

The retest correlations for the revictimization variables were somewhat lower than the individual abuse variables. Physical revictimization, i.e., physical abuse experienced both in childhood and adulthood, was moderately reliable for both (REPHYP, $r = .73$; REPHYF, $r = .73$). Sexual revictimization (RESEXP or RESEXF) was singular, with no one reporting sexual victimization both in childhood and in adulthood.

Difference scores, across participants, were also examined for significant differences between means of the variables across the time interval. The symptomatology variable, BSI*, was significantly lower ($t = -3.09$, $p < .004$; mean = 39.63, S.D. = 40.63) on the second administration of the questionnaire, compared with the first (mean = 48.65, S.D. = 40.04). This indicated that participants reported less symptomatology (either fewer symptoms, or less intense symptoms) a week or so after their first report. However, the high retest correlation ($r = .92$) of BSI* indicated that the shift was reliable in that the rank ordering of individuals, across time, did not change significantly. All other variables examined did not have significant differences between means, across the time interval.

These retest results indicated that the data was reasonably reliable. Some caution may be warranted in the interpretation of the sexual abuse variables, due to low frequency reports in childhood, and poorer reliability in the adulthood sexual abuse reports.

Abusive Victimization

Witnessing interparental Physical Abuse

Witnessing physical abuse between parents during childhood was defined as having occurred if participants answered "yes" to question 87: 'Did you ever see or hear one of your parents physically harm/mistreat a second parent?', and also answered "yes" to question 87ix and/or 87xxi: 'Do you think this behavior was abusive?'

Thirty-two participants (14.4%, 32/222) described 36 parents who were physically abusive to another parent, and four of the 32 participants

described a second parent who had physically abused another parent. Seventeen women participants (14.3%, 17/119) and 15 men participants (14.6%, 15/103) had witnessed physical abuse between their parents during childhood. Most of the abusive parents were fathers (83.3%, 30/36) with fewer mothers (16.7%, 6/36) described as abusive. Half of the mothers described as abusive (3/6) to their partners were also described as being physically victimized by their male partners. Almost all of the parents abusing their partners were the biological parents (94.4%, 34/36) of participants, with only a few described as step-parents (2/36).

Participants were, on average, seven or eight years old when they first witnessed physical abuse between their parents, and they continued to witness inter-parental physical abuse for an average of five to six years. The frequency of the witnessed abuse ranged from a single incident (5/36) to once a week (2/36). Many participants (16/36) saw their father physically abuse their mother two or three times, and many witnessed abuse between their parents about once a year (13/36).

Half of the fathers (3/6) who were victimized were described as having experienced no physical injuries, while one father was bruised and lost some hair, and one had had clothing torn. Of the 30 mothers who had been victimized, 12 were described as having experience no physical injuries. Half of the mothers (16/30) had been bruised, six had marks, two had cuts or scrapes, six had experienced black eyes, two had had bloody noses, two suffered joint or spinal injury, and one mother experienced sprained or broken bones.

Witnessing interparental Sexual Abuse

Witnessing sexual abuse between parents during childhood was defined as having occurred if participants answered "yes" to question 90: 'Did you ever see or hear one of your parents act in a sexual way which distressed a second parent?', and also answered "yes" to question 90ix and/or 90xxi: 'Do you think this behavior was abusive?'. Witnessing interparental sexual abuse during childhood was also defined as having occurred if participants answered "yes" to question 91: 'Did you ever see or hear one of your parents make a second parent act sexually against their will?', and also answered "yes" to question 91ix and/or 91xxi: 'Do you think this behavior was abusive?'.

Very few participants reported that they had ever witnessed sexual abuse between their parents. Five participants (2.3%, 5/222), three women and two men, had witnessed six parents sexually abuse another parent during childhood. Most of the abusive parents were fathers (5/6) who abused mothers, and most of the abusive partners were the biological parents (5/6) of the participants.

Participants were, on average, 11 to 13 years old when they first witnessed sexual abuse between their parents. Half of the participants (3/5) witnessed one incident of sexual abuse, one witnessed a couple of incidents, and two participants witnessed their father sexually abuse their mother several times a year for several years. No physical injuries as a result of sexual abuse between parents were reported.

Childhood Physical Abuse

Physical abuse by a parent during childhood was defined as having occurred if participants answered "yes" to question 95: 'Did anyone ever physically harm/mistreat you?', and answered "yes" to question 95vii and/or 95xviii: 'Do you think this behavior was abusive?', and answered either "biological parent", "adoptive or step-parent", or "foster parent" to question 95ii: 'What relationship were they to you?'.

Forty-three participants (19.4%, 43/222), 27 women and 16 men, reported having been physically abused during childhood by 55 family members. Forty of these 55 (72.7%, 40/55) were parents, 26 fathers and 14 mothers. Thirteen siblings (12 brothers and 1 sister), one male cousin, and one boyfriend of a parent were also described as having been physically abusive to participants during childhood. Childhood physical abuse by a family member was predominantly experienced by girl-children (27/43 victims), and predominantly perpetrated by male offenders (40/55 offenders) in the family.

Participants were, on average, 8 to 10 years old when the physical abuse began, and the abuse continued, on average, for 4 to 6 years. Family offenders were typically much older than their victims. On average, family offenders were 26 to 30 years old when the abuse began, and 20 years older than participant victims. Most participants who described physical abuse from a family member during childhood experienced the abuse more than once (48/55), with about half (29/55) who experienced physical abuse several times a year or more frequently. Significant injuries were reported by almost half of the victims of childhood physical abuse from a family

member, ranging from bruising (20/55) to sprained or broken bones (1/55) and spinal or joint injury (2/55).

Childhood Sexual Abuse

Eleven participants (5%, 11/222), nine women and two men, reported having been sexually abused by 16 family members during childhood. Compared with childhood physical abuse, participants who reported having experienced childhood sexual abuse were less likely to have been abused by a family member, than by a non-family member. Thirteen of these 16 abusers were male, and 3 were female. Nine of these 16 were siblings, with eight brothers and one sister identified as having sexually abused participants during childhood. Two mothers, two boyfriends of parents, two grandfathers, and one uncle were also identified as having sexually abused participants during childhood.

Participants were, on average, 9 to 10 years old when the sexual abuse began, and the abuse continued, on average, for one year. Family member offenders were, on average, 11 to 13 years older than their victims, and were, on average, 20 to 23 years of age when the sexual abuse began. The two male victims reported that the sexual victimization by a family member occurred once, while the female victims reported frequencies ranging from once (2/16) through to once a month (3/16), and once a week (1/16). Significant physical injuries were not usually reported by participants who had been sexually abused in childhood.

Adulthood Physical Abuse

Thirty-nine participants (17.6%, 39/222) described a total of 42 partners who had been physically abusive in adulthood. Most were heterosexual relationships, and a few (3/42) were same-gender relationships. More women (27.7%, 33/119) than men (5.8%, 6/103) participants had been physically abused in adulthood, and more offenders were male (37/42) than female (5/42). Most of the relationships were of a permanent nature; 11/42 were dating steadily, 15/42 were living with their partner, 9/42 were married, and 2/42 were former boyfriends. Some were of a more casual nature; 2/42 were acquaintances, 2/42 were friends, and 1/42 were dating casually.

Participants were, on average, 20 to 21 years old when the physical abuse began, and the abuse continued, on average, for one year. Abusive partners were, on average, 22 to 24 years old when the abuse began, and were, on average, one to three years older than their partners.

Many of the participants reported that the physical abuse from their partner had occurred once (14/42), or a few times (16/42). A significant number reported having been victimized once a year or more frequently (10/42). Many participants had experienced serious injuries as a result of adulthood physical abuse. Fourteen had been bruised, 11/42 reported cuts or scrapes, 9/42 had bloody noses, 8/42 experienced black eyes, 3/42 had sprained or broken bones, 2/42 had concussions, and 3/42 experienced head injuries.

Adulthood Sexual Abuse

Thirty-six participants (16.2%, 36/222) described a total of 54 partners who had been sexually abusive in adulthood. Participants were more likely to have experienced adulthood sexual abuse from more than one partner, compared with adulthood physical abuse. Most were heterosexual relationships, and a few (5/54) were same-gender relationships. Similar to the gender distribution in adulthood physical abuse, more women (26%, 31/119) than men (4.9%, 5/103) participants had been sexually abused in adulthood, and many more offenders were male (49/54) than female (5/54). Some of the relationships were of a casual nature; 7/54 were acquaintances, 1/54 was a co-worker, 9/54 were dating casually, and 6/54 were friends. Almost half of the relationships were of a permanent nature; 5/54 were dating steadily, 14/54 were living with their partner, and 7/54 were married. Other partners included 2/54 strangers, 2/54 relatives, and 1/54 was unspecified.

Participants were, on average, 20 to 21 years old when the sexual abuse began, and it continued, on average, for one year. Abusive partners were, on average, 23 to 24 years old when the abuse began, and were, on average, three years older than their partners.

About half of the participants reported that the abuse had occurred once (26/54), while some (16/54) had occurred two or three times. A number of participants (12/54) had been sexually abused by their partners several times a year or more frequently. Few serious physical injuries were reported by participants who had been sexually abused by their partner.

Hypothesis One : Gender is more predictive of adulthood partner victimization, in a general population, than is childhood parental abuse

The salience of gender as a predictor of adulthood partner victimization was examined through general frequency distributions, regression equations, and canonical correlations. Results of general analyses will be first discussed, followed by a summary of the results of the subsections of the primary hypothesis.

Frequency distributions

Table 1 presents a summary of the frequencies of experiences of abusive behavior described by participants. The distribution indicates that, as children, a similar number of women and men participants witnessed abuse between their parents, and that witnessing physical abuse was a more frequent experience than witnessing sexual abuse between parents. Being abused, in childhood, by a family member was experienced by more girls than boys, and both genders more frequently reported having been physically abused than having been sexually abused by a family member. In adulthood, many more women than men participants reported having experienced abusive behavior by their partners. Participants reported relatively as frequently that they had been sexually abused as that they had been physically abused by a partner.

Insert Table 1 about here

There was a predominance of female victims, as shown in Table 1, though a significant proportion of male victims, especially in childhood, is evident in the distribution. Examination of the distribution of offenders, by gender, across types of abuse experiences (see Table 2) indicates a very strong predominance of male, compared to female, offenders.

Insert Table 2 about here

Regression Analysis

The nominal or categorical nature of the gender variable posed some difficulties for multivariate analysis as most current statistical software programs presume that variables entered into equations have been measured quantitatively (often called "numeric" variables). The GLM procedure in the SAS programs (SAS Institute, 1985) includes regression analysis that recognizes nominal variables, and handles them distinct from numeric variables. The limitation is that the GLM procedure is based on an analysis of variance model, and regression proceeds upon dependent variables individually, and not upon a combination of dependent variables. Because of the importance of the gender variable in the analysis, the GLM procedure was used for regression analysis of this data.

An initial regression equation with adulthood physical abuse (AP) and adulthood sexual abuse (AS) as the dependent variables, and childhood

witnessing parental physical abuse (PP), childhood witnessing parental sexual abuse (PS), childhood physical abuse by a parent (CPP), and childhood sexual abuse by a parent (CPS), and gender (G) as the independent variables was examined (see Appendix E for a summary of these and all abbreviations). The abuse variables were initially coded for presence (1) or absence (0) of abuse. This model of independent variables was found to be predictive of the dependent variables ($F = 4.80, 5.38; p < .0003$), at a significant level, but the model was a fairly poor fit ($R\text{-square} = .10$) as only about 10% of the variance of the dependent variables was accounted for in this model (see Table 3). Examination of the relative contribution of each independent variable indicated that G contributed significantly ($p < .0001$) to the variance of the dependent variables, while the four childhood abuse variables did not significantly contribute individually to the model.

Insert Table 3 about here

Some researchers have argued that the experience of repeated assaults is qualitatively different from the experience of a single incident of assault (Finkelhor, 1979; Pagelow, 1981; Straus et al., 1980). This has led to the practice of differentiating individuals who were abused by one assailant from those who were abused by more than one assailant, or more than one time by the same assailant. The abuse variable were, therefore, recoded such that 0= no abuse experience, 1= single incident of abuse, and 2= repeated experience of abuse. This recoding was retained for all subsequent analysis which included abuse variables.

A regression equation, with the same variables as the first equation, which included the recoded abuse variables produced essentially the same results. With AP as the dependent variable ($F = 4.48, p < .0007$), and with AS as the dependent variable ($F = 4.88, p < .0003$) the model was significant, but again only accounted for about 10% of the variance ($R\text{-square} = .10$) of these dependent variables. Again, G was the only independent variable ($p < .0001$) which significantly contributed individually to the model, while the childhood abuse variables did not.

Regression equations for each gender group of participants were also examined to determine, with gender removed as a predictor variable, whether childhood abuse experiences were predictive of adulthood abuse. For women, the model of childhood abuse (PP, PS, CPS, CPP) as the independent variables with adulthood abuse (AP, AS) as the dependent variables was not significant ($F = .69, p < .6016$). For men, the model was significant in predicting AS ($F = 4.01, p < .0047$), and marginally significant in predicting AP ($F = 3.11, p < .0186$). The variable PS was found to significantly ($F = 12.45, p < .0006$) contribute individually to the model, while the other childhood abuse factors did not.

Few participants ($n = 2$) reported having been sexually abused during childhood by a parent, while many more ($n = 40$) reported having been physically abused by a parent in childhood. It can be argued that abuse by other close family members, such as siblings, uncles or aunts, grandparents, and cousins, can be particularly significant because of the nature of family ties (Straus et al., 1980). This argument could be particularly important when considering childhood sexual abuse because definitions often include family relationships which are deemed

unacceptable if sexual. A regression analysis was, therefore, conducted with an expansion of the definitions of childhood physical abuse to include childhood physical abuse by a family member (CFP) and childhood sexual abuse by a family member (CFS). Family member was defined as either a parent, boy/girlfriend of parent, uncle or aunt, grandparent, sibling, or cousin.

The regression equation with AP and AS as the dependent variables and PP, PS, CFP, CFS, and G as the independent variables was found to be significant ($F = 4.17, 4.46; p < .0012$), as shown in Table 4. As with the previous regression analyses, the only independent variable which significantly contributed individually to the model was G ($p < .0002$), while the childhood abuse factors did not. This model, with the family member abuse factors, was a slightly poorer fit ($R\text{-square} = .09$) than the parent abuse factor model, indicating that this family abuse model accounted for about 9% of the variance of the dependent variables.

Insert Table 4 about here

Regression equations for each gender group of participants were again examined. For women, the model of childhood family abuse (PP, PS, CFP, CFS) being predictive of adulthood abuse (AP, AS) was not significant ($F = .64, p < .6334$). For men, similar to the earlier regression, the model was significant in predicting AS ($F = 4.40, p < .0045$), but was marginally

significant in predicting AP ($F = 3.31, p < .0138$). Again, PS was the independent variable which significantly ($F = 13.07, p < .0005$) contributed individually to the model, while the other childhood abuse factors (PP, CFP, CFS) did not.

Stepwise regression was also performed to determine the combination of independent variables which best "fit" the model of predicting the dependent variables. Procedure STEPWISE in SAS (SAS Institute, 1985), the usual procedure used in this type of analysis, accepts only numeric variables. Gender (G) was, therefore excluded from this procedure. PP, PS, CFP, CFS were entered as independent variables, and AP, AS were the dependent variables. Forward, backward, stepwise, maximum R-square, and minimum R-square selection procedures were conducted and compared. The best model found through these procedures was:

$$AP + AS = PS + CFP + CFS .$$

This model excluded PP as an independent variable. However, the model was not significant ($F = 1.9, p < .12$), and the independent variables explained only about 3% of the variance of the dependent variables. This further strengthened the conclusion that there was no systematic relationship between the childhood family abuse factors and the adulthood partner abuse factors.

Canonical Correlation

Canonical correlation examines the relationships between linear combinations of sets of variables such that each successive canonical variate represents a dimension from the independent variables that is

correlated with a dimension of the dependent variables. A particularly descriptive multivariate technique, canonical correlational analysis can assist understanding of the relative contributions of sets of variables to the variance within that set, and to another paired set of variables. Similar to regression analysis, canonical correlation typically includes only numeric variables. Categorical variables, such as gender, must be given special consideration.

In order to explore the primary hypothesis, a canonical correlation was performed between the set of adulthood abuse variables (AP and AS) and the set of childhood parental abuse variables (PP, PS, CPP, and CPS), and G was excluded. All 222 participants were entered. The first canonical correlation was .209, which was not significant ($F = 1.264$, $p < .261$, $R\text{-square} = .044$). This indicated that there were no substantial correlational relationship between these two sets of variables.

As in the previous regression analysis, the definition of childhood abuse was then expanded to include abuse by family members. A second canonical correlation analysis was conducted which included CFP and CFS, in place of CPP and CPS. Results were similar to the first canonical correlation. The first canonical correlation for this second analysis was .195, which was not significant ($F = 1.130$, $p < .342$, $R\text{-square} = .038$).

Canonical correlation analysis was also performed between the sets of adulthood abuse variables and the childhood abuse variables, by gender. That is, canonical correlates were examined for men participants and for women participants separately. This was an alternate way to accommodate the categorical nature of the G variable. AP and AS were the dependent variable set, and PP, PS, CFP, CFS and G were the independent variable set.

For men, the first canonical correlation was .43 (18% of variance), and the second canonical correlation was .16 (3% of variance). The first canonical correlation was statistically significant ($F = 2.969, p < .0037$), while the second was not significant ($F = .8883, p < .4501$). The first canonical variate was retained as accounting for moderate linkages ($R\text{-square} = .185$) between the two sets of variables, and the second was dropped from further consideration. Inspection of the squared multiple correlations between the variables of the first canonical variate indicated an absence of singularity or multicollinearity which might have threatened the validity of the variate.

As presented in Table 5, both AS and AP were relevant to the first canonical variate in the adulthood abuse set. Among the childhood abuse variables, PS, PP, and CFP were relevant to the canonical variate. The first canonical variate accounted for 66% of the variance of the adulthood abuse variable set, and the adulthood set explained 12% of the variance of the childhood abuse set. The variate accounted for 31% of the variance of the childhood set, and the childhood set accounted for 6% of the variance of the adulthood abuse set. The two sets of variables share 23% of their variance within the first canonical variate.

Insert Table 5 about here

The first canonical variate indicates that men who experienced adulthood sexual abuse from a partner (.85) and adulthood physical abuse from a partner (.76) are very likely to have previously witnessed sexual abuse between their parents (.94), and somewhat likely to have witnessed physical abuse between their parents (.45) and/or have been physically abused by a family member (.38) during childhood.

For women participants, the first canonical correlation was .15 (R-square = .023) and the second canonical correlation was .08 (R-square = .002). Neither the first canonical correlation ($F = .4187, p < .9091$) nor the second canonical correlation ($F = .2301, p < .8753$) was statistically significant, and further consideration of these variates was not warranted.

This lack of correlational relationship indicated that, for women, the set of adulthood abuse variables and the set of childhood abuse variables shared no systematic pattern of variance. Neither set of abuse variables could account for variance in the other set, nor could any pattern of association between variables be detected through canonical correlation.

Summary Results of First Hypothesis

The primary first hypothesis:

Gender is more predictive of adulthood partner victimization, in a general population, than is childhood parental abuse,

has been strongly supported by the data. Gender explained a small, but significant, proportion of the variance of adulthood partner abuse in the sample of men and women, while childhood parental abuse did not contribute

significantly to the variance of adulthood partner abuse. Being female was more predictive of adulthood partner abuse than any of the childhood family abuse factors.

a) Being female is more predictive of adulthood partner victimization than is being male.

This subhypothesis was strongly supported by the data. A 2x2 chi-square of gender by adulthood abuse on the frequency distributions (Table 1) within the sample was significant (chi-square = 29.65, $p < .001$). Regression analysis demonstrated that gender (i.e., being female) was predictive of adulthood abuse, but the childhood abuse variables were not.

b) Being female is more predictive of adulthood partner victimization than is childhood parental abuse.

This subhypothesis was also supported by the data. As discussed, regression equations clearly indicated that gender was predictive of adulthood abuse and childhood abuse was not, in the overall sample. Regression analysis and canonical correlation analysis, by gender, also demonstrated that, for women, there was no significant relationship between childhood abuse and adulthood abuse. Minimal relationships between some childhood abuse and adulthood abuse factors were found for men, but not for women.

c) Women are more likely to have been victims of adulthood partner abuse than to have been victims of childhood parental abuse.

This subhypothesis was not supported by the data. A 2x2 chi-square of childhood parental abuse by adulthood partner abuse, with women participants, was not significant (chi-square = 1.3545, $p < .25$). Yet the multivariate analysis demonstrated that childhood parental (and/or childhood family) abuse did not predict adulthood partner abuse for women, or for the sample as a whole. This indicated that although a large proportion of women experienced childhood abuse and a large proportion of women experienced adulthood abuse, women who were victimized as children were not particularly the same women who were victimized as adults. The relationship between childhood and adulthood abuse was not predictive. One did not explain the other.

Hypothesis Two: Revictimization (i.e., both childhood parental and adulthood partner abuse) is more predictive of high somatic symptomization and/or seeking therapeutic intervention than is either childhood parental or adulthood partner abuse.

Frequency distribution of BSI* and THERAPY

As discussed in the Method section, symptomatology was measured as the sum of questions 16 to 73 of the questionnaire (Appendix C). This was the BSI scale plus the five Dissociation items. This will hereafter be referred to as the BSI*, to distinguish it from the published BSI scale (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983).

Across participants, scores on the BSI* ranged from 5 to 182, with a mean score of 47.806 (S.D. = 32.223), and a median of 40. For men participants, scores on the BSI* ranged from 5 to 142, with a mean score of

44.728 (S.D. = 27.081), and a median of 38. For women, the range was from 6 to 182, with a mean of 50.470 (S.D. = 35.990), and a median of 41. Though women, on the whole, had slightly higher scores on the BSI* compared to men, the distributions were not significantly dissimilar. This supported analysis across and between gender groups.

Helpseeking behavior was measured on questions 107 and 108 of the questionnaire. Across participants, almost half of the participants (48.2%, 107/222) reported that they had talked to someone, outside of their family, about a family or personal problem. About one quarter of all participants (24.3%, 54/222) indicated that they had, more recently, talked to a second person different than the first. Proportionally the same number of women as men indicated they had spoken to one or two people about a personal or family problem.

The most frequently identified person to whom participants turned for help was a friend (43/107 first helpers, 16/54 second helpers). The second most frequently identified helper was a counselor (12/107, 12/54), followed by doctor/physician (11/107, 4/54), priest/minister (9/107, 5/54), psychologist (7/107, 4/54), psychiatrist (5/107, 4/54), and social worker (5/107, 4/54). Other helpers (15/107, 5/54) were also identified.

Therapeutic contact was defined as having had at least two to three sessions with a psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker, and/or counselor (= THERAPY variable). Table 6 presents the relative frequency distribution of THERAPY, plus the comparative distribution of DOCTOR (seeking help from a doctor/physician), RELIGION (seeking help from a priest/minister), and FRIEND (seeking help from a friend). The tendency for women to seek help

from professional caregivers more often than men, as demonstrated in Table 6, has been previously noted in the literature (Chesler, 1972).

Insert Table 6 about here

THERAPY contact was independent of DOCTOR contact for men, while three women who sought THERAPY (3/21) also sought help from a DOCTOR (3/11). THERAPY contact was independent of RELIGION contact for women, while one man who sought THERAPY (1/10) also sought help from a priest/minister, i.e., RELIGION (1/5). This suggested that those participants who sought THERAPY were not likely to have also sought help from a doctor/physician or from a priest/minister.

Regression Analysis

The second hypothesis presumed that women were the prevalent victims of adulthood partner abuse. This presumption was supported by the data and analysis of the second hypothesis was conducted with data from the women participants (n = 119).

The first regression equation considered was with BSI* as the dependent variable, and PP, PS, CPP, and CPS as the independent variables. This model was not significant ($F = 1.447$, $p < .3381$), indicating that the four childhood parental abuse variables were not predictive of higher symptomatology, for the women.

The second equation retained BSI* as the dependent variable, and entered the adulthood partner abuse variables AP and AS as the independent variables. This model was not significant ($F = .658, p < .5197$). This indicated that adulthood partner abuse experiences were not particularly predictive of somatic symptoms, for women participants.

Revictimization was examined by retaining BSI* as the dependent variable, and including the childhood witnessing of interparental abuse as well as adulthood abuse by a partner (= REPA), and being abused by a parent in childhood as well as adulthood abuse by a partner (= RECPA) as the independent variables. This regression model was not significant ($F = .279, p < .7569$). This indicated that revictimization, as defined by REPA and RECPA, was not predictive of symptomatology, for women.

The salience of revictimization of a specific type of abuse, either physical or sexual, was examined in the next regression equation. Still retaining BSI* as the independent variable, the revictimization variables of childhood witnessing or being physically abused by a parent as well as adulthood physical abuse by a partner (= REPHYP), and childhood witnessing or being sexually abused by a parent as well as adulthood sexual abuse by a partner (= RESEXP) were the independent variables. This regression model was not significant ($F = .347, p < .5572$). The variable RESEXP was not present within the sample of women participants, and produced singularity in the model. This made it difficult to interpret these results.

The definition of childhood abuse was, as with the first hypothesis, expanded to include being abused by a family member (i.e., parents, girl/boyfriend of parent, grandparent, aunt or uncle, sibling, cousin)

during childhood. A model with BSI* as the dependent variable, and PP, PS, CFP, and CFS as the independent variables was considered. This model was marginally significant ($F = 2.602$, $p < .0396$), indicating that the childhood family abuse variables were somewhat predictive ($R\text{-square} = .0837$) of somatic symptoms (see Table 7). The childhood abuse factors did not individually contribute significantly to the variance of BSI*. This suggested that childhood abuse by a family member was somewhat predictive of higher symptomatology, for women.

Insert Table 7 about here

A final regression equation was examined with the expanded childhood family abuse definitions integrated into the revictimization variables. REPHYF included childhood witnessing parental physical abuse and/or being physically abused by a family member, as well as adulthood physical abuse by a partner. RESEXF included childhood witnessing parental sexual abuse and/or being sexually abused by a family member, as well as adulthood sexual abuse by a partner. BSI* was, again, the dependent variable, and REPHYF and RESEXF were the independent variables. This model was the most significant ($F = 8.765$, $p < .0003$, $R\text{-square} = .1313$) of the regression models examined for this hypothesis (see Table 7). RESEXF was individually significant in explaining the variance of BSI*, while REPHYF was not. The model, as a whole, explained about 13% of the variance of BSI*. These results indicated that experiencing family sexual abuse in childhood and

again in adulthood was significantly predictive of higher symptomatology, while re-experiencing family physical abuse was less predictive, for women participants.

A second set of regression equations, similar to the ones discussed, but with THERAPY as the dependent variable (instead of BSI*) were conducted.

The first model, with THERAPY as the dependent variable, and PP, PS, CPP, CPS as the independent variables was found to be marginally significant ($F = 2.631$, $p < .0379$, $R\text{-square} = .0845$). Table 8 presents the details of this model, which explained about 8% of the variance of THERAPY. CPS individually contributed significantly to the model, while PP, PS, CPP did not. These results indicated that, for women participants, childhood sexual abuse by a parent was somewhat predictive of therapy-seeking behavior, but other childhood parental abuse factors were not very predictive.

Insert Table 8 about here

Other regression models examined with THERAPY as the dependent variables were not significant. Adulthood partner abuse (with AP and AS as the independent variables) was not predictive ($F = .406$, $p < .6670$) of THERAPY. Revictimization (with REPA and RECPA as independent variables) was not predictive ($F = .352$, $p < .7040$) of THERAPY.

The childhood abuse variables were expanded to include abuse by family members (CFP and CFS), but the model which included PP, PS, CFP, and CFS as independent variables was not significantly predictive ($F = 1.180$, $p < .3234$) of THERAPY. This was surprising, as the childhood parental abuse model (see above) had been predictive.

These regression equations indicated that, for women, there was no strong relationship between abusive family victimization and therapeutic help-seeking behavior. A modest relationship between childhood sexual abuse by a parent and therapy-seeking behavior was demonstrated, but other childhood and adulthood experiences did not well account for the variance of THERAPY. Sexual revictimization was also somewhat predictive of therapy-seeking, for women.

Canonical Correlation

Canonical correlation depends on a minimum of two variables in each set of any canonical analysis. Therefore, the two dependent variables of the second hypothesis (BSI* and THERAPY) were entered into one side of the canonical correlation, and various combinations of sets of abuse variables into the other side.

With childhood parental abuse (PP, PS, CPP, CPS) as the set of abuse variables, the first canonical correlation was .3199 ($F = 1.7362$, $p < .0912$, $R\text{-square} = .1023$), which was not significant. Though this variate explained a reasonable proportion (about 10%) of the variance, the lack of significance indicated that there was no pattern of correlation between the set of somatic symptoms and therapy-seeking, and the childhood parental abuse set.

Next, adulthood abuse (AP and AS) were considered as the set of abuse variables. The first canonical variate was not significant ($F = .4784$, $p < .7516$, $R\text{-square} = .0156$). This lack of significance indicated that there was no correlational relationship between the set of somatic symptoms and therapy-seeking behavior, and the set of adulthood partner abuse, for women.

Revictimization (REPA and RECPA) through childhood parental and adulthood partner abuse was entered as the set of abuse variables in the next canonical model, and the two dependent variables (BSI* and THERAPY) comprised the second set. The first canonical correlation was .1094 ($R\text{-square} = .0120$) with an overall F of .3552 ($p < .8403$). This variate was not significant, and the model was not considered any further. This indicated that, for women, there was no correlational relationship between the somatic symptoms and therapy-seeking set, and the revictimization set.

Revictimization, as defined by REPHYP and RESEXP could not be examined because of the singularity of the RESEXP variable.

Canonical correlations with the expanded family abuse definitions of the CFP and CFS variables were also examined. The model with BSI* and THERAPY as one set, and PP,PS, CFP, CFS as the second set produced a first canonical correlation of .3229 ($F = 1.7316$, $p < .0922$, $R\text{-square} = .1043$). The second canonical correlation was .0939 ($F = .3377$, $p < .7981$, $R\text{-square} = .0088$). Neither canonical variate was significant, although the first variate explained about 10% of the shared variance between the two sets of variables. This indicated that, similar to childhood parental abuse, childhood family abuse was not significantly correlated with symptomatology and/or therapy-seeking behavior among women participants.

Revictimization was also expanded to include childhood family abuse, in place of the childhood parental abuse variables, in the next canonical model. The set of BSI* and THERAPY was compared with REPHYF and RESEXF. The first canonical correlation was .3625 ($F = 4.5086$, $p < .0016$, $R\text{-square} = .1314$), which was very significant. The second canonical correlation was .1002 ($F = 1.1759$, $p < .2804$, $R\text{-square} = .0100$), which was not significant. The first canonical variate was retained as accounting for moderate (about 13% of variance) relationships between the two sets of variables, and the second variate was not considered further. Inspection of the squared multiple correlations between the variables of the first canonical variate indicated an absence of singularity or multicollinearity.

As presented in Table 9, BSI* was relevant to the first canonical variate, and THERAPY was not. Among the family revictimization set of variables, in order of magnitude, both RESEXF and REPHYF were relevant to the first canonical variate. The first variate accounted for 50% of the variance of the symptom and therapy set, and the symptom and therapy set explained 7% of the variance of the family revictimization set. The variate accounted for 62% of the variance of the family revictimization set, and the family revictimization set explained 8% of the variance of the symptom and therapy set. The two sets of variables share 15% of their variance within the first canonical variate.

Insert Table 9 about here

This first canonical variate indicated that women who have been sexually revictimized (both in childhood and adulthood) by family members (.99) and also may have been physically revictimized by family members (.50) were very likely to currently be experiencing a high degree of symptomatology (.99).

Summary results of Second Hypothesis

The ancillary second hypothesis:

Revictimization (i.e., both childhood parental and adulthood partner abuse) is more predictive of high somatic symptomatology and/or seeking therapeutic intervention than is either childhood parental or adulthood partner abuse,

was partially supported by the data. Regression analysis and canonical correlational analysis indicated particular salience, for women participants, of childhood sexual abuse by a family member in accounting for higher symptomatology, and of childhood sexual abuse by a parent in accounting for therapy-seeking behavior. The salience of abusive sexual victimization, for women, was also evident in revictimization by family members. Women participants who were sexually revictimized, both as children and as adults, by family members were currently experiencing higher symptomatology, as measured by the BSI*. Revictimization did not particularly account for therapy-seeking behavior.

a) Women with high somatic symptomatology are more likely to have been revictimized than to have experienced only childhood abuse.

This subhypothesis was modestly supported. Childhood parental abuse was not significantly predictive of BSI*, while revictimization significantly

explained some variance of BSI*. However, childhood family abuse, particularly sexual abuse, was marginally predictive of BSI*, for women. And sexual revictimization was very predictive of BSI*, while physical revictimization was not.

b) Women with high somatic symptomatology are more likely to have been revictimized than to have experienced only adulthood partner abuse.

This subhypothesis was strongly supported by the data. Adulthood partner abuse was not, for women, particularly predictive of high scores on the BSI*. Revictimization, particularly sexual revictimization, was very predictive of higher symptomatology for women participants.

c) Women who have sought significant therapeutic intervention (i.e., at least two or three in-person sessions with a psychiatrist, a psychologist, a social worker or a counselor) are more likely to have been revictimized than to have experienced only childhood parental abuse.

This subhypothesis was not supported. Childhood parental abuse, particularly childhood sexual abuse by a parent, was somewhat predictive of women seeking therapy. Revictimization was not.

d) Women who have sought significant therapeutic intervention are more likely to have been revictimized than to have experienced only adulthood partner abuse.

This subhypothesis was not supported. Neither adulthood partner abuse nor revictimization was predictive of which women participants sought therapy.

Hypothesis Three: Traditional ideology attitudes co-vary more highly with revictimization than with either childhood abuse or adulthood partner abuse.

Frequency distribution of AWS

As discussed in the Method section, traditional attitudes towards women were measured by the short AWS (Spence & Helmreich, 1978), which appeared as items 1 to 15 on the questionnaire (Appendix C). Some items (questions 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, and 14) were reverse-scored, and then all 15 items were summed for the total AWS score. A high AWS indicated more feminist attitudes, and a low AWS indicated more traditional attitudes towards women and women's roles.

Across participants, scores on the AWS ranged from 18 to 45, with a mean of 43.992 (S.D. = 6.252), and a median of 36. For men participants, scores on the AWS ranged from 18 to 44, with a mean of 32.194 (S.D. = 6.113), and a median of 32. For women, AWS ranged from 25 to 45, with a mean of 37.412 (S.D. = 5.307), and a median of 38. Women's scores on the AWS were somewhat higher than men's scores, suggesting cautious interpretation if AWS scores were examined across all participants. Analysis by gender was supported by the distribution of the AWS variable.

The dependent variable of remaining in, or having left, an abusive partner relationship (examined in subhypothesis 3 (c)) was measured by combining previously defined adulthood abuse variables (AP and AS) and the subquestion of 'how old were you when this stopped?', with participants' current age. If AP and/or AS had occurred, and their current age matched

the age given as to when the abuse had 'stopped', then the participant was coded as remaining in an abusive relationship (=WASTAY). If AP and/or AS had occurred, and their current age was older than the age when the abuse stopped, then WASTAY was coded in the opposite direction. If AP and/or AS had never occurred, then WASTAY = 0. This variable was further coded to distinguish physical abuse from a partner (=WAPSTAY) and sexual abuse from a partner (=WASSTAY). WAPSTAY and WASSTAY were coded similiarly to WASTAY.

More women participants who had experienced adulthood partner abuse had either left the relationship, or the abuse had stopped, compared with the number of women who were still being abused by their partner. Of women who had been either physically and/or sexually abused by a partner (42.0%, 51/119), eight were still being abused by their partner (8/51). Of the women who had been physically abused by a partner (27.7%, 33/119), seven were still being battered by their partner (7/33). Of women who had been sexually abused by a partner (26.1%, 31/119), four were still being sexually assaulted by their partner (4/31). Of women who had been both physically and sexually abused by a partner (14.8%, 14/119), four were still being physically and sexually abused by their partner (4/14).

Regression analysis

The third hypothesis, similiar to the second hypothesis, presumed that more women than men were victimized as adults. This presumption was supported, and the analysis proceeded upon women participants' data.

The first regression equation entered AWS as the dependent variable and childhood parental abuse (PP, PS, CPP, CPS) as the independent variables.

This model was not significant ($F = 2.431$, $p < .0516$, $R\text{-square} = .7861$). This indicated that, for women, childhood parental abuse was not predictive of their traditional versus feminist attitudes towards women.

Expansion of the childhood abuse variables to include abuse by family members (CFP and CFS) did not enhance the fit of the model to predict AWS. With AWS as the dependent variable, and PP, PS, CFP, CFS as the independent variables, this model was, also, not significant ($F = 1.686$, $p < .1580$, $R\text{-square} = .0559$). This indicated that childhood family abuse was not predictive of women's attitudes towards women.

The next regression examined adulthood partner abuse as it related to AWS. The independent variables AP and AS were entered with AWS retained as the dependent variable. This adulthood victimization model was marginally predictive ($F = 3.810$, $p < .0250$, $R\text{-square} = .0616$). As seen in Table 10, AS contributed somewhat significantly to the model, but AP did not. These results indicated that, for women participants, adulthood partner victimization, especially sexual victimization, was marginally predictive of less traditional attitudes towards women.

Insert Table 10 about here

Revictimization was next considered. With AWS as the dependent variable, REPA and RECPA were entered. This model was not significant ($F = 1.069$, $p < .3466$, $R\text{-square} = .0181$). A second model, with REPHYP and

RESEXP as the independent variables could not be examined because of the singularity of the RESEXP variable. From the available results, it appeared that revictimization was not predictive of AWS.

The final models considered examined whether WASTAY, as well as the WAPSTAY and WASSTAY variables, were predictive of AWS. A model with AWS as the dependent variable, and WAPSTAY and WASSTAY as the independent variables was considered. This model was not significant ($F = .44$, $p < .6434$, $R\text{-square} = .0076$). A second model, with AWS retained, and WASTAY as the independent variable was not significant ($F = .67$, $p < .4154$, $R\text{-square} = .0057$). These results indicated that whether a woman had never been abused, or whether she had been abused by a partner in the past, or whether partner abuse was ongoing, her attitude towards women (as measured by AWS) did not vary significantly.

Summary results of Third Hypothesis

The ancillary third hypothesis:

Traditional ideology attitudes co-vary more highly with revictimization than with either childhood parental abuse or adulthood partner abuse,

was not supported by the data. Attitudes towards women were less traditional for women participants who had either experienced childhood parental abuse or adulthood partner abuse. Revictimization was not predictive of particular attitudes towards women (as measured by AWS), for women participants.

a) Revictimized women have more traditional attitudes than women who have experienced only childhood parental abuse.

This subhypothesis was not supported. Though women participants who had experienced childhood parental abuse were somewhat more feminist in their attitudes, revictimization did not systematically explain the variance of AWS.

b) Revictimized women have more traditional attitudes than women who have experienced only adulthood partner abuse.

Similarly, the data did not support this subhypothesis. Women participants who had experienced abusive victimization by a partner had somewhat more feminist attitudes towards women, but, again, revictimization did not predict attitudes in any particular direction.

c) Women who have left abusive partner relationships will have less traditional attitudes than women remaining in abusive partner relationships.

This subhypothesis was, also, not supported by the data. Many women participants had been physically and/or sexually abused by a partner in adulthood (51/119), and most (42/51) had either left the relationship or were no longer being victimized. Yet whether a woman had never been victimized in adulthood, or had been but was no longer victimized, or continued to be victimized did not contribute significantly to the variance of her attitudes towards women.

DISCUSSION

The intergenerational cycle of violence theory is a widely held explanation of the prevalence of family violence. It suggests that childhood violence leads to adulthood violence. According to the intergenerational cycle, the childhood family is where one learns about violence, learns to be violent, and learns to be violated. Later in life, one then passes these learnings on to the next generation in the family, i.e., one's marital partner and one's own children. Thus the cycle continues, generation after generation (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980).

Feminist researchers and scholars have challenged this assumption and criticized Straus et al.'s (1980) well known study which concluded that witnessing physical abuse between their parents and/or being abused by parents predisposed children to later engage in abusive behavior, as adults, with their own partners. Straus et al. also concluded that women were as likely to perpetrate violence with their partners, as were men.

In contrast to intergenerational cycle theory, feminist theory suggests that violence in families is systematically directed against women and children by men. Patriarchal and hierarchal structure within families, social institutions, and social attitudes maintain and support male aggression. Male violence is understood as both a means and a message of male power, dominance, and control (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Pagelow, 1980; Russell, 1982, 1984; Schechter, 1982).

The current study was designed to compare feminist theory of why women are battered with the intergenerational cycle theory of partner abuse. The study also contrasted with the research of Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980), which focused on perpetration of physical abuse between family members, by examining abusive physical and sexual victimization of and by family members.

Generalizability of Current Findings

Sampling

The sample included both women and men participants. Gender of offenders and of victims, both participants themselves and their parents, was measured. This allowed for statistical examination of gender as a factor in family abuse. The size of the sample, though large enough to support the analyses, was smaller than optimal. Ages, though older than most university samples, were limited to a 20-year span.

The sample was a non-clinical sample, but limited to university students. The majority of the students were from Introductory Psychology classes, which typically attract a relatively broad range of students from across campus. Participants were voluntary and self-selected, though the "credit" towards their class grade appeared to be the most motivating factor in their decision to participate. The sample, as a college-type sample, would be biased towards middle- and upper-middle class socioeconomic backgrounds.

The sample and sampling technique employed were reasonable for the exploratory nature of the study. Repeated patterns of family abuse were

the focus of this research, and this sample provided a sampling basis sufficient for the pilot work which has been conducted. This sample, as a non-clinical sample and as an adult sample, is probably more comparable to the general population than to a clinical sample. It is not a randomized sample, and generalization to a broader population should proceed cautiously. It is, however, reasonable to expect that the current findings would be replicated within a randomized sample of a more general population.

Incidence of Abuse

The incidence of family abuse reported by participants in this study was, on the whole, similiar to previously published incidence and prevalence rates for these variables.

Adulthood partner physical abuse was identified by 28% (33/119) of women participants, and is very close to Frieze's (1983) report of 29% of women who had been physically abused by their husbands/partners. This incidence also matches Straus et al.'s (1980) report of 28% of couples who had experienced physical violence during their marriage. Adulthood partner sexual abuse was identified by 26% (31/119) of women participants, which falls within the range reported by Frieze of 6% of women raped by their partners to 45% of women who had been pressured for sex by their partners. Russell (1982) has reported that 14% of married women from a large randomized general sample had been raped by their husbands.

Forty-two percent (42%, 51/119) of the women participants reported having been physically and/or sexually abused during adulthood by a

partner. This is higher than the 25% of married women who had been physically and/or sexually assaulted by their husbands, as reported by Russell (1982). The current incidence of 42% is also much higher than the "1 in 10" rate currently used by both the federal Canadian government and the provincial Manitoban government as the prevalence of wife abuse. The current sample of relatively young women suggests that at least one third of Canadian women have experienced physical and/or sexual abuse in their adulthood intimate relationships.

Adulthood partner physical assault was reported by 6% (6/103) of the men participants. This is much smaller than the 28% reported by Straus et al. (1980). It is a little larger than the 76:1 (wife assault:husband assault) ratio, or 1% reported in the police report statistics by Dobash & Dobash (1979). Adulthood partner sexual assault was reported by 5% (5/103) of the men participants. Comparable statistics are not known.

Childhood physical abuse by a parent was reported by 16% (19/119) of the women participants, and by 12% (12/103) of the men participants. Childhood physical abuse by a family member was reported by 22.7% (27/119) women participants, and by 15.5% (16/103) men participants. Boutet (1986) recently reviewed the literature on childhood physical abuse, and reported that "most investigators conclude that we do not know the extent of [physical] child abuse with any degree of accuracy or reliability" (p. 33). She further notes that Manitoba statistics of reported cases include both physical and sexual child abuse, making it difficult to assess even the reported incidence of childhood physical abuse. Comparable statistics to those reported in the current study are, therefore, not known.

Childhood sexual abuse by a parent was reported by 1% (1/119) of the women, and by 1% (1/103) of the men. This is consistent with findings by Finkelhor (1979). Childhood sexual abuse by a family member was identified by 7.6% (9/119) of women participants. This is lower than the 14% reported by Finkelhor (1979). Childhood sexual abuse by a family member was identified by 2% (2/103) of men participants. This is also lower than the 8% reported by Finkelhor. Consistent with Finkelhor, more participants experienced sexual abuse by same generation family members (i.e., siblings or cousins) than by a cross-generational family member. The lower incidence of childhood sexual abuse by a family member in the current study, compared with Finkelhor, may be due to differences in definitions. Firstly, the current study includes only cases which were self-described as abusive by a participant, while Finkelhor relied on researcher-defined cases of abuse. Secondly, the current study primarily included cases of sexual abuse which involved physical contact, while Finkelhor included what he defined as "non-contact", as well as "contact" sexual abuse.

Witnessing physical abuse between parents was reported by 14% (17/119) of the women and 15% (15/103) of the men. Witnessing sexual abuse between parents was reported by 3% (3/119) of the women and 2% (2/103) of the men. Comparable statistics are not known.

The current findings are, on the whole, similar to previously reported rates of incidence and prevalence. This increases confidence that it is reasonable to compare the current findings to the published literature on family abuse, and to use the current results as an addition to our research knowledge base. These findings add some new information on the incidence of family abuse for male victims, for childhood physical abuse, and for children witnessing abuse between their parents.

Reliability and Validity

The retest correlations of the current data indicated good reliability for the major variables, with the exception of the adulthood sexual abuse (AS) variable. Childhood sexual abuse was reported less frequently than in previous studies of similar methodology, though the patterns were similar. The lower frequency of childhood sexual abuse resulted in singularity in some analyses which limited interpretation of the results. The measurement of physical abuse variables had good retest reliability and sufficient frequency to support the multivariate analyses.

Construct validity of the variables was strengthened by expert feedback, as well as evaluation of responses and participants' feedback on the first draft of the questionnaire. Consistency of questions probing physical and sexual abuse across witnessing interparental, experiencing childhood, and experiencing adulthood abuse, increases confidence that a similar construct of abuse was understood by participants, across types of experiences. However, the self-report nature of the questionnaire limited verification of this interpretation, as might have occurred with an interview methodology.

Internal validity of the findings was strengthened by the inclusion of witnessing interparental abuse (i.e. first generation) as well as adulthood experiences of partner abuse (i.e. second generation) by both women and men. Consistent reports by both genders across both generations of the prevalence of female victims and male perpetrators of partner abuse increases confidence that this is, in fact, the predominant pattern of adulthood abusive victimization.

External validity and the generalizability of the findings to a general population are speculative, at best. Though the results are consistent with some randomly distributed sampled populations (Frieze, 1983; Russell, 1982), the results differ from those reported by Straus et al. (1980) on a randomly distributed population.

Strengths and Limits of the Design

The inclusion of both women and men in the current research strengthened the design and allowed the study of gender as a variable. However the size of the sample is smaller than optimal, and is somewhat of a limitation to the power of gender group analyses. Also, there were slightly more women than men in the sample, though it was not a significant difference.

The inclusion of both physical and sexual abuse is a strength in the current research. Many studies in the literature study these variables in isolation, which makes it difficult to compare results. In addition, the distinction between physical and sexual abuse can be an arbitrary or artificial one. For example, forcible rape with a weapon is both physical and sexual abuse. There is also, most likely, a psychological component to physical and/or sexual abuse. For example, dimensions of post-traumatic stress syndrome have been identified as one aspect of the psychological impact of sexual abuse (Briere, 1984; Runtz, 1987). The exclusion of psychological/emotional abuse from the current study was a limitation of the design.

The self-reported nature of the data was a limit to the study, as discussed in the Method. The use of a paper-and-pencil type instrument

further limits the reliability of the findings. Procedures such as the pilot development, expert feedback, retest sampling, and confidentiality of participation have attempted to maximize the reliability and validity of the data. However, the data remain limited by the nature of self-report measurement.

A final strength of the study was that witnessing of abuse between parents was included and measured so that these variables could be compared with the other abuse variables. Few research studies have previously allowed this type of comparison.

Discussion of Findings

Gender and Family Victimization

The salience of gender, of being female, and victimization by family members has been clearly demonstrated by the data. Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the influence of this variable. In Table 1, female participants reported childhood victimization by a family member about two times more often than male participants. Women reported having been abused by their partner about five times more often than men. An equivalent proportion of female and male participants (i.e., 1:1 ratio) had witnessed abuse between their parents. In Table 2, these ratios change dramatically, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Participants reported childhood victimization by a female family member about one third as often as by a male family member. Participants had been abused as adults by a female partner about one eighth times as often as by a male partner. Participants reported witnessing interparental female offenders about one fifth as often as witnessing interparental male offenders.

These distributions of victims and offenders of family abuse indicated a predominance of female victims, especially in adulthood, and a predominance of male offenders. Intergenerational cycle theory, which suggests that male victims of family abuse are as prevalent as female victims and that female offenders of family abuse are as prevalent as male offenders, is clearly not supported by these data. Feminist theory, which describes social discrimination on the basis of gender through patriarchal dominance and power, both predicts and explains the prevalence of male offenders and of female victims of family abuse reported in the current data.

As presented in the results of Hypothesis One, regression and canonical correlation analyses with adulthood abuse dependent variables, and with gender and childhood abuse as the independent variables, demonstrated that there was no significant variance shared between the adulthood abuse and the childhood abuse variables. There was, however, a significant variance shared between the adulthood abuse variables and the gender (i.e., being female) variable. This was true when parental childhood abuse variables were examined, as well as when family member childhood abuse variables were examined. This was also true when the entire sample was examined (i.e., both women and men participants), and when these variables were examined with the subsample of women participants. These results clearly challenge the theoretical assumption that a childhood history of abusive victimization within the family can explain or predict which women are likely to be victimized in adulthood by a partner (i.e., intergenerational cycle theory).

The results indicated that, for men participants, witnessing interparental sexual abuse was somewhat predictive of adulthood experiences

of victimization by a partner. The importance of this relationship is tempered by the frequency distribution of the data, which indicated that 2/103 men reported having witnessed sexual abuse between their parents. Of these two men participants, one reported having been physically victimized in adulthood (by a male partner), and sexually victimized in adulthood by two partners (gender unspecified). The second man who had witnessed interparental sexual abuse in childhood reported neither physical nor sexual abuse by a partner in adulthood. This discrete data suggests that the finding of a relationship, for men, between childhood witnessing of interparental sexual abuse and adulthood victimization by a partner may be statistically significant but not particularly helpful in predicting adulthood victimization. Further, if one was to consider this finding as support for the intergenerational cycle of violence theory, the question of why the other childhood abuse factors were not significantly predictive of adulthood victimization for men would need to be addressed. In addition, why this relationship might hold true for men but not for women would need to be explained.

The results of Hypothesis One, part c), which indicated that a statistically similar proportion of women had been victimized in childhood as had been victimized in adulthood, may be instructive in understanding why previously published data has appeared to support intergenerational cycle of violence theory. Data frequently cited as support for intergenerational cycle theory (Gayford, 1975; Gelles, 1972, 1974; Scott, 1974; Straus et al., 1980) are typically presented as grouped frequency data. Arguments were developed from the probability of overlap between a sizeable proportion of a sample which has been victimized in childhood with

a sizeable proportion which has been victimized in adulthood. A similar argument could be developed from the current findings of Hypothesis One, part c). However, the regression and canonical correlational results of Hypothesis One have demonstrated that the women who had been victimized in childhood were not particularly the same women who had been victimized in adulthood. Though many women were victimized as children and many women were victimized as adults, their childhood family victimization was not associated with their adulthood partner victimization. Thus, intergenerational cycle theory was not supported by the current data. Previous childhood victimization within a family did not account for adulthood partner abusive victimization.

Yet being female, though a significant variable, did not account entirely (less than 10% of variance) for the occurrence of adulthood abusive victimization by a partner. Pagelow's (1981) tripartite model for understanding woman-battering has been supported by these data. The significance of being female is predicted in her Model I: Development, which identifies the broader social structures and sanctions of patriarchal and hierarchal power. Model II: Primary Battering, which examines why not all men batter their wives, and Model III: Secondary Battering, which examines why woman assault by a male partner may recur over time, are important components of Pagelow's model which acknowledge the importance of gender but suggest that other variables specific to the offender are also distinctive. The current findings directly support Pagelow's Model I, and further imply the importance of the questions of Model II and III for future research.

Symptomatology and Seeking Therapy

The findings of the second hypothesis support previous findings (Runtz, 1987) and further emphasize the lasting impact, for some women, of childhood sexual victimization by family members. Childhood sexual family abuse was a significant variable both in predicting higher symptomatology and some therapy-seeking behavior for women participants in this university sample. The sexual abuse occurred, predominantly, without severe physical force and over a relatively short period of time. Childhood sexual abuse which had occurred, on average, some 10 to 15 years earlier was still salient enough to be associated with higher scores on the BSI*, whether or not a woman had sought therapy.

Revictimization, i.e., having been victimized in childhood and again in adulthood, was not particularly predictive of higher scores on the BSI*. Adulthood victimization by a partner was also not predictive of higher BSI* scores with women participants. However, family sexual revictimization, as defined by the RESEXF variable, was a significant predictor of higher BSI* scores. This was consistent with the significant relationship of childhood family sexual abuse with BSI*. Sexual revictimization explained more (about 13%) of the variance of BSI* than did childhood family sexual abuse (less than 8% of the variance). This suggests that the impact of sexual abuse, as measured by BSI*, increases with revictimization.

Correlations of BSI* with abuse variables indicated a moderate relationship between BSI* and childhood abuse by parents and by family members, and between BSI* and revictimization. However, very low correlations between BSI* and witnessing interparental abuse ($r = .03$), and

between BSI* and adulthood partner abuse ($r = .18$) were found. This suggested that symptomatology, as measured by BSI*, may be useful in evaluating the effects of childhood victimization and revictimization, but may be limited in evaluation of the impact of witnessing interparental abuse or interpartner abuse.

The results of Hypothesis Two, parts c) and d), indicated that revictimization was not predictive of which women sought therapy. Nor was adulthood partner victimization predictive of therapy-seeking. However, similar to the relationships found between family abusive victimization and BSI*, childhood sexual abuse by a parent was somewhat predictive of women seeking therapy. However, no significant relationship between the THERAPY variable and BSI* were evident in the canonical correlational analyses. Correlation between BSI* and THERAPY ($r = .07$) was also low. This suggests that Hypothesis Two, parts a) and b) (with BSI* as the dependent variable), and Hypothesis Two, parts c) and d) (with THERAPY as the dependent variable) are better considered as two distinct lines of inquiry, rather than as related variables. No apparent relationship between higher symptomatology and therapy-seeking behavior was found in the current data.

The finding that adulthood partner abuse was not predictive of women seeking therapy may have implications for our current social care system. Recent findings of social services currently offered to and available to battered women in Winnipeg (Rycroft, 1987) indicated that counselling was one of the most available and most referred to social services, second only to emergency shelter, that agencies provided to battered women. The current data suggests that women victimized by their partners did not

particularly seek therapy. It may be that battered women's self-perceived needs and priorities are currently not well understood by professional caregivers, or that they do not coincide with agency-perceived needs of women abused by their partners.

Attitudes Towards Women

The predicted relationships in attitudes towards women, as measured by AWS, with childhood and/or adulthood abusive victimization were not supported by the data. Walker herself found her results contrary to what she had expected. Walker's (1984) finding that battered women scored higher (i.e., less traditional) than a normed college sample on the AWS was replicated in the current data. However, revictimization did not lead to continued change in AWS, while childhood abuse or adulthood abuse (but not both) tended to predict more feminist attitudes towards women.

It is possible that traditional vs. feminist attitudes may not be relevant to women's experiences of abusive victimization. Pagelow (1981) found nonsignificant results when examining the variance of traditional ideology with women's adulthood abusive experiences. Perhaps attitudes towards women (i.e., traditional ideology), with more non-significant than significant predictions demonstrated in these three studies, are not particularly important variables to examine in order to understand the impact or the incidence of abuse with victims. Post hoc analyses on the current entire sample indicated that gender was significant in predicting AWS, but abuse variables were not. This was consistent with women in the sample having scored somewhat higher on AWS than the men. These results suggest that future research on woman abuse need not continue to include traditional ideology variables.

The dependent variable (WASTAY) of Hypothesis Three, part c), was not well measured in the current study. An additional question of whether or not a participant was still in a relationship with a partner they had described as abusive, would have better clarified the measurement of this variable. An additional question of how the relationship was terminated (e.g., who initiated termination) may also have increased accuracy of the WASTAY variable. Unfortunately, imprecise measurement of this variable in the current study probably limits clear conclusions of the findings of Hypothesis Three, part c).

Clinical Implications

The intuitive appeal of the intergenerational cycle theory has been noted to lead to covert "blaming of the victim", especially by professional caregivers who work with battered women (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Stacey & Shupe, 1983). The current findings, which do not support the intergenerational cycle theory, challenge clinicians to re-think these assumptions. Being women, being female, has been demonstrated to be a significant factor in explaining the distribution of adulthood partner abusive victimization.

In contrast, previous childhood victimization did not explain adulthood victimization. This challenges clinicians to stop holding victims responsible for "looking for" or "feeling familiar" with victimization, and to place responsibility for assaultive and abusive behavior more clearly with the offender. The results of the current study also suggest the need to focus more on examining why particular individuals, especially particular men, abuse adults and children. The question of why particular

individuals are victimized does not appear to be a fruitful line of inquiry when the randomly distributed variable of gender significantly predicts victims and offenders of family abuse. We may better account for why family abuse occurs by increasing our understanding of who's perpetrating, rather than who's being victimized. This suggests the need for treatment programs which effectively understand, stop, and change offenders' abusive behavior, as well as treatment programs which effectively heal the impact of abuse on their victims.

A more helpful focus for victims may be to increase our awareness and understanding of the impact of victimization, and the needs of victims in healing or recovering from abuse. This study indicated that sexual abuse was somewhat predictive of high somatic symptomatology which was evident many years later. This was true regardless of whether or not women had sought therapy. This suggests that the impact of the sexual abuse, for women, may be particularly persistent. This may also indicate that the therapeutic experiences of women have not particularly reduced their symptoms associated with sexual victimization. Very little outcome data on the effectiveness of treatment intervention with victims of family abuse has yet been published.

Confirmation, in the current study, of relatively high incidence rates of family abusive victimization also suggests a need for continued social services to and for victims. The current finding that over one third of women participants had been physically and/or sexually abused by an adult partner, which was the highest incidence of any type of abuse measured, also underlines that violence is a relatively common experience for women in their adulthood intimate relationships.

REFERENCES

- Abramson, L., Seligman, M., & Teasdale, J. (1978). Learned helplessness in humans: Critique and reformulation. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87, 49-74.
- Aftanas, M. (1985). Techniques for assessing measurement accuracy. Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba. Photocopied paper.
- Aftanas, M. (1984). Principles of psychological measurement. Winnipeg, Man.: University of Manitoba Bookstore.
- Ball, P. G., & Wyman, E. (1978). Battered wives and powerlessness: What can counselors do? Victimology, 2, 545-552.
- Ballou, M., & Gabalac, N. (1985). A feminist position on mental health. Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas.
- Beere, C. A. (1979). Women and women's issues: A handbook of tests and measures. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borkowski, M., Murch, M., & Walker, V. (1983). Marital violence: The community response. London: Tavistock.
- Boutet, C. (1986). Physical abuse of children. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba.
- Breines, W., & Gordon, L. (1983). The new scholarship on family violence. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8, 490-531.
- Briere, J. (1984). The effects of childhood sexual abuse on later psychological functioning: Defining a "post-sexual-abuse syndrome". Paper presented at the Third National Conference on Sexual Victimization of Children, Washington, D.C., April, 1984).
- Briere, J., & Runtz, M. (1985). Symptomology associated with prior sexual abuse in a non-clinical sample. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, August, 1985.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against our will: Men, women, and rape. Toronto: Bantam.
- Burton, R. (1970). Validity of retrospective reports assessed by the multitrait-multimethod analysis Developmental Psychology, 3(3), 1-15.
- Canadian Federal Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs (1982). Report on violence in the family: Wife battering. Report from the House of Commons, Ottawa, May, 1982.

- Chesler, P. (1972). Women and madness. New York: Avon.
- Coleman, K. (1980). Conjugal violence: What 33 men report. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 6, 207-213.
- Cronbach, L. (1984). Essentials of psychological testing, (fourth edition). New York: Harper & Row.
- Derogatis, L. R. & Melisaratos, N. (1983). The Brief Symptom Inventory: An introductory report. Psychological Medicine, 13, 595-605.
- Derogatis, L.D., & Cleary, P. (1977). Confirmation of the dimensionality structure of the SCL-90. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 981-989.
- Derogatis, D., Lipman, R, Rickels, K, Uhlenhuth, E., & Covi, L. (1974). The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL): A self-report symptom inventory. Behavioral Science, 19, 1-15.
- Dobash R.E., & Dobash, R. (1979). Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy. New York: The Free Press.
- Dutton, D., & Painter, S. (1983). Traumatic bonding: The development of emotional attachments in battered women. Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia.
- Dworkin, A. (1981). Pornography: Men possessing women. New York: Perigee.
- Edwards, A. (1957). The social desirability variable in personality assessment and research. New York: Dryden Press.
- Edwards, D., Yarvis, R., Mueller, D., Zingale, H., & Wagman, W. (1978). Test-taking and the stability of adjustment scales: Can we assess patient deterioration? Evaluation quarterly, 2, 275-291.
- Errington, G. (1977). Family violence: Is it a woman's problem? Paper presented to Symposium on Family Violence, Vancouver, B.C., March, 1977.
- Feldman, J. (1981). Beyond attribution theory: Cognitive processes in performance appraisal. Journal of Applied Psychology, 66, 127-148.
- Finkelhor, D. (1978) Sexually victimized children. New York: Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1981). Four preconditions of sexual abuse: A model. Paper presented to the National Conference of Family Violence Research, Durham, NH, July, 1981.
- Finkelhor, D. (1984). Designing studies on the impact and treatment of child sexual abuse. Paper available from Family Violence Research Program, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, 03824. December, 1984.
- Finkelhor, D., & Baron, L. (1985). Risk factors for childhood sexual abuse: A review of the evidence. Paper available from Family Violence Research Program, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH, 03824. February, 1985.

- Finkelhor, D., Gelles, R., Hotaling, G., & Straus, M. (eds). (1983). The dark side of families: Current family violence research. London: Sage.
- Frieze, I. (1980). Causes and consequences of marital rape. Paper presented at Division 35's Open Symposium at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada, September, 1980.
- Frieze, I. (1983). Investigating the causes and consequences of marital rape. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8, 532-553.
- Frieze, I., Knoble, J., Washburn, C., & Zomnir, G. (1980). Characteristics of battered women and their marriages. Unpublished paper, Dept. of Psychology, University of Pittsburg.
- Gayford, J. J. (1975). Wife battering: A preliminary survey of 100 cases. British Medical Journal, 1, 194-197.
- Gelles, R. J. (1974). The violent home: A study of physical aggression between husbands and wives. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Gelles, R. J. (1976). Abused wives: Why do they stay? Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 659-668.
- Giles-Sims, J. (1983). Wife battering: A systems theory approach. New York: Guilford Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1978). In a different voice. Cambridge: University Press.
- Greenspan, M. (1983). A new approach to women and therapy. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Guttek, B. (1978). On the accuracy of retrospective attitudinal data. Public Opinion Quarterly, 42, 390-401.
- Harris, R. J. (1975). A primer of multivariate statistics. New York: Academic Press.
- Hauser, W. J. (1982). Differences in relative resources, familial power and spouse abuse. Palo Alto, Cal: R & E Research Associates.
- Hilberman, E., & Munson, K. (1978). Sixty battered women. Victimology, 2, 460-470.
- Hiroto, D. S., & Seligman, M. (1975). Generality of learned helplessness in man. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 311-327.
- Hoffman, P. (1984). Psychological abuse of women by spouses and live-in lovers. Women & Therapy, 3(1), 37-47.
- Jehu, D., & Gazan, M. (1983). Psychosocial adjustment of women who were sexually victimized in childhood or adolescence. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 2, 71-81.

- Kempe, C., Silverman, F., Steele, B., Droegemueller, W., & Silver, H. (1962). The battered-child syndrome. Journal of the American Medical Association, 181, 105-112.
- Lewis, D. J. (1982). A brief on wife battering with proposals for federal action. Ottawa, Ont.: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, January, 1982.
- Lion, J. R. (1977). Clinical aspects of wifebattering. In M. Roy (Ed.), Battered women (pp. 126-136). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- MacLeod, L. (1980). Wife battering in Canada: The vicious circle. Ottawa, Ont.: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- MacKenzie, D. A. (1985). Wife abuse: An overview of salient issues. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 4, 65-79.
- Maier, S. F., & Seligman, M. (1976). Learned helplessness: Theory and evidence. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 105, 3-46.
- Markesteyn, T. (1987). Victimology: Research issues. Colloquium presented at the Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba, February, 1987.
- Martin, D. (1983). Battered wives. New York: Pocket Books.
- Mednick, S., & Shaffer, J. (1963). Mothers' retrospective reports in child-rearing research. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 33, 457-461.
- Miller, J. B. (1976). Towards a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Pagelow, M. D. (1981). Woman-battering: Victims and their experiences. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Parker, B., & Schumacher, D. N. (1977). The Battered Wife Syndrome and violence in the nuclear family of origin: A controlled pilot study. American Journal of Public Health, 67, 760-761.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). Multiple regression in behavioral research. (second edition). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Peterson, R. (1980). Social class, social learning, and wife abuse. Social Science Review, Sept., 1980.
- Pizzey, E. (1974). Scream quietly or the neighbours will hear. London: Penguin.
- Prescott, S., & Letko, C. (1977). Battered women: A social psychological perspective. In M. Roy (Ed.), Battered women (pp.72-96). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

- Robbins, L. (1963). The accuracy of parental recall of aspects of child development and of child rearing practices. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66, 261-270.
- Rounsaville, B. J. (1978). Theories in marital violence: Evidence from a study of battered women. Victimology, 3, 11-31.
- Roy, M. (1977). Battered women: A psychosociological study of domestic violence. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Runtz, M. (1987). The psychosocial adjustment of women who were sexually and physically abused during childhood and early adulthood: A focus on revictimization. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Manitoba.
- Rush, F. (1980). The best kept secret: Sexual abuse of children. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Russell, D. E. H. (1982). Rape in marriage. New York: Collier.
- Russell, D. E. H. (1984). Sexual exploitation. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Ryan, W. (1976). Blaming the victim. (revised, updated). New York: Vintage.
- Rycroft, P. (1985). Category 6 measurement: Dual process measurement of personality with retrospective data. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba, March, 1985.
- Rycroft, P. (1987). Social Service Survey: Current and needed services in Winnipeg (Man.) for battered women and men who batter. Unpublished report, Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba, February, 1987.
- SAS Institute, Inc. (1985). SAS User's Guide, Version 5 Edition. Cary, N.C.: SAS Institute Inc.
- Schechter, S. (1982). Women and male violence. London: Pluto Press.
- Schulman, M. A. (1981). A survey of spousal violence against women in Kentucky. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Scott, P. D. (1974). Battered wives. British Journal of Psychiatry, 125, 433-441.
- Shainess, N. (1977). Psychological aspects of wifebattering. In M. Roy (Ed.), (pp. 111-118) Battered women. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Sheingold, K., & Tenney, Y. (1982). Memory for a salient childhood event. In U. Neisser's (ed.) Memory observed: Remembering in natural contexts. San Francisco: Freeman, pp. 201-212.
- Sinclair, D. (1985). Understanding wife assault. Toronto: Ontario government publications.

- Singleton, R., & Christiansen, J. B. (1977). The construct validation of a shortform attitudes towards feminism scale. Sociology and Social Research, 61, 294-303.
- Small, S. E. (1979). Wife assault: An overview of the problem in Canada. Toronto: Support Services for Assaulted Women.
- Smith, E. R., Ferree, M. M., & Miller, F. D. (1975). A short scale of attitudes toward feminism. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 6, 51-56.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1972). The Attitudes toward Women Scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. JASA Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 2, 66.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1978). Masculinity and Femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). Bulletin of the Psychometric Society, 2, 219-220.
- Spender, D. (1982). Women of ideas (and what men have done to them). London: Pluto.
- Stacey, W. A., & Shupe, A. (1983). The family secret: Domestic violence in America. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Stahley, G. B. (1978). A review of select literature of spousal violence. Victimology, 2, 591-607.
- Star, B. (1978). Comparing battered and non-battered women. Victimology, 3, 32-44.
- Straus, M. A. (1978). Wife beating: How common and why? Victimology, 2, 443-458.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 75-88.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books.
- Tabachnick, B. & Fidell, L. (1983). Using multivariate statistics. New York: Harper & Row.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). The battered woman. New York: Harper & Row.
- Walker, L. E. (1984). The battered woman syndrome. New York: Springer.

Wife assault in Canada. (April, 1980). Toronto: Support Services for Assaulted Women. (factsheet).

Wiggins, J. (1973). Personality and prediction: Principles of personality assessment. London: Addison-Wesley.

Women in abusive relationships: A guide to the law. (1985). Winnipeg, Man.: Community Legal Education Association.

TABLES

Table 1: Frequency of Victimization, by Gender

<u>TYPE OF ABUSE</u>	<u>FEMALE VICTIMS</u> (PARTICIPANTS) (n = 119)	<u>MALE VICTIMS</u> (PARTICIPANTS) (n = 103)
WITNESS PARENTAL ABUSE		
Physical	17 (14%)	15 (15%)
Sexual	3 (3%)	2 (2%)
CHILDHOOD ABUSE BY FAMILY MEMBER		
Physical	27 (23%)	16 (16%)
Sexual	9 (8%)	2 (2%)
ADULTHOOD ABUSE BY PARTNER		
Physical	33 (28%)	6 (6%)
Sexual	31 (26%)	5 (5%)
SUMMED TOTAL		
Physical	77	37
Sexual	43	9

Table 2: Frequency of Offenders, by Gender

<u>TYPE OF ABUSE</u>	<u>FEMALE OFFENDERS</u>	<u>MALE OFFENDERS</u>
WITNESS PARENTAL ABUSE		
Physical	6	30
Sexual	1	5
CHILDHOOD ABUSE BY FAMILY MEMBER		
Physical	15	40
Sexual	3	13
ADULTHOOD ABUSE BY PARTNER		
Physical	5	37
Sexual	5	49
SUMMED TOTAL		
Physical	26	80
Sexual	9	67

Table 3: Regression analysis of adulthood abuse by childhood abuse and gender.

D.V. = AP (Model: $AP = G + PP + PS + CPP + CPS$)

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
Model	5	3.2168	4.80	0.0003
Error	216	28.9318		
Corrected				
Total	221	32.1486	(R-square = 0.1001)	

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
G	1	2.5210	18.82	0.0001
PP	1	0.0273	0.20	0.6523
PS	1	0.2575	1.92	0.1670
CPP	1	0.1175	0.88	0.3501
CPS	1	0.2245	1.68	0.1968

Table 3 (continued)

D.V. = AS (Model: AS = G + PP + PS + CPP + CPS)

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
Model	5	3.3415	5.38	0.0001
Error	216	26.8207		
Corrected				
Total	221	30.1622	(R-square = 0.1108)	

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
G	1	2.2905	18.45	0.0001
PP	1	0.0002	0.00	0.9679
PS	1	0.2556	2.06	0.1528
CPP	1	0.4306	3.47	0.0639
CPS	1	0.2632	2.12	0.1469

Table 4: Regression analysis of adulthood abuse by childhood family abuse and gender.

D.V. = AP (Model: $AP = G + PP + PS + CFP + CFS$)

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
Model	5	8.4049	4.17	0.0012
Error	216	87.1446		
Corrected				
Total	221	95.5495		(R-square = 0.0880)

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
G	1	5.9408	14.73	0.0002
PP	1	0.0230	0.06	0.8114
PS	1	1.3363	3.31	0.0701
CFP	1	0.2018	0.50	0.4802
CFS	1	0.0570	0.14	0.7074

Table 4 (continued)

D.V. = AS (Model: AS = G + PP + PS + CFP + CFS)

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
Model	5	7.4339	4.46	0.0007
Error	216	71.9400		
Corrected				
Total	221	79.3787	(R-square = 0.0937)	

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
G	1	5.3501	16.06	0.0001
PP	1	0.0025	0.01	0.9305
PS	1	0.8632	2.59	0.1089
CFP	1	0.6829	2.05	0.1536
CFS	1	0.0486	0.15	0.7030

Table 5: Canonical Correlation of Adulthood Abuse variables
with Childhood Family Abuse variables, for Men.

	FIRST CANONICAL VARIATE	
	CORRELATION	COEFFICIENT
ADULTHOOD ABUSE SET		
AP	0.7646	0.5500
AS	0.8530	0.6793
Percent of Variance	0.6562	
Redundancy	0.1212	
CHILDHOOD ABUSE SET		
PP	0.4541	0.3066
PS	0.9359	0.8533
CFP	0.3812	0.1367
CFS	- 0.0918	- 0.1093
Percent of Variance	0.3090	
Redundancy	0.0571	
CANONICAL CORRELATION	0.4297	
EIGENVALUE	0.2265	

Table 6: Frequency of Help-seeking, by Gender

<u>TYPE OF HELP</u>	<u>WOMEN PARTICIPANTS</u> (n = 119)	<u>MEN PARTICIPANTS</u> (n = 103)
THERAPY	21 (18%)	10 (10%)
DOCTOR	11 (9%)	3 (3%)
RELIGION	7 (6%)	5 (5%)
FRIEND	22 (18%)	25 (24%)

Table 7: Regression analysis of BSI* by Childhood Family Abuse, for Women.

D.V. = BSI* (Model: $BSI^* = PP + PS + CFP + CFS$)

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
Model	4	12789.49	2.602	0.0396
Error	114	140058.16		
Corrected Total	118	152847.65		(R-square = 0.0837)

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
PP	1	109.25	- .87	0.3835
PS	1	3690.91	1.34	0.1831
CFP	1	4895.40	1.27	0.2072
CFS	1	4093.93	1.83	0.0706

Table 7 (continued)

D.V. = BSI* (Model: BSI* = REPHYF + RESEXF)

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
Model	2	20066.48	8.765	0.0003
Error	116	132781.16		
Corrected				
Total	118	152847.65		(R-square = 0.1313)

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
REPHYF	1	4959.05	0.48	0.6294
RESEXF	1	15107.44	3.63	0.0004

Table 8: Regression analysis of THERAPY by Childhood Parental Abuse, for Women.

D.V. = THERAPY (Model: THERAPY = PP + PS + CPP + CPS)

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
Model	4	3.416	2.631	0.0379
Error	114	37.020		
Corrected Total	118	40.437	(R-square = 0.0845)	

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
PP	1	0.094	0.666	0.5066
PS	1	0.490	- .666	0.5069
CPP	1	0.356	0.353	0.7247
CPS	1	2.476	2.762	0.0067

Table 9: Canonical Correlation of BSI* and THERAPY variables with Family Revictimization , for Women.

FIRST CANONICAL VARIATE		
	CORRELATION	COEFFICIENT
SYMPTOMATOLOGY & THERAPY		
BSI*	0.9995	1.0035
THERAPY	0.0895	- .0331
Percent of Variance	0.5035	
Redundancy	0.0662	
FAMILY REVICTIMIZATION		
REPHYF	0.5050	0.1355
RESEXF	0.9922	0.9389
Percent of Variance	0.6197	
Redundancy	0.0814	
CANONICAL CORRELATION	0.3625	
EIGENVALUE	0.1513	

Table 10: Regression analysis of AWS by Adulthood Partner Abuse, for Women.

D.V. = AWS

(Model: $AWS = AP + AS$)

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
Model	2	204.81	3.810	0.0250
Error	116	3118.02		
Corrected				
Total	118	3322.83		(R-square = 0.0616)

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>S.S.</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p ≥ F</u>
AP	1	109.51	1.45	0.1495
AS	1	95.42	1.88	0.0622

APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Lecture HandoutLECTURE NOTES -- Family abuse

ABUSE means mistreatment or harm to another person; includes neglect, physical assault, and sexual assault.

CHILD ABUSE means act or omission by the parent or person in charge, which act or omission results in harm to the child. It includes, but is not necessarily restricted to: physical beating, sexual abuse, and failure to provide reasonable protection for the child from physical harm (Manitoba Guidelines, 1984).

PREVALENCE:

2 -10% of all children physically abused
10 - 25% of all children sexually abused (20% of all girls; 10% of all boys)

10 - 30% of all women physically abused by a partner
5 - 40% of all women sexually abused by a partner

Problems with these statistics include: different definitions of abuse in different studies; some estimates based on reported cases, yet majority of cases are unreported; sampling biases in many studies.

EFFECTS OR IMPACT OF ABUSE:

The effects of abuse vary and may not necessarily occur to everyone. Yet similar impacts have been identified by many people who have been abused.

Some of the effects of PHYSICAL ABUSE include: "acting out" behavior (stealing, beating up others, lying, using chemicals, running, etc.); flinch or "startle-reaction" when approached; developmental delays in language and motor development; attempted suicide; controlled emotions; depression and low self-esteem.

Some common effects of SEXUAL ABUSE include: Sleep disturbance and nightmares; tension, anxiety; "dissociation"; heavy alcohol & drug use; self-mutilation; "acting out"; fears and phobias; isolation, social withdrawal.

Appendix B: Consent Form

This study, which focuses on abusive behavior that can occur in some families, asks some specific questions about assault that you may or may not have experienced. Because of the sensitive nature of these questions, your answers will be kept anonymous and strictly confidential. No names or other personally identifying information will be collected at any point on the questionnaires. About 400 students are expected to participate in this study, and all answers will be coded and analyzed by computer, in group summary form.

Your participation is voluntary, and you may choose to stop participating at any point in this study. You may also choose to not answer any particular question.

Thank you for your consideration.

_____ I have read the above and have decided to agree to participate in this study.

_____ I have read the above and have decided NOT to participate in this study.

Appendix C: Questionnaire

Study: FAMILIES

Researcher: Pat Rycroft

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each question carefully and answer as honestly as possible by circling the item that best describes your life experiences. There are no right or wrong answers in this questionnaire. Please tell me about any questions or concerns you might have. Thank you for your time and effort.

PART A

The statements listed below describe different attitudes towards the roles of women in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. Please express your feelings about each statement by indicating whether you:

(A) agree strongly, (B) agree mildly, (C) disagree mildly, or (D) disagree strongly.

- A B C D 1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.
- A B C D 2. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing the dishes and doing the laundry.
- A B C D 3. It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.
- A B C D 4. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.
- A B C D 5. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
- A B C D 6. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.
- A B C D 7. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.
- A B C D 8. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.
- A B C D 9. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.
- A B C D 10. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.
- A B C D 11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.
- A B C D 12. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.
- A B C D 13. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.
- A B C D 14. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.
- A B C D 15. There are many jobs in which men should be give preference over women in being hired or promoted.

Below are a list of problems and complaints that people sometimes have. Please read each one carefully, and circle one of the numbers to the left that best describes HOW MUCH THAT PROBLEM HAS BOTHERED YOU DURING THE PAST TWO MONTHS:

(0) Not at all, (1) A little bit, (2) Moderately, (3) Quite a bit, (4) Extremely.

- 0 1 2 3 4 16. Nervousness or shakiness inside
- 0 1 2 3 4 17. Faintness or dizziness
- 0 1 2 3 4 18. The idea that someone else can control your thoughts
- 0 1 2 3 4 19. Feeling others are to blame for most of your troubles
- 0 1 2 3 4 20. Trouble remembering things
- 0 1 2 3 4 21. Feeling outside your body
- 0 1 2 3 4 22. Feeling easily annoyed or irritated
- 0 1 2 3 4 23. Pains in heart or chest
- 0 1 2 3 4 24. Feeling afraid in open spaces or on the streets
- 0 1 2 3 4 25. Thoughts of ending your life
- 0 1 2 3 4 26. Feeling that most people cannot be trusted
- 0 1 2 3 4 27. Feeling shy or uneasy with the opposite sex
- 0 1 2 3 4 28. Suddenly scared for no reason
- 0 1 2 3 4 29. Not feeling like your real self
- 0 1 2 3 4 30. Temper outbursts that you could not control
- 0 1 2 3 4 31. Feeling blocked in getting things done
- 0 1 2 3 4 32. Feeling lonely
- 0 1 2 3 4 33. Feeling blue
- 0 1 2 3 4 34. Feeling no interest in things
- 0 1 2 3 4 35. Feeling fearful
- 0 1 2 3 4 36. Your feelings being easily hurt
- 0 1 2 3 4 37. "Spacing out"
- 0 1 2 3 4 38. Feeling others do not understand you or are unsympathetic
- 0 1 2 3 4 39. Feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike you
- 0 1 2 3 4 40. Nausea or upset stomach
- 0 1 2 3 4 41. Feeling inferior to others
- 0 1 2 3 4 42. Feeling that you are watched or talked about by others
- 0 1 2 3 4 43. Having to check and double-check what you do
- 0 1 2 3 4 44. Losing touch with reality
- 0 1 2 3 4 45. Difficulty making decisions
- 0 1 2 3 4 46. Feeling afraid to travel on buses, subways, or trains
- 0 1 2 3 4 47. Trouble getting your breath
- 0 1 2 3 4 48. Hot or cold spells
- 0 1 2 3 4 49. Having to avoid certain things, places, or activities because they frighten you

HOW MUCH THAT PROBLEM HAS BOTHERED YOU DURING THE PAST TWO MONTHS:

(0) Not at all, (1) A little bit, (2) Moderately, (3) Quite a bit, (4) Extremely.

- 0 1 2 3 4 50. Your mind goes blank
- 0 1 2 3 4 51. Numbness or tingling in parts of your body
- 0 1 2 3 4 52. Feeling hopeless about the future
- 0 1 2 3 4 53. Trouble concentrating
- 0 1 2 3 4 54. Feeling weak in parts of your body
- 0 1 2 3 4 55. Feeling tense, keyed up
- 0 1 2 3 4 56. Feeling uneasy when people are watching or talking about you
- 0 1 2 3 4 57. Having urges to beat, injure, or harm someone
- 0 1 2 3 4 58. Having urges to break or smash things
- 0 1 2 3 4 59. Feeling very self-conscious with others
- 0 1 2 3 4 60. Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie
- 0 1 2 3 4 61. Watching yourself from far away
- 0 1 2 3 4 62. Spells of terror or panic
- 0 1 2 3 4 63. Feeling uncomfortable about eating or drinking in public
- 0 1 2 3 4 64. Getting into frequent arguments
- 0 1 2 3 4 65. Feeling nervous when you are left alone
- 0 1 2 3 4 66. Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements
- 0 1 2 3 4 67. Feeling lonely even when you are with people
- 0 1 2 3 4 68. Feeling so restless you couldn't sit still
- 0 1 2 3 4 69. Feelings of worthlessness
- 0 1 2 3 4 70. Feeling that people will take advantage of you if you let them
- 0 1 2 3 4 71. The idea that you should be punished for your sins
- 0 1 2 3 4 72. Never feeling close to another person
- 0 1 2 3 4 73. The idea that something is wrong with your mind.

PART B

This section includes questions about behavior you may or may not have seen or heard between your parents while you lived with them.

The term "parents" means the adults who were primarily responsible for your care while you were growing up;

"home" means the place you lived with your parents;

"sexual harassment" means persistent or recurring and unwanted sexual attention which creates discomfort or threatens personal well-being, and includes leering, propositioning, and touching.

"abuse" means mistreatment or harm to another person, and includes neglect, physical assault, and sexual assault;

and "when you were growing up" means the time you lived with your parents up to the age of 18 years.

For each question, please circle the answer that best describes your experiences.

84. WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOU EVER SEE OR HEAR ONE OF YOUR PARENTS THREATEN TO PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT A SECOND PARENT?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 85 on page 5.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THE FIRST PARENT?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent (b) adoptive or step-parent (c) foster parent (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent (e) grandparent (f) uncle or aunt (g) other --describe: _____

iii. WHAT GENDER WAS THE SECOND PARENT?

- (a) male (b) female

iv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent (b) adoptive or step-parent (c) foster parent (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent (e) grandparent (f) uncle or aunt (g) other --describe: _____

v. WHAT DID THE FIRST PARENT EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threaten with closed or clenched fist (b) threaten to hit (c) threaten to kick or stomp (d) threaten to punch or beat (e) threaten to push other down stairs or from a height (f) threaten to burn or scald (g) threaten to throw something (h) threaten with motor vehicle (i) threaten to damage property (j) withheld money for basic needs (k) kept other from sleeping (l) kept other from eating (m) kept other from medical care (n) threaten to harm pet or animal (o) threaten to harm children (p) threaten with gun (q) threaten with knife, belt, etc. (r) threaten to kill other (s) threaten suicide (t) threaten suicide (u) others -- describe: _____

vi. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time (b) two or three times, altogether (c) about once a year (d) several times a year (e) about once a month (f) about once a week (g) more than once a week (h) other -- describe: _____

vii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time (b) got more violent, over time (c) got less violent, over time (d) happened once; no second time (e) other -- describe: _____

viii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (ix.) above (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

xi. DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i., ii.) above), EVER THREATEN TO PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT ONE OTHER PARENT?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 85 on page 5.

xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PARENT WHO THREATENED?

- (a) male (b) female

xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent (b) adoptive or step-parent (c) foster parent (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent (e) grandparent (f) uncle or aunt (g) other --describe: _____

xiv. WHAT GENDER WAS THE OTHER SECOND PARENT WHO WAS THREATENED?

- (a) male (b) female

xv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent (b) adoptive or step-parent (c) foster parent (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent (e) grandparent (f) uncle or aunt (g) other --describe: _____

xvi. WHAT DID THE PARENT (identified in (xii., xiii.) above) EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threaten with closed or clenched fist (b) threaten to hit (c) threaten to kick or stomp (d) threaten to punch or beat (e) threaten to push down stairs or other height (f) threaten to burn or scald (g) threaten to throw something (h) threaten with motor vehicle (i) threaten to damage property (j) withheld money for basic needs (k) kept other from sleeping (l) kept other from eating (m) kept other from medical care (n) threaten to harm pet or animal (o) threaten to harm children (p) threaten with gun (q) threaten with knife, belt, etc. (r) threaten to kill other (s) threaten suicide (t) threaten suicide (u) others -- describe: _____

- xvii. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?
- (a) once; no second time
 - (b) two or three times, altogether
 - (c) about once a year
 - (d) several times a year
 - (e) about once a month
 - (f) about once a week
 - (g) more than once a week
 - (h) other -- describe: _____

- xviii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?
- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
 - (b) got more violent, over time
 - (c) got less violent, over time
 - (d) happened once; no second time
 - (e) other -- describe: _____

- xix. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?
- (a) yes
 - (b) no
 - (c) don't know

- xx. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?
- I was about _____ years old.

- xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?
- I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xx) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

85. DID YOU EVER SEE OR HEAR ONE OF YOUR PARENTS INTENTIONALLY DAMAGE THE WALLS, DOORS, FURNITURE, OR OTHER HOUSEHOLD ITEMS IN YOUR HOME, IN FRONT OF YOUR SECOND PARENT?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
 If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 86 on page 6.

- i. WHAT GENDER WAS THE FIRST PARENT?
- (a) male
 - (b) female
- ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?
- (a) biological parent
 - (b) adoptive or step-parent
 - (c) foster parent
 - (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
 - (e) grandparent
 - (f) uncle or aunt
 - (g) other -- describe: _____

- iii. WHAT GENDER WAS THE SECOND PARENT?
- (a) male
 - (b) female

- iv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?
- (a) biological parent
 - (b) adoptive or step-parent
 - (c) foster parent
 - (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
 - (e) grandparent
 - (f) uncle or aunt
 - (g) other -- describe: _____

- v. WHAT DID THE FIRST PARENT EVER DO?
- (Circle as many as apply)
- (a) pushed or knocked over things
 - (b) kicked things
 - (c) threw things
 - (d) smashed things
 - (e) punched things
 - (f) pulled things down
 - (g) tore or slashed things
 - (h) poured liquids or food over things
 - (i) burned things
 - (k) cracked or splintered things
 - (l) shot holes in things
 - (m) others -- describe: _____

- vi. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?
- (a) once; no second time
 - (b) two or three times, altogether
 - (c) about once a year
 - (d) several times a year
 - (e) about once a month
 - (f) about once a week
 - (g) more than once a week
 - (h) other -- describe: _____

- vii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?
- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
 - (b) got more violent, over time
 - (c) got less violent, over time
 - (d) happened once; no second time
 - (e) other -- describe: _____

- viii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?
- (a) yes
 - (b) no
 - (c) don't know

- ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?
- I was about _____ years old.

- x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?
- I was about _____ years old.
- (b) happened once; same age as (ix.) above
 - (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

- xi. DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER DAMAGE ITEMS IN YOUR HOME IN FRONT OF ONE OTHER PARENT?
- (a) yes
 - (b) no
 - (c) don't know
- If "yes", please continue answering below.
 If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 86 on page 6.

DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER DAMAGE ITEMS IN YOUR HOME IN FRONT OF ONE OTHER PARENT?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PARENT WHO DAMAGED ITEMS?

- (a) male (b) female

xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent (b) adoptive or step-parent (c) foster parent (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent (e) grandparent (f) uncle or aunt (g) other --describe: _____

xiv. WHAT GENDER WAS THE OTHER SECOND PARENT?

- (a) male (b) female

xv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent (b) adoptive or step-parent (c) foster parent (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent (e) grandparent (f) uncle or aunt (g) other --describe: _____

xvi. WHAT DID THE PARENT (identified in (xii., xiii.) above) EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) pushed or knocked over things (b) kicked things (c) threw things (d) smashed things (e) punched things (f) pulled things down (g) tore or slashed things (h) poured liquids or food over things (i) burned things (j) cracked or splintered things (k) shot holes in things (l) others -- describe: _____

xvii. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time (b) two or three times, altogether (c) about once a year (d) several times a year (e) about once a month (f) about once a week (g) more than once a week (h) other -- describe: _____

xviii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time (b) got more violent, over time (c) got less violent, over time (d) happened once; no second time (e) other -- describe: _____

xix. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

xx. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xx) above (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

86. WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOU EVER HEAR OR SEE ONE OF YOUR PARENTS INTENTIONALLY THROW SOMETHING AT A SECOND PARENT?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 87 on page 8.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THE FIRST PARENT?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent (b) adoptive or step-parent (c) foster parent (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent (e) grandparent (f) uncle or aunt (g) other --describe: _____

iii. WHAT GENDER WAS THE SECOND PARENT?

- (a) male (b) female

iv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent (b) adoptive or step-parent (c) foster parent (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent (e) grandparent (f) uncle or aunt (g) other --describe: _____

WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOU EVER HEAR OR SEE ONE OF YOUR PARENTS
INTENTIONALLY THROW SOMETHING AT A SECOND PARENT?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

v. WHAT DID THE FIRST PARENT EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threw food
- (b) threw pot or pan
- (c) threw dishes or cups
- (d) threw pillow, towel, etc.
- (e) threw knife
- (f) threw furniture
- (g) threw ashtray or lamp
- (h) threw person
- (i) threw glass item
- (k) threw hot liquid
- (l) threw board or brick
- (m) threw book
- (n) threw bottle
- (o) others -- describe: _____

vi. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

vii. WHAT INJURIES DID THE SECOND PARENT EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (k) burn
- (l) black eye
- (m) other eye injury
- (n) bloody nose
- (o) eardrum damaged
- (p) teeth cracked or broken
- (q) sprained or broken bone
- (r) joint or spinal injury
- (s) concussion
- (t) head injury
- (u) miscarriage
- (v) internal injury
- (w) numbness or paralysis
- (x) stitches needed
- (y) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

viii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

ix. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (x.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

xii. DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER INTENTIONALLY THROW SOMETHING AT ONE OTHER PARENT?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 87 on page 8.

xiii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PARENT WHO THREW SOMETHING?

- (a) male
- (b) female

xiv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) other --describe: _____

xv. WHAT GENDER WAS THE OTHER SECOND PARENT?

- (a) male
- (b) female

xvi. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) other --describe: _____

xvii. WHAT DID THE PARENT (identified in (xiii., xiv.) above) EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threw food
- (b) threw pot or pan
- (c) threw dishes or cups
- (d) threw pillow, towel, etc.
- (e) threw knife
- (f) threw furniture
- (g) threw ashtray or lamp
- (h) threw person
- (i) threw glass
- (k) threw hot liquid
- (l) threw board or brick
- (m) threw book
- (n) threw bottle
- (o) others -- describe: _____

xviii. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER INTENTIONALLY THROW SOMETHING AT ONE OTHER PARENT?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

xix. WHAT INJURIES DID THE OTHER SECOND PARENT EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (k) burn
- (l) black eye
- (m) other eye injury
- (n) bloody nose
- (o) eardrum damaged
- (p) teeth cracked or broken
- (q) sprained or broken bone
- (r) joint or spinal injury
- (s) concussion
- (t) head injury
- (u) miscarriage
- (v) internal injury
- (w) numbness or paralysis
- (x) stitches needed
- (y) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

xx. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xxi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

xxii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xxiii. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xxii .) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

87. DID YOU EVER SEE OR HEAR ONE OF YOUR PARENTS PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT A SECOND PARENT?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 88 on page 10.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THE FIRST PARENT?

- (a) male
- (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) other --describe: _____

iii. WHAT GENDER WAS THE SECOND PARENT?

- (a) male
- (b) female

iv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) other --describe: _____

v. WHAT DID THE FIRST PARENT EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) push or shove
- (b) slap, hit, or spank
- (c) claw, scratch or bite
- (d) grab or wrestle
- (e) twist arm or leg
- (f) throw object at
- (g) punch
- (h) kick
- (j) beat
- (k) hit with object
- (l) throw bodily
- (m) push or shove down stairs or other height
- (n) whip
- (o) choke or strangle
- (p) burn or scald
- (q) try to drown
- (r) point or threaten with gun
- (s) point or threaten with knife or other weapon
- (t) use motor vehicle against other
- (u) others -- describe: _____

vi. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

DID YOU EVER SEE OR HEAR ONE OF YOUR PARENTS PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT A SECOND PARENT?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

vii. WHAT INJURIES DID THE SECOND PARENT EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
(b) painful, but no real injury
(c) clothing torn
(d) lost hair
(e) broken eyeglasses
(f) splinters or fragments in skin
(g) bruising
(h) marks
(i) cuts or scrapes
(k) burn
(l) black eye
(m) other eye injury
(n) bloody nose
(o) eardrum damaged
(p) teeth cracked or broken
(q) sprained or broken bone
(r) joint or spinal injury
(s) concussion
(t) head injury
(u) miscarriage
(v) internal injury
(w) numbness or paralysis
(x) stitches needed
(y) required medical treatment
(z) others -- describe:

viii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
(b) got more violent, over time
(c) got less violent, over time
(d) happened once; no second time
(e) other -- describe:

ix. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (x.) above
(c) It never stopped; continues to happen

xii. DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.ii.) above), EVER PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT ONE OTHER PARENT?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 88 on page 10.

xiii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PARENT WHO PHYSICALLY HARMED/MISTREATED A PARENT?

- (a) male (b) female

xiv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
(b) adoptive or step-parent
(c) foster parent
(d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
(e) grandparent
(f) uncle or aunt
(g) other --describe:

xv. WHAT GENDER WAS THE OTHER SECOND PARENT WHO WAS HARMED/MISTREATED?

- (a) male (b) female

xvi. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
(b) adoptive or step-parent
(c) foster parent
(d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
(e) grandparent
(f) uncle or aunt
(g) other --describe:

xvii. WHAT DID THE PARENT (identified in (xiii., xiv.) above) EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) push or shove
(b) slap, hit, or spank
(c) claw, scratch or bite
(d) grab or wrestle
(e) twist arm or leg
(f) throw object at
(g) punch
(h) kick
(i) beat
(k) hit with object
(l) throw bodily
(m) push or shove down stairs or other height
(n) whip
(o) choke or strangle
(p) burn or scald
(q) try to drown
(r) point or threaten with gun
(s) point or threaten with knife or other weapon
(t) use motor vehicle against other
(u) others -- describe:

xviii. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
(b) two or three times, altogether
(c) about once a year
(d) several times a year
(e) about once a month
(f) about once a week
(g) more than once a week
(h) other -- describe:

xix. WHAT INJURIES DID THE OTHER SECOND PARENT EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
(b) painful, but no real injury
(c) clothing torn
(d) lost hair
(e) broken eyeglasses
(f) splinters or fragments in skin
(g) bruising
(h) marks
(i) cuts or scrapes
(k) burn
(l) black eye
(m) other eye injury
(n) bloody nose
(o) eardrum damaged
(p) teeth cracked or broken
(q) sprained or broken bone
(r) joint or spinal injury
(s) concussion
(t) head injury
(u) miscarriage
(v) internal injury
(w) numbness or paralysis
(x) stitches needed
(y) required medical treatment
(z) others -- describe:

DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT ONE OTHER PARENT?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

- xx. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?
 - (a) stayed about as violent, over time
 - (b) got more violent, over time
 - (c) got less violent, over time
 - (d) happened once; no second time
 - (e) other -- describe: _____

- xxii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

- xxiii. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xxiii.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

- xxi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no
 - (c) don't know

88. DID YOU EVER SEE OR HEAR ONE OF YOUR PARENTS SEXUALLY HARASS A SECOND PARENT?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 89 on page 11.

- i. WHAT GENDER WAS THE FIRST PARENT?
 - (a) male
 - (b) female
- ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?
 - (a) biological parent
 - (b) adoptive or step-parent
 - (c) foster parent
 - (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
 - (e) grandparent
 - (f) uncle or aunt
 - (g) other --describe: _____

- vii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE HARASSMENT CHANGE?
 - (a) stayed about the same, over time
 - (b) got more intense, over time
 - (c) got less intense, over time
 - (d) happened once; no second time
 - (e) other -- describe: _____

- iii. WHAT GENDER WAS THE SECOND PARENT?
 - (a) male
 - (b) female

- viii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no
 - (c) don't know

- iv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?
 - (a) biological parent
 - (b) adoptive or step-parent
 - (c) foster parent
 - (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
 - (e) grandparent
 - (f) uncle or aunt
 - (g) other --describe: _____

- ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

- x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

 - (b) happened once; same age as (ix.) above
 - (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

- v. WHAT DID THE FIRST PARENT EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

 - (a) leer or stare in sexual way
 - (b) keep propositioning
 - (c) often talk sexually or about sex
 - (d) pinch or grab sexually
 - (e) wrongly accuse other of having an affair
 - (f) show pornographic pictures
 - (g) try to undress other
 - (h) pull other's clothes off
 - (i) flash or expose themselves
 - (k) others -- describe: _____

- xi. DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER SEXUALLY HARASS ONE OTHER PARENT?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no
 - (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 89 on page 11.

- vi. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?
 - (a) once; no second time
 - (b) two or three times, altogether
 - (c) about once a year
 - (d) several times a year
 - (e) about once a month
 - (f) about once a week
 - (g) more than once a week
 - (h) other -- describe: _____

- xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PARENT WHO WAS SEXUALLY HARASSING ANOTHER PARENT?
 - (a) male
 - (b) female
- xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?
 - (a) biological parent
 - (b) adoptive or step-parent
 - (c) foster parent
 - (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
 - (e) grandparent
 - (f) uncle or aunt
 - (g) other --describe: _____

DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER SEXUALLY HARASS ONE OTHER PARENT?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

- xiv. WHAT GENDER WAS THE OTHER SECOND PARENT WHO WAS HARASSED?
(a) male (b) female
- xv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?
(a) biological parent
(b) adoptive or step-parent
(c) foster parent
(d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
(e) grandparent
(f) uncle or aunt
(g) other --describe: _____
- xvi. WHAT DID THE PARENT (identified in (xii., xiii.) above) EVER DO?
(Circle as many as apply)
(a) leer or stare in sexual way
(b) keep propositioning
(c) often talk sexually or about sex
(d) pinch or grab sexually
(e) wrongly accuse other of having an affair
(f) show pornographic pictures
(g) try to undress other
(h) pull other's clothes off
(i) flash or expose themselves
(k) others -- describe: _____
- xvii. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?
(a) once; no second time
(b) two or three times, altogether
(c) about once a year
(d) several times a year
(e) about once a month
(f) about once a week
(g) more than once a week
(h) other -- describe: _____
- xviii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE HARASSMENT CHANGE?
(a) stayed about the same, over time
(b) got more intense, over time
(c) got less intense, over time
(d) happened once; no second time
(e) other -- describe: _____
- xix. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?
(a) yes (b) no (c) don't know
- xx. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?
I was about _____ years old.
- xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?
I was about _____ years old.
(b) happened once; same age as (XX) above
(c) it never stopped; continues to happen

89. WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOU EVER SEE OR HEAR ONE OF YOUR PARENTS PRESSURE A SECOND PARENT FOR SEX?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 90 on page 12.

- i. WHAT GENDER WAS THE FIRST PARENT?
(a) male (b) female
- ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?
(a) biological parent
(b) adoptive or step-parent
(c) foster parent
(d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
(e) grandparent
(f) uncle or aunt
(g) other --describe: _____
- iii. WHAT GENDER WAS THE SECOND PARENT?
(a) male (b) female
- iv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?
(a) biological parent
(b) adoptive or step-parent
(c) foster parent
(d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
(e) grandparent
(f) uncle or aunt
(g) other --describe: _____
- v. WHAT DID THE FIRST PARENT EVER DO?
(Circle as many as apply)
(a) said it was their duty
(b) said should "if you loved me"
(c) threatened to leave relationship
(d) praised or flattered other; payed special attention
(e) got angry if didn't get sex
(f) demanded sex
(g) punished other if didn't get sex
(h) emotionally withdrew if didn't get sex
(j) threatened physical force to get sex
(k) gave special gift or favour for sex
(l) compared parent unfavourably with others
(m) pulled clothes off other
(n) kept touching other sexually; started sex
(o) others -- describe: _____
- vi. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?
(a) once; no second time
(b) two or three times, altogether
(c) about once a year
(d) several times a year
(e) about once a month
(f) about once a week
(g) more than once a week
(h) other -- describe: _____

WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP, DID YOU EVER SEE OR HEAR ONE OF YOUR PARENTS
PRESSURE A SECOND PARENT FOR SEX?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

vii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE
PRESSURE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

viii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR
WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST
TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (ix.) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

xi. DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE
FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.,ii.)
above), EVER PRESSURE ONE OTHER
PARENT FOR SEX?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to
question 90 on page 12.

xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PARENT
WHO WAS SEXUALLY PRESSURING
ANOTHER PARENT?

- (a) male (b) female

xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) other --describe: _____

xiv. WHAT GENDER WAS THE OTHER SECOND
PARENT WHO WAS PRESSURED?

- (a) male (b) female

xv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) other --describe: _____

xvi. WHAT DID THE PARENT (identified
in (xii., xiii.) above) EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) said it was their duty
- (b) said should "if you loved me"
- (c) threatened to leave relationship
- (d) praised or flattered other; payed special attention
- (e) got angry if didn't get sex
- (f) demanded sex
- (g) punished other if didn't get sex
- (h) emotionally withdrew if didn't get sex
- (j) threatened physical force to get sex
- (k) gave special gift or favour for sex
- (l) compared parent unfavourably with others
- (m) pulled clothes off other
- (n) kept touching other sexually; started sex
- (o) others -- describe: _____

xvii. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xviii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE
PRESSURE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xix. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR
WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

xx. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST
TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xx) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

90. DID YOU EVER SEE OR HEAR ONE OF YOUR PARENTS ACT IN A SEXUAL WAY WHICH
DISTRESSED A SECOND PARENT?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 91 on page 14.

DID YOU EVER SEE OR HEAR ONE OF YOUR PARENTS ACT IN A SEXUAL WAY WHICH DISTRESSED A SECOND PARENT?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THE FIRST PARENT?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
(b) adoptive or step-parent
(c) foster parent
(d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
(e) grandparent
(f) uncle or aunt
(g) other --describe: _____

iii. WHAT GENDER WAS THE SECOND PARENT?

- (a) male (b) female

iv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
(b) adoptive or step-parent
(c) foster parent
(d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
(e) grandparent
(f) uncle or aunt
(g) other --describe: _____

v. WHAT DID THE FIRST PARENT EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging
(b) pinched or grabbed them sexually
(c) pulled others' clothes off
(d) exposed others' breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(e) exposed own breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(f) rubbed others' breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(g) rubbed own breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(h) forced hand to genital masturbation
(i) forced mouth to genital masturbation
(k) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse
(l) completed vaginal or anal intercourse
(m) forced sex with third person
(n) others -- describe _____

vi. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
(b) two or three times, altogether
(c) about once a year
(d) several times a year
(e) about once a month
(f) about once a week
(g) more than once a week
(h) other -- describe: _____

vii. WHAT INJURIES DID THE SECOND PARENT EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
(b) painful, but no real injury
(c) clothing torn
(d) lost hair
(e) broken eyeglasses
(f) splinters or fragments in skin
(g) bruising
(h) marks
(i) cuts or scrapes
(k) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals
(l) black eye
(m) other eye injury
(n) bloody nose
(o) teeth cracked or broken
(p) foreign object in anus or vagina
(q) sprained or broken bone
(r) joint or spinal injury
(s) concussion
(t) unplanned pregnancy
(u) miscarriage
(v) internal bleeding
(w) venereal disease
(x) stitches needed
(y) required medical treatment
(z) others -- describe: _____

viii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
(b) got more violent, over time
(c) got less violent, over time
(d) happened once; no second time
(e) other -- describe: _____

ix. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (x.) above
(c) it never stopped; continues to happen

xii. DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER ACT IN A SEXUAL WAY WHICH DISTRESSED ONE OTHER PARENT?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 91 on page 14.

xiii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PARENT WHOSE BEHAVIOR WAS DISTRESSING?

- (a) male (b) female

xiv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
(b) adoptive or step-parent
(c) foster parent
(d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
(e) grandparent
(f) uncle or aunt
(g) other --describe: _____

xv. WHAT GENDER WAS THE OTHER SECOND PARENT WHO WAS DISTRESSED?

- (a) male (b) female

xvi. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
(b) adoptive or step-parent
(c) foster parent
(d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
(e) grandparent
(f) uncle or aunt
(g) other --describe: _____

xvii. WHAT DID THE PARENT (identified in (xiii.,xiv.) above) EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging
(b) pinched or grabbed them sexually
(c) pulled others' clothes off
(d) exposed others' breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(e) exposed own breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(f) rubbed others' breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(g) rubbed own breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(h) forced hand to genital masturbation
(i) forced mouth to genital masturbation
(k) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse
(l) completed vaginal or anal intercourse
(m) forced sex with third person
(n) others -- describe _____

DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER ACT IN A SEXUAL WAY WHICH DISTRESSED ONE OTHER PARENT?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

xviii. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xx. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xix. WHAT INJURIES DID THE OTHER SECOND PARENT EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (k) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals
- (l) black eye
- (m) other eye injury
- (n) bloody nose
- (o) teeth cracked or broken
- (p) foreign object in anus or vagina
- (q) sprained or broken bone
- (r) joint or spinal injury
- (s) concussion
- (t) unplanned pregnancy
- (u) miscarriage
- (v) internal bleeding
- (w) venereal disease
- (x) stitches needed
- (y) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

xxi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

xxii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xxiii. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xxii.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

91. DID YOU EVER HEAR OR SEE ONE OF YOUR PARENTS MAKE A SECOND PARENT ACT SEXUALLY AGAINST THEIR WILL?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.

If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 92 on page 16.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THE FIRST PARENT?

- (a) male
- (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) other --describe: _____

iii. WHAT GENDER WAS THE SECOND PARENT?

- (a) male
- (b) female

iv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) other --describe: _____

v. WHAT DID THE FIRST PARENT EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging
- (b) pinched or grabbed them sexually
- (c) pulled others' clothes off
- (d) exposed others' breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (e) exposed own breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (f) rubbed others' breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (g) rubbed own breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (h) forced hand to genital masturbation
- (j) forced mouth to genital masturbation
- (k) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse
- (l) completed vaginal or anal intercourse
- (m) forced sex with third person
- (n) others -- describe: _____

vi. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

vii. WHAT INJURIES DID THE SECOND PARENT EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (j) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals
- (k) black eye
- (l) other eye injury
- (m) bloody nose
- (n) teeth cracked or broken
- (o) foreign object in anus or vagina
- (p) sprained or broken bone
- (q) joint or spinal injury
- (r) concussion
- (s) unplanned pregnancy
- (t) miscarriage
- (u) internal bleeding
- (v) venereal disease
- (w) stitches needed
- (x) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

viii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

ix. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (x.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

xii. DID ANOTHER PARENT, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PARENT (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER MAKE ONE OTHER PARENT ACT SEXUALLY AGAINST THEIR WILL?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 92 on page 16.

xiii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PARENT WHO FORCED SEXUAL BEHAVIOR?

- (a) male
- (b) female

xiv. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) other --describe: _____

xv. WHAT GENDER WAS THE OTHER SECOND PARENT WHO WAS FORCED?

- (a) male
- (b) female

xvi. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) other --describe: _____

xvii. WHAT DID THE PARENT (identified in (xiii.,xiv.) above) EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging
- (b) pinched or grabbed them sexually
- (c) pulled others' clothes off
- (d) exposed others' breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (e) exposed own breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (f) rubbed others' breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (g) rubbed own breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (h) forced hand to genital masturbation
- (i) forced mouth to genital masturbation
- (j) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse
- (k) completed vaginal or anal intercourse
- (l) forced sex with third person
- (n) others -- describe: _____

xviii. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xix. WHAT INJURIES DID THE OTHER SECOND PARENT EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (j) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals
- (k) black eye
- (l) other eye injury
- (m) bloody nose
- (n) teeth cracked or broken
- (o) foreign object in anus or vagina
- (p) sprained or broken bone
- (q) joint or spinal injury
- (r) concussion
- (s) unplanned pregnancy
- (t) miscarriage
- (u) internal bleeding
- (v) venereal disease
- (w) stitches needed
- (x) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

xx. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xxi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

xxii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xxiii. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xxii.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

PART C

This section asks questions about experiences that may or may not have happened to you when you were a child, up to the age of 16 years.

For each question, please circle the answer that best describes your experiences.

92. BEFORE YOU TURNED 16, DID ANYONE EVER THREATEN TO PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.

If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 93 on page 17.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PERSON?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) brother or sister
- (h) cousin
- (i) other relative
- (k) friend
- (l) acquaintance
- (m) neighbour
- (n) stranger
- (o) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS OTHER PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threaten with closed or clenched fist
- (b) threaten to hit
- (c) threaten to kick or stomp
- (d) threaten to punch or beat
- (e) threaten to push me down stairs or from a height
- (f) threaten to burn or scald
- (g) threaten to throw something
- (h) threaten with motor vehicle
- (i) threaten to damage property
- (k) withheld money for basic needs
- (l) kept me from sleeping
- (m) kept me from eating
- (n) kept me from medical care
- (o) threaten to harm pet or animal
- (p) threaten to harm other children
- (q) threaten with gun
- (r) threaten with knife, belt, etc.
- (s) threaten to kill me
- (t) threaten suicide
- (u) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

v. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE THREATS CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

vi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

vii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

viii. HOW OLD WAS THIS OTHER PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (ix.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

x. DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER THREATEN TO PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 93 on page 17.

xi. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON WHO THREATENED YOU?

- (a) male (b) female

xii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) brother or sister
- (h) cousin
- (i) other relative
- (k) friend
- (l) acquaintance
- (m) neighbour
- (n) stranger
- (o) other -- describe: _____

xiii. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threaten with closed or clenched fist
- (b) threaten to hit
- (c) threaten to kick or stomp
- (d) threaten to punch or beat
- (e) threaten to push me down stairs or from a height
- (f) threaten to burn or scald
- (g) threaten to throw something
- (h) threaten with motor vehicle
- (i) threaten to damage property
- (k) withheld money for basic needs
- (l) kept me from sleeping
- (m) kept me from eating
- (n) kept me from medical care
- (o) threaten to harm pet or animal
- (p) threaten to harm other children
- (q) threaten with gun
- (r) threaten with knife, belt, etc.
- (s) threaten to kill me
- (t) threaten suicide
- (u) others -- describe: _____

-17-

DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE
FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.)
above), EVER THREATEN TO PHYSICALLY
HARM/MISTREAT YOU?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

xiv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xv. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE
THREATS CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xvi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR
WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

xvii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST
TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xviii. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PERSON,
THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xvii.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

93. DID ANYONE EVER INTENTIONALLY DESTROY YOUR THINGS OR DAMAGE YOUR ROOM?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.

If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 94 on page 18.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PERSON?

- (a) male
- (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) brother or sister
- (h) cousin
- (i) other relative
- (j) friend
- (k) acquaintance
- (l) neighbour
- (m) stranger
- (o) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS OTHER PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) pushed or knocked things over
- (b) kicked things
- (c) threw things
- (d) smashed things
- (e) punched things
- (f) pulled things down
- (g) tore or slashed things
- (h) poured liquids or food over things
- (i) burned things
- (k) cracked or splintered things
- (l) shot holes in things
- (m) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

v. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE
VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

vi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR
WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

vii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST
TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

viii. HOW OLD WAS THIS OTHER PERSON,
THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (ix.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

x. DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE
FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.)
above), EVER INTENTIONALLY DESTROY
YOUR THINGS OR DAMAGE YOUR ROOM?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to
question 94 on page 18.

DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER INTENTIONALLY DESTROY YOUR THINGS OR DAMAGE YOUR ROOM?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

xi. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON WHO DAMAGED THINGS?

- (a) male (b) female

xii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent (b) adoptive or step-parent (c) foster parent (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent (e) grandparent (f) uncle or aunt (g) brother or sister (h) cousin (i) other relative (j) friend (k) acquaintance (l) neighbour (m) stranger (n) other -- describe: _____

xiii. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) pushed or knocked things over (b) kicked things (c) threw things (d) smashed things (e) punched things (f) pulled things down (g) tore or slashed things (h) poured liquids or food over things (i) burned things (j) cracked or splintered things (k) shot holes in things (l) others -- describe: _____

xiv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time (b) two or three times, altogether (c) about once a year (d) several times a year (e) about once a month (f) about once a week (g) more than once a week (h) other -- describe: _____

xv. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time (b) got more intense, over time (c) got less intense, over time (d) happened once; no second time (e) other -- describe: _____

xvi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

xvii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xviii. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xvii.) above (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

94. BEFORE YOU WERE 16, DID ANYONE EVER INTENTIONALLY THROW SOMETHING AT YOU TO HARM YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.

If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 95 on page

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PERSON?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent (b) adoptive or step-parent (c) foster parent (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent (e) grandparent (f) uncle or aunt (g) brother or sister (h) cousin (i) other relative (j) friend (k) acquaintance (l) neighbour (m) stranger (n) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS OTHER PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threw food (b) threw pot or pan (c) threw dishes or cups (d) threw pillow, towel, etc. (e) threw knife (f) threw furniture (g) threw ashtray or lamp (h) threw person (i) threw glass item (j) threw hot liquid (k) threw board or brick (l) threw book (m) threw bottle (n) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time (b) two or three times, altogether (c) about once a year (d) several times a year (e) about once a month (f) about once a week (g) more than once a week (h) other -- describe: _____

BEFORE YOU WERE 16, DID ANYONE EVER INTENTIONALLY THROW SOMETHING AT YOU TO HARM YOU?
If "yes", please continue answering below.

- 19 -

v. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (j) burn
- (k) black eye
- (l) other eye injury
- (m) bloody nose
- (n) eardrum damaged
- (o) teeth cracked or broken
- (p) sprained or broken bone
- (q) joint or spinal injury
- (r) concussion
- (s) head injury
- (t) miscarriage
- (u) internal injury
- (v) numbness or paralysis
- (w) stitches needed
- (x) required medical treatment
- (y) others -- describe: _____

vi. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

vii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

viii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WAS THIS OTHER PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (viii.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

xi. DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER INTENTIONALLY THROW SOMETHING AT YOU TO HARM YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 95 on page 20.

xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON WHO THREW SOMETHING AT YOU?

- (a) male (b) female

xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) brother or sister
- (h) cousin
- (i) other relative
- (j) friend
- (k) acquaintance
- (l) neighbour
- (m) stranger
- (n) other -- describe: _____

xiv. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threw food
- (b) threw pot or pan
- (c) threw dishes or cups
- (d) threw pillow, towel, etc.
- (e) threw knife
- (f) threw furniture
- (g) threw ashtray or lamp
- (h) threw person
- (i) threw glass item
- (j) threw hot liquid
- (k) threw board or brick
- (l) threw book
- (m) threw bottle
- (n) others -- describe: _____

xv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xvi. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (j) burn
- (k) black eye
- (l) other eye injury
- (m) bloody nose
- (n) eardrum damaged
- (o) teeth cracked or broken
- (p) sprained or broken bone
- (q) joint or spinal injury
- (r) concussion
- (s) head injury
- (t) miscarriage
- (u) internal injury
- (v) numbness or paralysis
- (w) stitches needed
- (x) required medical treatment
- (y) others -- describe: _____

xvii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xviii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xx. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xix.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

95. DID ANYONE EVER PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
 If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 96 on page 21.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PERSON?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) brother or sister
- (h) cousin
- (i) other relative
- (j) friend
- (k) acquaintance
- (l) neighbour
- (m) stranger
- (n) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS OTHER PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) push or shove
- (b) slap, hit, or spank
- (c) claw, scratch or bite
- (d) grab or wrestle
- (e) twist arm or leg
- (f) throw object at
- (g) punch
- (h) kick
- (i) beat
- (j) hit with object
- (k) throw bodily
- (l) push or shove down stairs or other height
- (m) whip
- (n) choke or strangle
- (o) burn or scald
- (p) try to drown
- (q) point or threaten with gun
- (r) point or threaten with knife or other weapon
- (s) use motor vehicle against me
- (t) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

v. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (j) burn
- (k) black eye
- (l) other eye injury
- (m) bloody nose
- (n) eardrum damaged
- (o) teeth cracked or broken
- (p) sprained or broken bone
- (q) joint or spinal injury
- (r) concussion
- (s) head injury
- (t) miscarriage
- (u) internal injury
- (v) numbness or paralysis
- (w) stitches needed
- (x) required medical treatment
- (y) others -- describe: _____

vi. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

vii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

viii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WAS THIS OTHER PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (viii.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

xi. DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
 If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 96 on page 21.

xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON WHO PHYSICALLY HARMED/MISTREATED YOU?

- (a) male (b) female

xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) brother or sister
- (h) cousin
- (i) other relative
- (j) friend
- (k) acquaintance
- (l) neighbour
- (m) stranger
- (n) other -- describe: _____

xiv. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) push or shove
- (b) slap, hit, or spank
- (c) claw, scratch or bite
- (d) grab or wrestle
- (e) twist arm or leg
- (f) throw object at
- (g) punch
- (h) kick
- (i) beat
- (j) hit with object
- (k) throw bodily
- (l) push or shove down stairs or other height
- (m) whip
- (n) choke or strangle
- (o) burn or scald
- (p) try to drown
- (q) point or threaten with gun
- (r) point or threaten with knife or other weapon
- (s) use motor vehicle against me
- (t) others -- describe: _____

DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT YOU?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

-21-

xv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xvii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xvi. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (k) burn
- (l) black eye
- (m) other eye injury
- (n) bloody nose
- (o) eardrum damaged
- (p) teeth cracked or broken
- (q) sprained or broken bone
- (r) joint or spinal injury
- (s) concussion
- (t) head injury
- (u) miscarriage
- (v) internal injury
- (w) numbness or paralysis
- (x) stitches needed
- (y) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

xviii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xx. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xix.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

96. BEFORE YOU WERE 16, DID ANYONE EVER SEXUALLY HARASS YOU?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.

If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 97 on page 22.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PERSON?

- (a) male
- (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) brother or sister
- (h) cousin
- (j) other relative
- (k) friend
- (l) acquaintance
- (m) neighbour
- (n) stranger
- (o) other -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

v. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE HARASSMENT CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS OTHER PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) leer or stare in sexual way
- (b) keep propositioning
- (c) often talk sexually or about sex
- (d) pinch or grab me sexually
- (e) try to kiss or hug me sexually
- (f) show pornographic pictures
- (g) try to undress me
- (h) pull my clothes off
- (j) flash or expose themselves
- (k) try to see me undressed
- (l) others -- describe: _____

vi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

vii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

viii. HOW OLD WAS THIS OTHER PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (vii.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

x. DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER SEXUALLY HARASS YOU?
 (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know
 If "yes", please continue answering below.
 If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 97 on page 22.

xi. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON WHO SEXUALLY HARASSED YOU?
 (a) male (b) female

xii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?
 (a) biological parent
 (b) adoptive or step-parent
 (c) foster parent
 (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
 (e) grandparent
 (f) uncle or aunt
 (g) brother or sister
 (h) cousin
 (i) other relative
 (j) friend
 (k) acquaintance
 (l) neighbour
 (m) stranger
 (n) other -- describe: _____

xiii. WHAT DID THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON (identified in (xi.,xii) above), EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)
 (a) leer or stare in sexual way
 (b) keep propositioning
 (c) often talk sexually or about sex
 (d) pinch or grab sexually
 (e) try to kiss or hug me sexually
 (f) show pornographic pictures
 (g) try to undress me
 (h) pull my clothes off
 (i) flash or expose themselves
 (k) try to see me undressed
 (l) others -- describe: _____

xiv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?
 (a) once; no second time
 (b) two or three times, altogether
 (c) about once a year
 (d) several times a year
 (e) about once a month
 (f) about once a week
 (g) more than once a week
 (h) other -- describe: _____

xv. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE HARASSMENT CHANGE?
 (a) stayed about the same, over time
 (b) got more intense, over time
 (c) got less intense, over time
 (d) happened once; no second time
 (e) other -- describe: _____

xvi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?
 (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

xvii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?
 I was about _____ years old.

xviii. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?
 They were about _____ years old.

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?
 I was about _____ years old.
 (b) happened once; same age as (xvii.) above
 (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

97. DID ANYONE EVER PRESSURE YOU FOR SEX?

(a) yes (b) no (c) don't know
 If "yes", please continue answering below.
 If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 98 on page 24.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS OTHER PERSON?
 (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?
 (a) biological parent
 (b) adoptive or step-parent
 (c) foster parent
 (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
 (e) grandparent
 (f) uncle or aunt
 (g) brother or sister
 (h) cousin
 (i) other relative
 (j) friend
 (k) acquaintance
 (l) neighbour
 (m) stranger
 (n) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THE OTHER PERSON EVER DO?
 (Circle as many as apply)
 (a) said it was an education
 (b) said should "if you loved me"
 (c) threatened to leave relationship
 (d) praised or flattered me; payed special attention
 (e) got angry if didn't get sex
 (f) demanded sex
 (g) punished me if didn't get sex
 (h) emotionally withdrew if didn't get sex
 (j) threatened physical force to get sex
 (k) gave special gift or favour for sex
 (l) compared me unfavourably with others
 (m) pulled clothes off me
 (n) kept touching me sexually
 (o) others -- describe: _____

DID ANYONE EVER PRESSURE YOU FOR SEX?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

v. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE PRESSURE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

vi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

vii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

viii. HOW OLD WAS THIS OTHER PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (vii.) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

x. DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER PRESSURE YOU FOR SEX?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 98 on page 24.

xi. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON WHO WAS SEXUALLY PRESSURING YOU?

- (a) male
- (b) female

xii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) brother or sister
- (h) cousin
- (i) other relative
- (j) friend
- (k) acquaintance
- (l) neighbour
- (m) stranger
- (n) other -- describe: _____

xiii. WHAT DID THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON (identified in (xi.,xii) above), EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) said it was an education
- (b) said should "if you loved me"
- (c) threatened to leave relationship
- (d) praised or flattered me; payed special attention
- (e) got angry if didn't get sex
- (f) demanded sex
- (g) punished me if didn't get sex
- (h) emotionally withdrew if didn't get sex
- (j) threatened physical force to get sex
- (k) gave special gift or favour for sex
- (l) compared me unfavourably with others
- (m) pulled clothes off me
- (n) kept touching me sexually
- (o) others -- describe: _____

xiv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xv. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE PRESSURE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xvi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

xvii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xviii. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xvii.) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

98. DID ANYONE EVER ACT IN A SEXUAL WAY WHICH DISTRESSED YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 99 on page 25.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THE OTHER PERSON?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
(b) adoptive or step-parent
(c) foster parent
(d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
(e) grandparent
(f) uncle or aunt
(g) brother or sister
(h) cousin
(i) other relative
(k) friend
(l) acquaintance
(m) neighbour
(n) stranger
(o) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THE OTHER PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging
(b) pinched or grabbed me sexually
(c) pulled my clothes off
(d) exposed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(e) exposed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(f) rubbed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(g) rubbed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(h) forced hand to genital masturbation
(j) forced mouth to genital masturbation
(k) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse
(l) completed vaginal or anal intercourse
(m) forced sex with third person
(n) others -- describe _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
(b) two or three times, altogether
(c) about once a year
(d) several times a year
(e) about once a month
(f) about once a week
(g) more than once a week
(h) other -- describe: _____

v. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
(b) painful, but no real injury
(c) clothing torn
(d) lost hair
(e) broken eyeglasses
(f) splinters or fragments in skin
(g) bruising
(h) marks
(j) cuts or scrapes
(k) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals
(l) black eye
(m) other eye injury
(n) bloody nose
(o) teeth cracked or broken
(p) foreign object in anus or vagina
(q) sprained or broken bone
(r) joint or spinal injury
(s) concussion
(t) unplanned pregnancy
(u) miscarriage
(v) internal bleeding
(w) venereal disease
(x) stitches needed
(y) required medical treatment
(z) others -- describe: _____

vi. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
(b) got more violent, over time
(c) got less violent, over time
(d) happened once; no second time
(e) other -- describe: _____

vii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

viii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WAS THIS OTHER PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (viii) above
(c) it never stopped; continues to happen

xi. DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER ACT IN A SEXUAL WAY WHICH DISTRESSED YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 99 on page 25.

xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND PERSON WHOSE BEHAVIOR WAS DISTRESSING?

- (a) male (b) female

xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
(b) adoptive or step-parent
(c) foster parent
(d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
(e) grandparent
(f) uncle or aunt
(g) brother or sister
(h) cousin
(j) other relative
(k) friend
(l) acquaintance
(m) neighbour
(n) stranger
(o) other -- describe: _____

xiv. WHAT DID THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON (identified in (xii,xiii) above), EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging
(b) pinched or grabbed me sexually
(c) pulled my clothes off
(d) exposed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(e) exposed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(f) rubbed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(g) rubbed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
(h) forced hand to genital masturbation
(j) forced mouth to genital masturbation
(k) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse
(l) completed vaginal or anal intercourse
(m) forced sex with third person
(n) others -- describe _____

DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER ACT IN A SEXUAL WAY WHICH DISTRESSED YOU?

If "yes", please continue answering below. -25-

xv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe:

xvi. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (k) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals
- (l) black eye
- (m) other eye injury
- (n) bloody nose
- (o) teeth cracked or broken
- (p) foreign object in anus or vagina
- (q) sprained or broken bone
- (r) joint or spinal injury
- (s) concussion
- (t) unplanned pregnancy
- (u) miscarriage
- (v) internal bleeding
- (w) venereal disease
- (x) stitches needed
- (y) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe:

xvii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe:

xviii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xx. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xix.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

99. BEFORE YOU TURNED 16, DID ANYONE EVER MAKE YOU ACT SEXUALLY WITH THEM?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.

If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 100 on page 27.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THE OTHER PERSON?

- (a) male
- (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
- (b) adoptive or step-parent
- (c) foster parent
- (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
- (e) grandparent
- (f) uncle or aunt
- (g) brother or sister
- (h) cousin
- (i) other relative
- (k) friend
- (l) acquaintance
- (m) neighbour
- (n) stranger
- (o) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THE OTHER PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging
- (b) pinched or grabbed me sexually
- (c) pulled my clothes off
- (d) exposed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (e) exposed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (f) rubbed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (g) rubbed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (h) forced hand to genital masturbation
- (i) forced mouth to genital masturbation
- (k) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse
- (l) completed vaginal or anal intercourse
- (m) forced sex with third person
- (n) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

v. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (k) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals
- (l) black eye
- (m) other eye injury
- (n) bloody nose
- (o) teeth cracked or broken
- (p) foreign object in anus or vagina
- (q) sprained or broken bone
- (r) joint or spinal injury
- (s) concussion
- (t) unplanned pregnancy
- (u) miscarriage
- (v) internal bleeding
- (w) venereal disease
- (x) stitches needed
- (y) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

If "yes", please continue answering below.

vi. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
 (b) got more violent, over time
 (c) got less violent, over time
 (d) happened once; no second time
 (e) other -- describe: _____

vii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

viii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WAS THIS OTHER PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (viii.) above
 (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

xi. DID ANOTHER PERSON, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER MAKE YOU ACT IN A SEXUAL WAY?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
 If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 100 on page 27.

xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON?

- (a) male (b) female

xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) biological parent
 (b) adoptive or step-parent
 (c) foster parent
 (d) boyfriend or girlfriend of parent
 (e) grandparent
 (f) uncle or aunt
 (g) brother or sister
 (h) cousin
 (i) other relative
 (j) friend
 (k) acquaintance
 (l) neighbour
 (m) stranger
 (n) other -- describe: _____

xiv. WHAT DID THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON (identified in (xii,xiii) above), EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging
 (b) pinched or grabbed me sexually
 (c) pulled my clothes off
 (d) exposed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
 (e) exposed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
 (f) rubbed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
 (g) rubbed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
 (h) forced hand to genital masturbation
 (i) forced mouth to genital masturbation
 (j) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse
 (k) completed vaginal or anal intercourse
 (l) forced sex with third person
 (m) others -- describe: _____

xv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
 (b) two or three times, altogether
 (c) about once a year
 (d) several times a year
 (e) about once a month
 (f) about once a week
 (g) more than once a week
 (h) other -- describe: _____

xvi. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
 (b) painful, but no real injury
 (c) clothing torn
 (d) lost hair
 (e) broken eyeglasses
 (f) splinters or fragments in skin
 (g) bruising
 (h) marks
 (i) cuts or scrapes
 (j) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals
 (k) black eye
 (l) other eye injury
 (m) bloody nose
 (n) teeth cracked or broken
 (o) foreign object in anus or vagina
 (p) sprained or broken bone
 (q) joint or spinal injury
 (r) concussion
 (s) unplanned pregnancy
 (t) miscarriage
 (u) internal bleeding
 (v) venereal disease
 (w) stitches needed
 (x) required medical treatment
 (y) others -- describe: _____

xvii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
 (b) got more violent, over time
 (c) got less violent, over time
 (d) happened once; no second time
 (e) other -- describe: _____

xviii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xx. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PERSON, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xix.) above
 (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

PART D

This fourth section includes questions about experiences you may or may not have had with a date, a lover, a partner or a spouse, since you were 16 years old.

The term "partner" means a person you have dated, lived with, or have married; in other words, someone who has had a significant personal relationship with you,

and "home" means the place you lived, at that time.

Please circle the answer that best describes what you have experienced as an adult.

100. SINCE YOU TURNED 16, HAS A PARTNER EVER THREATENED TO PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 101 on page 28.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS PARTNER?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance (b) casual dating (c) steady dating (d) living together (e) first marriage (f) separated (g) divorced (h) re-marriage (j) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS OTHER PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threaten with closed or clenched fist (b) threaten to hit (c) threaten to kick or stomp (d) threaten to punch or beat (e) threaten to push me down stairs or from a height (f) threaten to burn or scald (g) threaten to throw something (h) threaten with motor vehicle (j) threaten to damage property (k) withheld money for basic needs (l) kept me from sleeping (m) kept me from eating (n) kept me from medical care (o) threaten to harm pet or animal (p) threaten to harm children (q) threaten with gun (r) threaten with knife, belt, etc. (s) threaten to kill me (t) threaten suicide (u) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time (b) two or three times, altogether (c) about once a year (d) several times a year (e) about once a month (f) about once a week (g) more than once a week (h) other -- describe: _____

v. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE THREATS CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time (b) got more intense, over time (c) got less intense, over time (d) happened once; no second time (e) other -- describe: _____

vi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

vii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

viii. HOW OLD WAS THIS PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (vii.) above (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

x. DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.iii.) above), EVER THREATEN TO PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 101 on page 28.

xi. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND OTHER PARTNER WHO THREATENED YOU?

- (a) male (b) female

xii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance (b) casual dating (c) steady dating (d) living together (e) first marriage (f) separated (g) divorced (h) re-marriage (j) other -- describe: _____

xiii. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PARTNER EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threaten with closed or clenched fist (b) threaten to hit (c) threaten to kick or stomp (d) threaten to punch or beat (e) threaten to push me down stairs or from a height (f) threaten to burn or scald (g) threaten to throw something (h) threaten with motor vehicle (j) threaten to damage property (k) withheld money for basic needs (l) kept me from sleeping (m) kept me from eating (n) kept me from medical care (o) threaten to harm pet or animal (p) threaten to harm other children (q) threaten with gun (r) threaten with knife, belt, etc. (s) threaten to kill me (t) threaten suicide (u) others -- describe: _____

DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i..iii.) above), EVER THREATEN TO PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT YOU?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

-28-

xiv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xv. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE THREATS CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xvi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

xvii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xviii. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xvii.) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

101. HAS A PARTNER EVER INTENTIONALLY DAMAGED THE WALLS, DOORS, FURNITURE, OR OTHER HOUSEHOLD ITEMS IN YOUR HOME, IN FRONT OF YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.

If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 102 on page 29

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS PARTNER?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance
- (b) casual dating
- (c) steady dating
- (d) living together
- (e) first marriage
- (f) separated
- (g) divorced
- (h) re-marriage
- (j) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS OTHER PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) pushed or knocked things over
- (b) kicked things
- (c) threw things
- (d) smashed things
- (e) punched things
- (f) pulled things down
- (g) tore or slashed things
- (h) poured liquids or food over things
- (j) burned things
- (k) cracked or splintered things
- (l) shot holes in things
- (m) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

v. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

vi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

vii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

viii. HOW OLD WAS THIS PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (vii.) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

x. DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i..iii.) above), EVER INTENTIONALLY DAMAGE ITEMS IN YOUR HOME IN FRONT OF YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.

If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 102 on page 29.

DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER INTENTIONALLY DAMAGE ITEMS IN YOUR HOME IN FRONT OF YOU?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

xi. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER WHO DAMAGED THINGS?

- (a) male (b) female

xii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance (b) casual dating (c) steady dating (d) living together (e) first marriage (f) separated (g) divorced (h) re-marriage (j) other -- describe: _____

xiii. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PARTNER EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) pushed or knocked things over (b) kicked things (c) threw things (d) smashed things (e) punched things (f) pulled things down (g) tore or slashed things (h) poured liquids or food over things (j) burned things (k) cracked or splintered things (l) shot holes in things (m) others -- describe: _____

xiv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time (b) two or three times, altogether (c) about once a year (d) several times a year (e) about once a month (f) about once a week (g) more than once a week (h) other -- describe: _____

xv. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time (b) got more intense, over time (c) got less intense, over time (d) happened once; no second time (e) other -- describe: _____

xvi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

xvii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xviii. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xvii.) above (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

102. HAS A PARTNER EVER INTENTIONALLY THROWN SOMETHING AT YOU TO HARM YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.

If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 103 on page 31.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS PARTNER?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance (b) casual dating (c) steady dating (d) living together (e) first marriage (f) separated (g) divorced (h) re-marriage (j) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS OTHER PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threw food (b) threw pot or pan (c) threw dishes or cups (d) threw pillow, towel, etc. (e) threw knife (f) threw furniture (g) threw ashtray or lamp (h) threw person (j) threw glass item (k) threw hot liquid (l) threw board or brick (m) threw book (n) threw bottle (o) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time (b) two or three times, altogether (c) about once a year (d) several times a year (e) about once a month (f) about once a week (g) more than once a week (h) other -- describe: _____

v. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt (b) painful, but no real injury (c) clothing torn (d) lost hair (e) broken eyeglasses (f) splinters or fragments in skin (g) bruising (h) marks (j) cuts or scrapes (k) burn (l) black eye (m) other eye injury (n) bloody nose (o) eardrum damaged (p) teeth cracked or broken (q) sprained or broken bone (r) joint or spinal injury (s) concussion (t) head injury (u) miscarriage (v) internal injury (w) numbness or paralysis (x) stitches needed (y) required medical treatment (z) others -- describe: _____

If "yes", please continue answering below.

vi. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

vii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

viii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WAS THIS PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (viii.) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

xi. DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER INTENTIONALLY THROW SOMETHING AT YOU TO HARM YOU?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 103 on page 3/.

xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER WHO THREW SOMETHING AT YOU?

- (a) male
- (b) female

xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance
- (b) casual dating
- (c) steady dating
- (d) living together
- (e) first marriage
- (f) separated
- (g) divorced
- (h) re-marriage
- (j) other -- describe: _____

xiv. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PARTNER EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) threw food
- (b) threw pot or pan
- (c) threw dishes or cups
- (d) threw pillow, towel, etc.
- (e) threw knife
- (f) threw furniture
- (g) threw ashtray or lamp
- (h) threw person
- (i) threw glass item
- (k) threw hot liquid
- (l) threw board or brick
- (m) threw book
- (n) threw bottle
- (o) others -- describe: _____

xv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xvi. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (k) burn
- (l) black eye
- (m) other eye injury
- (n) bloody nose
- (o) eardrum damaged
- (p) teeth cracked or broken
- (q) sprained or broken bone
- (r) joint or spinal injury
- (s) concussion
- (t) head injury
- (u) miscarriage
- (v) internal injury
- (w) numbness or paralysis
- (x) stitches needed
- (y) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

xvii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xviii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xx. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xix.) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

103. SINCE YOU WERE 16, HAS A PARTNER EVER PHYSICALLY HARMED/MISTREATED YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 104 on page 32.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS PARTNER?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance (b) casual dating (c) steady dating (d) living together (e) first marriage (f) separated (g) divorced (h) re-marriage (j) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS PARTNER EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) push or shove (b) slap, hit, or spank (c) claw, scratch or bite (d) grab or wrestle (e) twist arm or leg (f) throw object at (g) punch (h) kick (i) beat (k) hit with object (l) throw me bodily (m) push or shove down stairs or other height (n) whip (o) choke or strangle (p) burn or scald (q) try to drown (r) point or threaten with gun (s) point or threaten with knife or other weapon (t) use motor vehicle against me (u) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time (b) two or three times, altogether (c) about once a year (d) several times a year (e) about once a month (f) about once a week (g) more than once a week (h) other -- describe: _____

v. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt (b) painful, but no real injury (c) clothing torn (d) lost hair (e) broken eyeglasses (f) splinters or fragments in skin (g) bruising (h) marks (i) cuts or scrapes (k) burn (l) black eye (m) other eye injury (n) bloody nose (o) eardrum damaged (p) teeth cracked or broken (q) sprained or broken bone (r) joint or spinal injury (s) concussion (t) head injury (u) miscarriage (v) internal injury (w) numbness or paralysis (x) stitches needed (y) required medical treatment (z) others -- describe: _____

vi. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time (b) got more violent, over time (c) got less violent, over time (d) happened once; no second time (e) other -- describe: _____

vii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

viii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WAS THIS PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (viii.) above (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

xi. DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i., ii.) above), EVER PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 104 on page 32.

xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER WHO PHYSICALLY HARMED/MISTREATED YOU?

- (a) male (b) female

xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance (b) casual dating (c) steady dating (d) living together (e) first marriage (f) separated (g) divorced (h) re-marriage (j) other -- describe: _____

xiv. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) push or shove (b) slap, hit, or spank (c) claw, scratch or bite (d) grab or wrestle (e) twist arm or leg (f) throw object at (g) punch (h) kick (i) beat (k) hit with object (l) throw me bodily (m) push or shove down stairs or other height (n) whip (o) choke or strangle (p) burn or scald (q) try to drown (r) point or threaten with gun (s) point or threaten with knife or other weapon (t) use motor vehicle against me (u) others -- describe: _____

DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER PHYSICALLY HARM/MISTREAT YOU?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

xv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xvi. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (j) burn
- (k) black eye
- (l) other eye injury
- (m) bloody nose
- (n) eardrum damaged
- (o) teeth cracked or broken
- (p) sprained or broken bone
- (q) joint or spinal injury
- (r) concussion
- (s) head injury
- (t) miscarriage
- (u) internal injury
- (v) numbness or paralysis
- (x) stitches needed
- (y) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

xvii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xviii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xx. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xix.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

104. HAS A PARTNER EVER SEXUALLY HARASSED YOU?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.

If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 105 on page 33.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS PARTNER?

- (a) male
- (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance
- (b) casual dating
- (c) steady dating
- (d) living together
- (e) first marriage
- (f) separated
- (g) divorced
- (h) re-marriage
- (j) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS PARTNER EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) leer or stare in sexual way
- (b) keep propositioning
- (c) often talk sexually or about sex
- (d) pinch or grab me sexually
- (e) wrongly accuse me of having an affair
- (f) show pornographic pictures
- (g) try to undress me
- (h) pull my clothes off
- (j) flash or expose themselves
- (k) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

v. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE HARASSMENT CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

vi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

HAS A PARTNER EVER SEXUALLY HARASSED YOU?
If "yes", please continue answering below.

vii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

viii. HOW OLD WAS THIS PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (vii.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

x. DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER SEXUALLY HARASS YOU?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 105 on page 33

xi. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER WHO THREATENED YOU?

- (a) male
- (b) female

xii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance
- (b) casual dating
- (c) steady dating
- (d) living together
- (e) first marriage
- (f) separated
- (g) divorced
- (h) re-marriage
- (j) other -- describe: _____

xiii. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PARTNER EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) leer or stare in sexual way
- (b) keep propositioning
- (c) often talk sexually or about sex
- (d) pinch or grab me sexually
- (e) wrongly accuse me of having an affair
- (f) show pornographic pictures
- (g) try to undress me
- (h) pull my clothes off
- (j) flash or expose themselves
- (k) others -- describe: _____

xiv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xv. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE HARASSMENT CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xvi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

xvii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xviii. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xvii.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

105. HAS A PARTNER EVER PRESSURED YOU FOR SEX?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 106 on page 34.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS PARTNER?

- (a) male
- (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance
- (b) casual dating
- (c) steady dating
- (d) living together
- (e) first marriage
- (f) separated
- (g) divorced
- (h) re-marriage
- (j) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS PARTNER EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) said it was my duty
- (b) said should "if you loved me"
- (c) threatened to leave relationship
- (d) praised or flattered me; payed special attention
- (e) got angry if didn't get sex
- (f) demanded sex
- (g) punished me if didn't get sex
- (h) emotionally withdrew if didn't get sex
- (j) threatened physical force to get sex
- (k) gave special gift or favour for sex
- (l) compared me unfavourably with others
- (m) pulled clothes off me
- (n) kept touching me sexually; started sex
- (o) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

v. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE PRESSURE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

vi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

vii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

viii. HOW OLD WAS THIS PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (vii.) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

x. DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i., ii.) above), EVER PRESSURE YOU FOR SEX?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 106 on page 34.

xi. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER WHO PRESSURED YOU?

- (a) male (b) female

xii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance
- (b) casual dating
- (c) steady dating
- (d) living together
- (e) first marriage
- (f) separated
- (g) divorced
- (h) re-marriage
- (j) other -- describe: _____

xiii. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PARTNER EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) leer or stare in sexual way
- (b) keep propositioning
- (c) often talk sexually or about sex
- (d) pinch or grab me sexually
- (e) wrongly accuse me of having an affair
- (f) show pornographic pictures
- (g) try to undress me
- (h) pull my clothes off
- (i) flash or expose themselves
- (k) others -- describe: _____

xiv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xv. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE PRESSURE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about the same, over time
- (b) got more intense, over time
- (c) got less intense, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xvi. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

xvii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xviii. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xvii.) above
- (c) It never stopped; continues to happen

106. SINCE YOU TURNED 16, HAS A PARTNER EVER ACTED IN A SEXUAL WAY WHICH DISTRESSED YOU?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.
If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 107 on page 36.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS PARTNER?

- (a) male (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance
- (b) casual dating
- (c) steady dating
- (d) living together
- (e) first marriage
- (f) separated
- (g) divorced
- (h) re-marriage
- (j) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS PARTNER EVER DO? If "yes", please continue answering below.

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging
- (b) pinched or grabbed me sexually
- (c) pulled my clothes off
- (d) exposed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (e) exposed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (f) rubbed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (g) rubbed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (h) forced hand to genital masturbation
- (i) forced mouth to genital masturbation
- (j) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse
- (l) completed vaginal or anal intercourse
- (m) forced sex with third person
- (n) others -- describe _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

v. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (j) cuts or scrapes
- (k) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals
- (l) black eye
- (m) other eye injury
- (n) bloody nose
- (o) teeth cracked or broken
- (p) foreign object in anus or vagina
- (q) sprained or broken bone
- (r) joint or spinal injury
- (s) concussion
- (t) unplanned pregnancy
- (u) miscarriage
- (v) internal bleeding
- (w) venereal disease
- (x) stitches needed
- (y) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

vi. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

vii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

viii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WAS THIS PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (viii.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

xi. DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER ACT IN A SEXUAL WAY WHICH DISTRESSED YOU?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 107 on page 36.

xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER WHO ACTED IN A SEXUAL WAY WHICH DISTRESSED YOU?

- (a) male
- (b) female

xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance
- (b) casual dating
- (c) steady dating
- (d) living together
- (e) first marriage
- (f) separated
- (g) divorced
- (h) re-marriage
- (j) other -- describe: _____

xiv. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging
- (b) pinched or grabbed me sexually
- (c) pulled my clothes off
- (d) exposed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (e) exposed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (f) rubbed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (g) rubbed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (h) forced hand to genital masturbation
- (i) forced mouth to genital masturbation
- (k) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse
- (l) completed vaginal or anal intercourse
- (m) forced sex with third person
- (n) others -- describe _____

xv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

xvi. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (j) cuts or scrapes
- (k) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals
- (l) black eye
- (m) other eye injury
- (n) bloody nose
- (o) teeth cracked or broken
- (p) foreign object in anus or vagina
- (q) sprained or broken bone
- (r) joint or spinal injury
- (s) concussion
- (t) unplanned pregnancy
- (u) miscarriage
- (v) internal bleeding
- (w) venereal disease
- (x) stitches needed
- (y) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER ACT IN A SEXUAL WAY WHICH DISTRESSED YOU?

If "yes", please continue answering below.

-36-

xvii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

xviii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xx. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xix.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

107. HAS A PARTNER EVER MADE YOU ACT SEXUALLY AGAINST YOUR WILL?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below.

If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 108 on page 38.

i. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS PARTNER?

- (a) male
- (b) female

ii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance
- (b) casual dating
- (c) steady dating
- (d) living together
- (e) first marriage
- (f) separated
- (g) divorced
- (h) re-marriage
- (j) other -- describe: _____

iii. WHAT DID THIS PARTNER EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging
- (b) pinched or grabbed me sexually
- (c) pulled my clothes off
- (d) exposed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (e) exposed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (f) rubbed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (g) rubbed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks
- (h) forced hand to genital masturbation
- (j) forced mouth to genital masturbation
- (k) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse
- (l) completed vaginal or anal intercourse
- (m) forced sex with third person
- (n) others -- describe: _____

iv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time
- (b) two or three times, altogether
- (c) about once a year
- (d) several times a year
- (e) about once a month
- (f) about once a week
- (g) more than once a week
- (h) other -- describe: _____

v. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt
- (b) painful, but no real injury
- (c) clothing torn
- (d) lost hair
- (e) broken eyeglasses
- (f) splinters or fragments in skin
- (g) bruising
- (h) marks
- (i) cuts or scrapes
- (k) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals
- (l) black eye
- (m) other eye injury
- (n) bloody nose
- (o) teeth cracked or broken
- (p) foreign object in anus or vagina
- (q) sprained or broken bone
- (r) joint or spinal injury
- (s) concussion
- (t) unplanned pregnancy
- (u) miscarriage
- (v) internal bleeding
- (w) venereal disease
- (x) stitches needed
- (y) required medical treatment
- (z) others -- describe: _____

vi. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time
- (b) got more violent, over time
- (c) got less violent, over time
- (d) happened once; no second time
- (e) other -- describe: _____

vii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

viii. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

ix. HOW OLD WAS THIS PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

x. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (viii.) above
- (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

xi. DID ANOTHER PARTNER, OTHER THAN THE FIRST PERSON (identified in (i.,ii.) above), EVER MAKE YOU ACT SEXUALLY AGAINST YOUR WILL?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

If "yes", please continue answering below. If "no" or "don't know", please go to question 108 on page 38.

xii. WHAT GENDER WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER WHO MADE YOU ACT SEXUALLY AGAINST YOUR WILL?

- (a) male (b) female

xiii. WHAT RELATIONSHIP WERE THEY TO YOU?

- (a) acquaintance (b) casual dating (c) steady dating (d) living together (e) first marriage (f) separated (g) divorced (h) re-marriage (j) other -- describe: _____

xiv. WHAT DID THIS SECOND PERSON EVER DO?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) forced kissing or hugging (b) pinched or grabbed me sexually (c) pulled my clothes off (d) exposed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks (e) exposed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks (f) rubbed my breasts, genitals, or buttocks (g) rubbed their breasts, genitals, or buttocks (h) forced hand to genital masturbation (j) forced mouth to genital masturbation (k) attempted vaginal or anal intercourse (l) completed vaginal or anal intercourse (m) forced sex with third person (n) others -- describe _____

xv. HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

- (a) once; no second time (b) two or three times, altogether (c) about once a year (d) several times a year (e) about once a month (f) about once a week (g) more than once a week (h) other -- describe: _____

xvi. WHAT INJURIES DID YOU EVER RECEIVE?

(Circle as many as apply)

- (a) no real hurt (b) painful, but no real injury (c) clothing torn (d) lost hair (e) broken eyeglasses (f) splinters or fragments in skin (g) bruising (h) marks (j) cuts or scrapes (k) tears to mouth, anus, or genitals (l) black eye (m) other eye injury (n) bloody nose (o) teeth cracked or broken (p) foreign object in anus or vagina (q) sprained or broken bone (r) joint or spinal injury (s) concussion (t) unplanned pregnancy (u) miscarriage (v) internal bleeding (w) venereal disease (x) stitches needed (y) required medical treatment (z) others -- describe: _____

xvii. DID THE INTENSITY OF THE VIOLENCE CHANGE?

- (a) stayed about as violent, over time (b) got more violent, over time (c) got less violent, over time (d) happened once; no second time (e) other -- describe: _____

xviii. DO YOU THINK THIS BEHAVIOR WAS ABUSIVE?

- (a) yes (b) no (c) don't know

xix. HOW OLD WERE YOU THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

I was about _____ years old.

xx. HOW OLD WAS THIS SECOND PARTNER, THE FIRST TIME THIS HAPPENED?

They were about _____ years old.

xxi. HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN THIS STOPPED?

I was about _____ years old.

- (b) happened once; same age as (xix.) above (c) it never stopped; continues to happen

PART E

108. HAVE YOU EVER GONE TO TALK TO SOMEONE, OUTSIDE OF YOUR FAMILY, ABOUT A PERSONAL OR FAMILY PROBLEM?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
- (c) don't know

i. If "yes", who was the first person you contacted?

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| (a) doctor/physician | (g) psychologist |
| (b) priest or minister | (h) psychiatrist |
| (c) lawyer | (j) other -- describe: _____ |
| (d) police | _____ |
| (e) social worker | _____ |
| (f) counselor | _____ |

ii. How many times did you see this person, face-to-face ?

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| (a) none; phone or letter contact only | (e) for 6 months to a year |
| (b) one session | (g) for longer than a year |
| (c) 2 or 3 sessions | (h) other -- describe: _____ |
| (d) for a few months | _____ |

iii. Who was the most recent person you have contacted?

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| (a) doctor/physician | (g) psychologist |
| (b) priest or minister | (h) psychiatrist |
| (c) lawyer | (j) other -- describe: _____ |
| (d) police | _____ |
| (e) social worker | _____ |
| (f) counselor | _____ |

iv. How many times did you see this second person, face-to-face?

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| (a) none; phone or letter contact only | (e) for 6 months to a year |
| (b) one session | (f) for longer than a year |
| (c) 2 or 3 session | (h) other -- describe: _____ |
| (d) for a few months | _____ |

109. WHAT IS YOUR GENDER? (a) male (b) female

110. HOW OLD ARE YOU TODAY? I am _____ years old.

111. WERE YOU BORN IN CANADA? (a) yes (b) no
If "no", HOW OLD WERE YOU WHEN YOU CAME TO CANADA? I was _____ years old.

112. IS ENGLISH YOUR FIRST LANGUAGE? (a) yes (b) no
If "no", WHAT LANGUAGE IS YOUR FIRST LANGUAGE? _____

113. WHAT IS YOUR MARITAL STATUS? (a) single; never married (b) married
(c) living together (d) separated or divorced (e) remarried
(f) widowed (g) other -- describe: _____

114. DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN? (a) yes (b) no If "yes", how many? _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT TO ANSWER THESE MANY QUESTIONS. PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO ME, AND I CAN GIVE YOU SOME FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE STUDY.

Appendix D: Feedback to Participants

Study: FAMILIES

Researcher: Pat Rycroft

FEEDBACK

The study named "FAMILIES" is one part of a research project examining the assumption that abuse experienced in childhood is a 'risk factor' or somehow predisposes a person to be abused by a marital partner, later in that person's life. This study integrates several types of abuse, as well as different developmental periods when abuse may have occurred, into one single study. Participants in this research include people who have not experienced abuse, as well as those who have, and includes both women and men.

The responses of many different people (about 400 in total) to the same questions that you have answered, will be analyzed to see whether or not particular types of childhood experiences can or cannot predict later experiences as an adult. Also, possible gender differences (between men and women), as well as attitudes towards traditional and non-traditional roles for women and men will be examined.

I sincerely appreciate your support and involvement in this research project. If you would like to receive a summary of the actual results of this study, please fill out the "Request for outcome information" form and deposit your request in the ballot-type box as you leave today. If you want to contact me about this research, you can leave a message for me at

474-9338 (General Office, Psychology), or at my own office (110 Fletcher Argue).

You may also wish to use one of the confidential telephone counseling services available, free, to anyone in Winnipeg. I recommend either of the following services:

KLINIC Community Health Centre, offers peer crisis counseling
24 hours a day at:

786-8686 (Crisis counseling)

or

774-4525 (Sexual assault counseling).

Manitoba Committee on Wife Abuse (M.C.W.A.), offers peer crisis
counseling, 24 hours a day, for battered women at:

942-3052 (Crisis counseling).

Again, thank you for your assistance in this study.

Pat Rycroft, graduate student,
Department of Psychology,
University of Manitoba,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Appendix E: Summary of Abbreviations in Text

AP = Adulthood Physical abusive victimization by a partner

AS = Adulthood Sexual abusive victimization by a partner

AWS = Attitudes Towards Women Scale (Traditional Ideology variable)

BSI* = Brief Symptom Inventory + Dissociation scale
(Symptomatology variable)

CFP = Childhood Physical abusive victimization by a Family member

CFS = Childhood Sexual abusive victimization by a Family member

CPP = Childhood Physical abusive victimization by a Parent

CPS = Childhood Sexual abusive victimization by a Parent

CTS = Conflict Tactics Scale

DOCTOR = seeking help from a doctor/physician

Family member = biological parent, step parent, foster parent,
boy/girlfriend of parent, grandparent,
aunt/uncle, sibling, or cousin

FEM = Attitudes towards feminism scale

FRIEND = seeking help from a friend

G = Gender of participant

Parent = biological parent, step parent, or foster parent

PP = childhood witnessing Parental Physical abuse

PS = childhood witnessing Parental Sexual abuse

RELIGION = seeking help from a priest/minister

REPA = Revictimization; childhood witnessing of Parental abuse,
as well as Adulthood abuse by a partner

RECPA = Revictimization; Childhood abuse by a Parent, as well
as Adulthood abuse by a partner

REPHYF = Revictimization; childhood witnessing parental Physical
abuse and/or being Physically abused by a Family member,
as well as adulthood Physical abuse by a partner

RESEXF = Revictimization; childhood witnessing parental Sexual
abuse and/or being Sexually abused by a Family member,
as well as adulthood Sexual abuse by a partner

REPHYF = Revictimization; childhood witnessing parental Physical
abuse and/or being Physically abused by a Parent, as
well as adulthood Physical abuse by a partner

RESEXP = Revictimization; childhood witnessing parental Sexual
abuse and/or being Sexually abused by a Parent, as
well as adulthood Sexual abuse by a partner

THERAPY = seeking help from a psychiatrist, psychologist, social
worker, and/or counselor

WAPSTAY = whether or not a Woman in Adulthood who had been Physically
abused by a partner had Stayed in that relationship, or the
abuse had stopped

WASSTAY = whether or not a Woman in Adulthood who had been Sexually
abused by a partner had Stayed in that relationship, or
the abuse had stopped

WASTAY = WAPSTAY and/or WASSTAY