

#7 The combined and independent impact of witnessed intimate partner violence and child maltreatment.

Kathleen Watson MacDonell

Full article available in *Partner Abuse*, Volume 3, Issue 3, 2012.

(Article available for free at: <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/springer/pa>)

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a pervasive issue, generating startling facts regarding its detrimental societal effects. Children and adolescents have been referred to as the ‘invisible victims’ or the ‘unintended victims’ with respect to their exposure to intimate partner violence. There is also considerable overlap between witnessing IPV and experiencing childhood maltreatment, with statistics showing 30 to 60% of IPV perpetrators also abuse children within the household. Due to the vast research base exploring the effects of youth exposure to IPV and/or maltreatment, the Partner Abuse State of the Knowledge (PASK) project strives to summarize and catalog all relevant literature. As part of this project, the current paper reviews what is known about the short and long-term impact of witnessing IPV as well as a review of the literature reporting the unique impact of experiencing both IPV and maltreatment compared to witnessing IPV only.

Seventy-three articles were included in the present review; all dissertations, book chapters, or articles not published in peer review journals were excluded. To be included, articles had to contain data; therefore, no theoretical papers were reviewed. Outcomes related to either witnessing IPV or experiencing childhood maltreatment and witnessing IPV had to be reported in order for the article to be reviewed. Each article was summarized in a table format into six subtopics. Articles that reported outcomes specific to multiple subtopics were listed in each corresponding table; however, entries only include relevant outcomes.

In Table 1, Impact of Witnessing Mutual Physical IPV on Children and Adolescents, the research reviewed overwhelmingly suggests that children and adolescents exposed to mutual IPV are at risk for a wide range of detrimental outcomes. Negative consequences were reported in both the internalizing and externalizing domains of functioning, on health and cognitive outcomes as well as on youth’s relationships with family, peers and romantic partners. As seen in Table 2, Impact of Witnessing Mutual Physical IPV in Adulthood, these negative impacts of

witnessing mutual IPV in childhood and adolescence have also been found to persist into adulthood. However, none of the reviewed studies explored the impact on health or intellectual outcomes in adulthood and as these outcomes were found in youth exposed to IPV, it is of interest to the field to assess whether these deficits are maintained long-term.

Few articles to date have explored the effect of perpetrator gender on exposure outcomes; however, articles that did find interesting differences. There are clear indications that outcomes can differ depending on the gender of the perpetrator as well as the gender of the witness. Worse outcomes were found in youth exposed to male perpetrated IPV (see Table 3, Impact of Witnessing Male Perpetrated IPV) in internalizing and externalizing behavioral domains as well as regarding the use of aggression against family members and dating partners, compared to youth not exposed to violence. In adulthood, dating violence was reported at greater rates in females exposed in youth and higher rates of substance abuse were reported in exposed males and females. Outcomes related to exposure to female perpetrated IPV (see Table 4, Impact of Witnessing Female Perpetrated Physical IPV) were only reported within childhood and adolescence in the articles reviewed. Again, higher rates of aggression towards peers, family members and dating partners were consistently reported in exposed youth, compared to non-exposed youth.

Children, when exposed to both IPV and childhood maltreatment have been described as being dealt a 'double whammy', as they are exposed to two forms of family violence, each individually found to result in significant negative outcomes both in the short and long-term. Overall, there are mixed results as to whether there are significant additive effects of witnessing IPV and child maltreatment compared to witnessing IPV only (see Table 5, The Impact of Exposure to IPV and Child Maltreatment in Childhood and Adolescence). With some studies finding more negative outcomes for 'double whammy' youth and others concluding that additive effects do not exist. Compared to youth outcomes, less is known about the long-term impact of experiencing both childhood maltreatment and witnessing IPV on adult functioning (See Table 6, The Impact of Exposure to IPV and Child Maltreatment in Adulthood). It was consistently reported that witnessing IPV was significantly associated with negative outcomes related to adjustment (i.e. depression and trauma symptoms) in adulthood, however, it was experiencing child abuse, specifically that was found to contribute to the intergenerational transmission of family violence.

Implications for intervention and policy include increased funding to programs that support parents leaving violent relationships, specifically to provide more intensive counseling for youth witnesses, as well as resources to help the parent get back on their feet. Also, it is suggested that similar supports be made available for fathers leaving violent situations with their children, as these do not exist. Prevention is imperative, as clear negative implications are related to exposure to family violence. The implementation of evidence-based programs aimed at reducing or preventing behavioral problems in children may aid in reducing familial violence as reductions in child maltreatment have been found as positive outcomes related to this programs and although it hasn't been assessed, may reduce IPV as well.

Recommendations for future research include the continued use of the Child Behavioral Checklist/Youth Self Report as well as the Conflict Tactics Scale, as both were utilized very consistently across the literature allowing easy comparison across studies. Secondly, future research should focus on samples that are more representative of the general population as a heavy reliance on sampling from, for example battered women's shelters, might lead to an over-representation of families of lower socio-economic status being assessed. Lastly, as with most research the reviewed literature primarily used cross-sectional designs. More emphasis on longitudinal designs is needed as cross-sectional designs fail to provide a comprehensive picture of the impact of experiencing family violence, especially with regards to these effects in adulthood.

About the Author

Katie Watson MacDonell, M.A. completed her undergraduate degree in Psychology at the University of Guelph with a minor in Criminal Justice and Public Policy. She went on to complete her Master's degree in Forensic Psychology at John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Currently, she is working as a research assistant at Simon Fraser University with Dr. Robert McMahon and Dr. Marlene Moretti.

Contact:

Katie.watsonmacdonell@gmail.com

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
Rosenbaum, A., & O’Leary, K.D. (1981). Children: the unintended victims of marital violence. <i>Journal of Orthopsychiatry</i> , 51(4), 692-699.	52 women & children	~ Violence group: average age- 33.01 years; married an avg. of 11.69 years; avg. of 2.63 children; ~ 2 comparison groups- 1) Satisfactory Marriage: avg. age- 37.8, married for avg. of 14.75 years; had avg. of 2.89 children; 2) Non-violent/ Discordant: avg. age of 35.10 years; married avg. of 13.55 years; had avg. of 2.67 children.	~Cross-sectional; maternal report ~ Self-referred victims of physical marital violence to the Victims Information Bureau of Suffolk County (VIBS), NY between November 1977 and December 1978 ~ 2 comparison groups – 1) 20 women selected at random from a Cole’s telephone directory of Suffolk County; considered satisfactorily married couples; 2) 20 women- non-violent, discordant couples; recruited from taking part in marital therapy either at SUNY Stony Brook or a Suffolk County community mental health center.	~ All groups did not differ significantly on behavior problem scores (assessed using the Peterson-Quay Behavior Problem Checklist); on the factors of Conduct Disorder and Personality disorder-children from spouse-abusive couples were the most deviant (however, not significant). ~ Almost 26% of the witness group fell into the clinical range for conduct disorder and 29% fell within the normal range; 11% of the satisfactory group children scored within the clinical range, and 67% in the normal range; non-violent couples children were 23% clinical range, 39% normal range.
Wolfe, D.A., Jaffee, P., Wilson, S.K., & Zak, L. (1985). Children of battered women:	142 mothers; 198 children	~ Children ranged in age from 4 to 16 years of age ~ Violent Families: Mean child age of 8.9 years; 55 males, 47	~ Cross-sectional; maternal report ~ 102 children recruited from shelters for abused women and their children; 96 were from the	~ Significantly more children from the violent families fell into the high range on child behavior problems (assessed using the CBCL); broken down by gender, it was significant for males and not for females. ~ Child adjustment problems within the

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>The relation of child behavior to family violence and maternal stress. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>, 53(5), 657-665.</p>		<p>females; Household income of \$14,148; 58 came from intact, 26 from reconstituted, and 18 from single parent homes. ~ Non-violent families: Mean child age of 8.4 years; 43 males, 53 females; Household incomes of \$12,642; 39 came from intact, 24 from reconstituted, and 33 from single parent homes.</p>	<p>community through newspaper ads ~ Children grouped into violent or non-violent families based on the Conflict Tactics Scale</p>	<p>clinical range for children in violent homes was 26.5% (34% for males; 20% for females); a rate 2.5 times greater than children from non-violent homes ~ Child behavior problems and social competence (assessed using the CBCL) were predicted to be a function of the degree of family violence and maternal stress (defined as a combination of reports on the General Health Questionnaire and Life Experiences Survey) ~ Overall, significant prevalence of behavior problems and diminished social competence reported by mothers of children who have witnessed family violence ~ 26.5% of children fell within the clinical range, with scores more elevated for males than females. ~ Among children exposed to domestic violence, those reported as showing clinical-range problems were more likely to have been exposed to a higher frequency of violence</p>
<p>Wolfe, D.A., Zak, L., Wilson, S., & Jaffee, P. (1986). Child witnesses to violence between parents:</p>	<p>63 mother/child dyads</p>	<p>~ Children ranged in age from 4-13 years of age ~ Three groups: Former Shelter Residents; Current Shelter Residents; Non-violent Controls</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal report ~ Recruited from 6 battered women's shelters in the province of Ontario, or through their continued individual or group</p>	<p>~ Children recently exposed to family violence (assessed using the CTS) were reported as having fewer interests, fewer social activities, and lower school performance, but were not reported as showing significantly more behavior problems overall, in comparison to children</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Critical issues in behavioral and social adjustment. <i>Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology</i>, 14(1), 95-104.</p>		<p>~ Former Residents- 15 boys, 8 girls; mean age of 8.39; # of children in family- 3.52 ~ Current Residents- 7 boys; 10 girls; mean age of 8.00; # of children in family- 2.35 ~ Control- 13 boys; 10 girls; mean age of 8.91</p>	<p>involvement with the shelters; control group recruited through newspaper advertisements ~ Former residents had to have been exposed to DV within the past 6 months; Current Residents had to have been exposed within the past 6 weeks ~ Comparison group: children who had never been exposed to family violence; solicited from newspaper ads.</p>	<p>from non-violent families (all child adjustment outcomes assessed using the CBCL). ~ Significant main effects for group were obtained for the measures of child social competence (CBCL); family disadvantage (assessed based on 7 sociodemographic variables); and maternal health (assessed using the General Health Questionnaire) ~ Children in the current resident groups had the lowest reported social confidence rating. ~ All three groups differed from each other on the index of family disadvantage, with the former residents having the highest disadvantage rating.</p>
<p>Hughes, H.M. (1988). Psychological and behavioral correlates of family violence in children witnesses and victims. <i>Journal of Orthopsychiatry</i>, 58(1), 77-90.</p>	<p>178 children</p>	<p>~ All children between the ages of 3 and 12 years of age; 42 boys; 55 girls; ~ Witness Group (n=40): mother Mean age of 29.7 years; income under 12,000/yr- 68%; mother not completed high school- 50%; mother employed- 41%. ~ Abused/Witness Group (n=55): mother Mean age of 30.6 years;</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal and child report ~ Witness group and Abused/Witness group recruited from local battered Women shelter; comparison group recruited through local media (radio, newspaper, television) ~ Mothers had to be currently living with a partner.</p>	<p>~ Witnessing DV was assessed using the CTS (maternal report only) ~ Witness-only children had higher or lower scores than the comparison children, however, they were only significantly different from the comparison group on Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale and the self-esteem test for young school-age children (Piers Young Children's Self-Concept Scale) ~ Witness-only group had significantly higher anxiety scores (assessed using the Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale) and significantly lower self-esteem scores than the comparison group, however the</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
		income under 12,000/yr-74%; mother not completed high school-62%; mother employed-31%. ~ Comparison Group (n=83): mother Mean age of 28.9 years; income under 12,000/yr-40%; mother not completed high school-13%; mother employed-51%		witness-only group did not differ significantly on either outcome compared to the abused/witness group. ~ No significant differences between groups on depression scores (assessed using the CDI)
Carlson, B.E. (1990). Adolescent observers of marital violence. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> , 5(4), 285-299.	101 adolescents	~ Respondents ranged in age from 13 to 18 years, mean age of 15.41 years; 55% were male; 76% were White, 15% were Black, 9% from Other Ethnicities ~Majority came from low-income backgrounds, fewer than half lived most their lives with both biological parents; 68% were placed after interviews in foster homes or residential settings	~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Respondents recruited from 4 residential treatment agencies and 1 runaway youth shelter ~ Assessed using open and closed ended questions for all constructs (no standardized measures used)	~ Witnessing violence between parents was unrelated to the frequency of being sad and unhappy for both males and females. ~ reporting self injurious thoughts was highly and significantly related to having witnessed violence between their parents ~ A trend was found for respondents exposed to marital violence, as they were more likely to run away compared to youth who did not witness marital violence; when split by gender, this finding only holds up for males. ~ Males who witnessed parental violence were more than twice as likely to hit their mothers than males who had not witnessed marital violence; half of male observers versus one-fourth of non-observers had hit

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
				<p>their fathers. ~ For females, 1/3 of observers of marital violence say they had hit their fathers compared to only 16% of non-observing females ~ For both males and females, observing marital violence was not related to the approval of dating violence.</p>
<p>Suh, E.K. & Abel, E.M. (1990). The impact of spousal violence on the children of the abused. <i>Journal of Independent Social Work</i>, 4(4), 27-34.</p>	<p>258 children</p>	<p>~ 44% of children were offspring of both the victim and abuser; 26% of children were offspring of solely the mother</p>	<p>~ Review of case files of women with children who had sought refuge at a shelter for battered women in Orlando Florida from 1976 to 1986. ~ All data (exposure to DV and outcome variables) taken from shelter intake questionnaire</p>	<p>~ Behavioral problems: 44.5% of shelter children physically fought with each other; 47.8% of children physically with others; 33.7% physically fought with their mothers and/or father. ~ Children living in households characterized by domestic violence were likely to be abusive towards their brothers/sisters; however not more likely to hit others outside their families or their parents.</p>
<p>Carlson, B.E. (1991). Outcomes of physical abuse and observation of marital violence among adolescents in placement. <i>Journal of</i></p>	<p>101 adolescents</p>	<p>~ 55 males; 46 females ~ Ranged in age from 13 to 18 years; mean age of 15.41 years. ~ 76% White; 15% Black; 9% of Other ethnicities. ~ Most came from low-income, multi-problem families; 50% had been</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Recruited from residential treatment agencies (n= 59) and one runaway shelter (n=42)</p>	<p>~ All outcome variables assessed using open and closed ended questions. ~ Sense of well-being was found to be significantly lower among subjects who have both been abused and witnessed abuse, compared to those who have experienced either abuse only, witnessed IPV only or none at all. ~ Approval of violence, use of violence, substance abuse and frequency of running</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<i>Interpersonal Violence</i> , 6(4), 526-534.		placed in care before; fewer than half grew up with both biological parents.		away were unaffected by physical abuse, witnessing marital violence, or exposure to both IPV and abuse; although not significant, scores were in the predicted direction.
Sternberg, K.J., Lamb, M.E., Greenbaum, C., Cicchetti, D., Dawud, S., Cortes, R.M., Krispin, O. & Lorey, F. (1993). Effects of domestic violence on children's behavior problems and depression. <i>Developmental Psychology</i> , 29(1), 44-52.	110 families	~ 61 male and 49 female 8-12 year olds ~ lower class, two parent families of Jewish origin ~ 75% had parents born in Middle Eastern and North African countries. ~ parents had average of 9.4 years of formal education ~ all children lived with both biological parents, average of three siblings ~ 4 groups: Child Abuse (n=33; 18boys; 15 girls); Spouse Abuse (n=16, 8 boys; 8 girls); Abused Witnesses (n=30; 21 boys; 9 girls); Comparison (n=31; 14 boys; 17 girls)	~ Cross-sectional; parent and child report ~ Recruited through social workers from the Department of Family Services in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, Israel ~ Domestic violence assessed as at least one incident in the past 6 months according to social workers involved in case ~ 4 groups: Child abuse-experienced physical abuse by one or both parents; Spouse Abuse-witnessed physical violence between their parents; Abused Witnesses-both witnessed and been physically abused by one or both parents; Comparison-neither abused or witnessed	~ Children in the abused witness, child and spouse abuse groups had significantly higher depression scores on the Childhood Depression Index (CDI) than children in the comparison group; mean scores of children in the three domestic violence groups did not differ significantly from each other ~ Females in the child abuse and spouse abuse groups reported more externalizing behavior problems (assessed using the YSR) than did boys whereas girls in the abused witness and comparison groups reported fewer externalizing behavior problems than did boys ~ Children in the domestic violence group had more externalizing behavior problems (assessed using the YSR) than children in the comparison group; girls within this group had more problems than boys while girls in the comparison group had fewer problems than boys ~ Mothers of children in the spouse only and abuse witness groups reported more externalizing behavior problems (assessed using the CBCL) than did mothers of children in the comparison group

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>O'Keefe, M. (1994). Linking marital violence, mother-child/father-child aggression and child behavior problems. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 9(1), 63-78.</p>	<p>185 children</p>	<p>~ Children range in age from 7 to 13 years; Mean age of 9.5 years ~ 49% female; 42% Caucasian, 37% Hispanic, 21% Black. ~ 85% from low socioeconomic backgrounds ~ 98% of mothers were biological mothers; 59% of mother's spouse/partners were biological father of child/children</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; parental report ~ Recruited from families temporarily living in battered women's shelters from both urban and rural areas ~ All children had witnessed at least one incident of interparental physical aggression during previous 12 months.</p>	<p>~ The relationship between amount of marital violence witnessed (assessed using the CTS) was significantly related to both internalizing and externalizing behavior scores (assessed using the CBCL) even when controlling for age, race, father status, and other familial aggression. ~ Race was significantly related to externalizing behavior problems with Caucasian's scoring higher on externalizing scale than Black children; Also Caucasian males scored higher on the externalizing scale than Black males ~ The amount of violence witnessed by both males and females was significantly related to internalizing and externalizing behavior problem scores (assessed using the CBCL).</p>
<p>O'Keefe, M. (1995). Predictors of child abuse in martially violent families. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 10(3), 3-25.</p>	<p>184 children; 120 families</p>	<p>~ Children ranged in age from 7 to 13 years; Mean age of 9.5 years ~ 51% were male; 49% female ~ 37% were Hispanic; 21% African American; 42% Caucasian ~ 85% came from low socioeconomic backgrounds</p>	<p>~Cross-sectional; maternal and child report ~ Recruited from battered women's shelters</p>	<p>~ Children exposed to marital violence (assessed using the CTS) are at increased risk for both internalizing and externalizing behavioral problems (assessed using the CBCL)</p>
<p>Kolbo, J.R. (1996). Risk and</p>	<p>60 children</p>	<p>~ 30 boys; 30 girls ~ 70% of the sample</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; parental and child report</p>	<p>~ Exposure to violence (assessed using the CTS) was negatively correlated with</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>resilience among children exposed to family violence. <i>Violence and Victims, 11(2), 113-128.</i></p>		<p>were Caucasian; Ranged in age from 8 to 11 years of age; ~ 46.7% had moved into a domestic abuse shelter, in with a friend, or into a new residence as a result of violence ~ 30% living with parents, 70% of children's parents were either single, separated, widowed, or divorced; 58% of parents participating were females; 65% of parents' incomes were less than \$15,000; 20% had income between \$15,000 and \$30,000</p>	<p>~ Participants referred to non-shelter agencies providing education, supportive therapy and self-help groups in Minneapolis and Minnesota</p>	<p>children's reports of self-worth (assessed using the Self-Perception Profile for Children) and positively correlated with parents' reports of children's behavior problems (assessed using the CBCL) ~ Support (assessed using the Supportive Relationship Questionnaire-child report) was negatively correlated with behavior problems and positively correlated with self-worth ~ IQ (assessed using the Wechsler Intelligence Scale) was negatively correlated with behavioral problems, and positively correlated with self-worth. ~ When split for gender the relationship between exposure to violence and behavioral problems is strong for girls, but there is no correlation between exposure and behavioral problems for boys</p>
<p>Kolbo, J.R., Blakely, E.H., & Engleman, D. (1996). Children who witness domestic violence: A review of empirical literature.</p>	<p>Literature Review</p>			<p>~ Children who witness DV are at risk for maladaptation in one or more of the following domains- behavioral, emotional, social, cognitive, and physical. ~ The wide range of findings reported over the years has lead to a growing conclusion that a linear social learning model is not adequate. As a result, researchers have recently focused more attention on mediating variables such as frequency of DV, duration</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11(2), 281-293.</i>				of exposure and severity of violence witnessed.
Fantuzzo, J.W., & Mohr, W.K. (1999). Prevalence and effects of child exposure to domestic violence. <i>Domestic Violence and Children, 9(3), 21-32.</i>	Literature Review			<p>~ More externalizing and internalizing behaviors are seen in children exposed to DV than children from non-violent homes; exposed children tend to be more aggressive and to exhibit behavior problems in school and communities ranging from temper tantrums to fights, internalizing problems include depression, suicidal behaviors, anxiety, fears, phobias, insomnia, tics, bed-wetting, and low self-esteem.</p> <p>~ Findings are less clear regarding social development with some studies finding a marked difference between those from violent homes and those not, whereas other studies do not find a difference.</p> <p>~ Literature is mixed as to whether gender mediates the effects of exposure to DV; some studies have found no differences, while others found that boys were more severely and negatively affected than girls.</p>
Edelson, J.L. (1999). Children's Witnessing of Adult Domestic Violence.	31 articles reviewed		<p>~ Literature Review</p> <p>~ Studies included only explored physical conflict and separated out children who had experienced abuse as well as</p>	~ Children who witnessed DV have been found to exhibit more aggressive and antisocial as well as fearful and inhibited behaviors; have lower social competence; show more anxiety, depression, trauma symptoms and temperament problems than

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14(8), 839-870.</i>			witnessing DV	<p>non-witnesses.</p> <p>~ Few studies have reported finding no differences between witnesses and non-witnesses.</p> <p>~ Effect of witnessing DV on cognitive functioning and attitudes have been mixed with some studies finding no differences between academic ability and others finding that witnesses have lower cognitive functioning.</p> <p>~ Witnessing DV has been linked to an increase in attitudes a child has concerning the use of violence as a form of conflict resolution; they may establish attitudes that support their own use of violence.</p>
<p>Jankowski, M.K., Leitenberg, H., Henning, K., & Coffey, P. (1999). Intergenerational transmission of dating aggression as a function of witnessing only same sex parents vs. opposite sex parents vs. both</p>	1342 undergraduates	<p>~ 846 women and 496 men</p> <p>~ respondents had to have had at least one dating relationship since age of 16</p> <p>~ Mean age of the sample was 18.8 years (SD=1.9); 71% in first year of college, 19% were sophomores, 6% juniors, 3% seniors, and 1% nontraditional students</p> <p>~ Average Hollingshead</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report</p> <p>~ Retrospective reporting of exposure to parental IPV</p> <p>~ Recruited from introductory psychology class at the University of Vermont.</p>	<p>~ The Conflict Tactics Scale was used to assess exposure to parental IPV and current IPV in dating relationships.</p> <p>~ 13.9% reported witnessing at least one conflict between their parents involving physical aggression before the age of 16</p> <p>~ 17.2% of respondents reported having perpetrated dating aggression in their own relationships.</p> <p>~ 28.95% of respondents who reported witnessing mutual parental violence also reported perpetrating dating violence in their own relationship; 31.58% of respondents who reported witnessing mutual parental violence also reported being victimized by</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>parents as perpetrators of domestic violence. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 14(3), 267-279.</i></p>		<p>SES of 4.2 (SD=.81). ~ 95% Caucasian</p>		<p>dating violence in their own relationships. ~ Odds of perpetrating dating aggression nearly doubled for those who had witnessed both parents engage in marital aggression (odds ratio = 1.96). ~ The odds of being victimized by dating aggression by one's dating partner increased more than twofold if the respondent witnessed both parents engage in physical conflict against each other (odds ratio = 2.21).</p>
<p>Jouriles, E.N., Spiller, L.C., Stephens, N., McDonald, R., & Swank, P. (2000). Variability in adjustment of children of battered women: The role of child appraisals of interparent conflict. <i>Cognitive Therapy and Research, 24(2), 233-249.</i></p>	<p>154 mother/child dyads</p>	<p>~ Families had at least one child between 8 and 12 years of age ~ Children: 71 girls, 83 boys; girls mean age of 9.6 years; boys mean age of 9.3 years. ~ Mothers: 40% Caucasian, 32% African American, 27% Hispanic, 1% other ethnicity; Mean age of 33 years; 25% were cohabitating, 8% were unmarried and not residing with batterer; mothers had a mean of 11.3 years of education; and mean family income</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal and child report ~ Sample recruited from battered women's shelters ~ No comparison group</p>	<p>~ Witnessing domestic violence was assessed using the CTS. ~ 47% of the children had clinical levels of externalizing problems, 53% had clinical levels of internalizing problems (assessed using the CBCL and YSR). ~ 16% of children were in the clinical range on the CDI and 23% were in the clinical range on the Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS). ~ Self-blame (assessed using the Self-blame subscale of the Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale (CPIC) and the Self-Blame Subscale of the Children's Beliefs about Parental Separation Scale (CBAPS)) correlated positively with CBCL externalizing problems. ~ Threat and fear of abandonment (assessed using the Threat subscale of the CPIC and</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
		of \$20,000;		modified version of the Fear of Abandonment subscale of the CBAPS) were correlated positively with RCMAS and the CDI scores.
<p>Carlson, B.E. (2000). Children exposed to intimate partner violence: Research findings and implications for intervention. <i>Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 1</i>(4), 321-342.</p>	Literature Review			<p>~ Some children exposed to DV do not seem to manifest adverse reactions, and no pattern of immediate or short-term effects to exposure has been found; some immediate reactions found include emotional distress, anger, fear, anxiety and a desire to intervene</p> <p>~ Short-term effects of witnessing DV include externalizing behavior problems (i.e. aggression & conduct problems) and internalizing problems (i.e. anxiety, depression and social issues)</p> <p>~ There is a lack of longitudinal studies and the limited results available report the possibility of long-term adjustment problems such as depression, reduced self-esteem, and violence towards their dating partners.</p> <p>~ Moderating factors in children's responses to witnessing DV include the nature of the violence (e.g. frequency and severity); and child's age and gender; exposure to other forms of maltreatment (i.e. sexual abuse); presence of protective factors (i.e. social support) that may buffer the negative effects of witnessing DV</p> <p>~ Mediating factors that may help explain why exposure is harmful include disrupted</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Marks, C.R., Glaser, B.A., Glass, J.B., Horne, A.M. (2001). Effects of witnessing severe marital discord on children's social competence and behavioral problems. <i>The Family Journal</i>, 9(2), 94-101.</p>	<p>23 mother-child dyads</p>	<p>~ 78% of sample were African American; 81% make less than \$20,000 per year ~ Children: 13 males, 10 females; mean age of 5 years</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; parent report ~ Recruited from 4 shelters for abused women and one legal advocacy program servicing this population ~ All results compared to CBCL normative data</p>	<p>parenting, type of coping strategies used by children, and development of posttraumatic stress reactions (i.e. psychological arousal)</p> <p>~ The witnessing group (assessed using the CTS) had significantly lower levels of social competence and significantly higher levels of behavioral problems and externalizing behavior than the normative sample ~ No significant differences were found between the groups on internalizing behaviors ~ No significant correlations were found between the amount of husband-to-wife violence or total violence and children's social competence, total behavior problems, or internalizing problems ~ Children who witnessed marital violence were significantly different from the normative sample in terms of social competence and behavioral problems.</p>
<p>Huth-Bocks, A.C., Levendosky, A.A., & Semel, M.A. (2001). The direct and indirect effects of domestic violence on young children's</p>	<p>100 mother-child dyads</p>	<p>~ Children ranged from 3.0-5.9 years; Mean age of 4.4 years; 43% were African American, 24% Biracial, 21% Caucasian, 11% Hispanic/ Latino, and 1% Asian. ~ Mothers ranged in age from 19 to 46; Mean age</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal report ~ Participants recruited with flyers placed at local Head Start pre-schools, Family Independence agencies, local domestic shelters and community postings in a Midwestern city</p>	<p>~ Current domestic violence (assessed using the Severity of Violence against Women scales) had a direct effect on children's verbal abilities (assessed using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised(PPVT-R)), while having not apparent direct effect on visual-spatial abilities (assessed using the Wechsler Preschool-Primary Scale-Revised(WPPSI-R)) ~ Domestic violence was not significantly</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
intellectual functioning. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> , 16(3), 269-290.		of 27.9 years; Avg. monthly income of \$1320; 42% of mothers were single, 25% married; 13% divorced, 10% separated and 10% cohabiting; 41% had graduated high school, 57% had graduated college		related to the home environment, and was also not directly related to PPVT-R scores or WPPSI-R scores.
Yexley, M., Borowsky, I., & Ireland, M. (2002). Correlation between different experiences of intrafamilial physical violence and violent adolescent behavior. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 17, 707-720.	21,249 high school students	~ Respondents ranged in age from 11 to 20 years; mean age of 14.3 years ~ 37.2% from grade 6; 36% from grade 9; 26.9% from grade 12 ~ 65% of the sample lived with both biological parents; 83% were White, 1% American Indian, 4% Black; 2% Mexican/Latin American, 5% Pacific Islander/Asian American	~ Cross-sectional data obtained from the longitudinal 1998 Minnesota Student Survey; anonymous questionnaire administered in public schools every 3 years since 1989 ~ Self-report; all outcomes and IPV questions assessed with closed ended questions; no standardized measures used.	~ Those reporting they witnessed marital violence were significantly more likely to report 'ever attempting suicide', 'fighting in the last 12 months' and 'carried a gun to school in the last 30 days' than respondents who did not witness IPV.
Mahoney, A., Donnelly, W.O.,	232 adolescen	~ Dual parent families ~Children: Mean age:	~ Cross-sectional; maternal and adolescent	~ Conflict tactics scale was used to assess exposure to parental domestic violence

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Boxer, P., & Lewis, T. (2003). Marital and severe parent-to-adolescent physical aggression in clinic referred families: Mother and adolescent reports on co-occurrence and links to child behavior problems. <i>Journal of family Psychology</i>, 17(1), 3-19.</p>	<p>ts</p>	<p>14.1, ranged from 11 to 18 years of age; 53% male, 90% Caucasian ~ Mother: mean age 38.2; 76% of mothers were married; 24% unmarried/cohabiting ~ 24% of household income in \$24,000-\$36,000 range; 29% between \$36,000 and \$60,000; 10% in \$60,000+ range ~ 83% of mothers were biological parents of adolescent respondent; 7% were the step-mother</p>	<p>report ~Recruited from families participating in diagnostic assessment service at a nonprofit, private, community mental health center for youths in the Midwest. ~ Conflict Tactics Scale assessed parental physical aggression; Parent-Child CTS assessed parent-child sever physical aggression</p>	<p>~ Adolescent reports of mother to father and father to mother physical aggression were consistently tied to both maternal and youth reports of greater externalizing problems (assessed using the CBCL and YSR) ~ Mothers' reports of their own use of marital physical aggression were related only to their own perception of more externalizing problems but not the youth reports of disruptive behavior</p>
<p>Kitzmann, K.M., Gaylord, N.K., Holt, A.R., & Kenny, E.D. (2003). Child witnesses to domestic violence: A meta-analytic review. <i>Journal</i></p>	<p>118 studies reviewed</p>		<p>~ Meta-analysis</p>	<p>~ Correlational studies showed a significant association between exposure to DV and child problems ~ Group comparison studies showed that witnesses had significantly worse outcomes compared to non-witnesses and those from verbally aggressive homes; however, witnesses were not significantly different from physically abused children or physically abused witnesses</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p><i>of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71(2), 339-352.</i></p>				<p>~ 63% of child witnesses were found to fare much worse than the average child; however, that means 37% of child witnesses showed outcomes that were similar to, or better than non-witnesses</p> <p>~ Effects of witnessing inter-parental violence may be even greater than the effects of witnessing other forms of destructive conflict</p> <p>~ Current analysis provides robust evidence that exposure to inter-parental aggression is associated with significant disruptions in children's psychosocial functioning, at least in the short term.</p>
<p>McFarlane, J.M., Groff, J.Y., O'Brien, J.A., & Watson, K. (2003). Behaviors of children who are exposed and not exposed to intimate partner violence: An analysis of 330 Black, White and Hispanic children. <i>Pediatrics,</i></p>	<p>330 children</p>	<p>~ Exposed to DV group <i>n</i>=258; comparison group <i>n</i>=72</p> <p>~ Mothers ranged in age from 18 to 44;</p> <p>~ 45.2% had annual household income less than \$10,000</p> <p>~ Children: 53.6 were female, 46.4% male; 68.9% Hispanic, 23.2% Black, 6.7% White and 1.2% Asian</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal report</p> <p>~ Data taken from the baseline assessment of a randomized intervention study on effectiveness of abuse treatment services</p> <p>~ Recruited from primary care public health clinics and Women, Infants and Children clinics in a large urban area</p>	<p>~ No significant differences were found for children of abused and non-abused women between ages of 18 months to 5 years old on the internalizing, externalizing and total problem behaviors (assessed using the CBCL).</p> <p>~ Significant group differences were found for the internalizing, externalizing and total behavior problems (assessed using the CBCL) when children from abused and non-abused women between the ages of 6 and 18 years old</p> <p>~ Children of abused mothers had significantly higher internalizing, externalizing and total behavior problem scores than those exhibited by children of</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<i>112(3), 202-207.</i>				non-abused women within the same age range.
Wolfe, D.A., Crooks, C.V., Lee, V., McIntyre-Smith, A., & Jaffee, P.G. (2003). The effect of children's exposure to domestic violence: A meta-analysis and critique. <i>Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 6(3), 171-187.</i>	41 studies reviewed		~ Meta-analysis	~ 40 of the 41 studies had effect sizes indicating that exposure to DV has a negative effect on children and these children experience more difficulties than their peers ~ Developmental stage, gender, and type of outcome assessed were often looked at as moderators. A lack of significant findings with these moderators illustrates a lack of stability in the data, lack of a defined set of negative outcomes after exposure, and a wide variance in how outcomes are measured.
Lichter, E.L. & McCloskey, L.A. (2004). The effects of childhood exposure to marital violence on adolescent gender-beliefs and dating	208 mother-adolescent dyads	~ Children ranged in age from 13-21 years old, mean age 16.7 years; 49% were male ~ Mothers mean age of 32.8 years at Time 1; 53.3% White, 36% Hispanic, 4.7% African American, 5.2% Native American; 53.8% of	~ Longitudinal assessment over 7-9 year span; maternal and adolescent report ~ Recruited from a low-income areas of midsized Southwestern city ~ Mothers who experienced IPV recruited from community and from	~ Exposure to IPV (assessed using the CTS) did not predict dating violence perpetration, however, traditional beliefs about family (assessed by Family Role Scale), gendered dating scripts (Assessed using the Dating Scripts Scale) and acceptance of male-to-female dating violence (assessed using the Attitudes about Dating Index) were significantly associated with dating violence in adolescence.

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>violence. <i>Psychology of Women Quarterly</i>, 28, 344-357.</p>		<p>mothers had completed high school; mean monthly income reported as \$1,479.</p>	<p>battered women's shelters; comparison group recruited from the community.</p>	<p>~ Exposure to marital violence was unrelated to the Family Roles Scale or the Dating Scripts Scale suggesting that growing up in a violent home does not necessarily lead to the development of traditional patriarchal beliefs about male-female relationship roles.</p>
<p>Saltzman, K.M., Holden, G.W. & Holahan, C.J. (2005). The psychobiology of children exposed to marital violence. <i>Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology</i>, 34(1), 129-139.</p>	<p>48 children</p>	<p>~ 2 groups: exposed to marital violence (n=21); clinical comparison group (n=27) ~ Ranged in age from 5 to 13 years of age ~ Exposed group: 15 males, 6 females; mean age of 8.29 years; 11 Hispanics, 8 Caucasians, 2 African Americans ~ Comparison: recruited from families presenting at a local children's mental health center with anxiety, depression and disruptive behavior; 16 males, 11 females mean age 8.52 years; 19 Caucasians, 6 Hispanics, 1 Native American, 1 African American</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal and child report ~ Community sample of children from violent homes; recruited those who had an identified incident or incidents of exposure to marital violence</p>	<p>~ Children exposed to marital violence (assessed using the CTS) had significantly higher total scores on the Trauma Symptom Checklist than controls ~ Heart rate (assessed using a heart rate monitor) was significantly related with exposure to marital violence, with exposed children having higher heart rates both pre- and post-interview ~ No relationship was found between witnessing marital violence and pre-interview systolic blood pressure, pre-interview diastolic blood pressure and post-interview systolic blood pressure, however a significant difference was found between the groups for post-interview diastolic blood pressure, with exposed children having higher rates. ~ Salivary cortisol was significantly related to marital violence exposure, with exposed children having higher levels of cortisol both pre- and post-interview.</p>
<p>Bair-Merritt, M.H.,</p>	<p>22 studies reviewed</p>		<p>~ Systematic review ~ Excluded cases</p>	<p>~ Evidence supports that children exposed to IPV are at risk for under-immunization,</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Blackstone, M., & Feudtner, C. (2006). Physical health outcomes of childhood exposure to intimate partner violence: A systematic review. <i>Pediatrics</i>, 117 (2), 278-290.</p>			<p>involving child abuse</p>	<p>however, evidence is inconclusive regarding exposure to IPV and overall health status and use of health-related services ~ Evidence was insufficient to draw a conclusion on whether exposure to IPV was related to a lower likelihood of breastfeeding, or related to poor weight gain after birth. ~ Evidence supports a link between IPV exposure and adolescent and adult risk-taking behavior</p>
<p>Bauer, N.S., Herrenkohl, T.I., Lozano, P., Rivara, F.P., Hill, K.G., & Hawkins, J.D. (2006). Childhood bullying involvement and exposure to intimate partner violence. <i>Pediatrics</i>, 118 (2), 235-242.</p>	<p>112 children</p>	<p>~ Children ranged in age from 6-13 years; 52.7% female ~ Parent characteristics: 78.6% female; mean age of 27 years 34.8% White; 44.6% Black; 50% were single/never married; 56% reported household income of less than \$31,000/year; 31.6% were enrolled in welfare programs (i.e. TANF)</p>	<p>~ Longitudinal data; parent and child report ~ Community based sample from Seattle Washington ~ Data from two closely related longitudinal studies (Seattle Social Development Project (SSDP; parents/G2) & SSDP Intergenerational Study (children/G3).</p>	<p>~ Association of IPV exposure (assessed using maternal report on the CTS) with externalizing behaviors revealed a relative risk of 5.2; with internalizing problems a relative risk of 1.2; a relative risk of 1.6 for attention problems and a relative risk of 1.9 for social problems (all childhood outcomes assessed using the CBCL) ~ A statistically significant association was found between IPV and child's externalizing behaviors, internalizing problems and attention problems. ~ Risk for child bullying and bullying victimization (assessed using the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire) was increased in those who were exposed to IPV.</p>
<p>Sternberg, K.J., Baradaran, L.P.,</p>	<p>1870 children</p>	<p>~ Children ranged in age from 4 to 14 years of</p>	<p>~ Mega-analysis of data from 15 different studies</p>	<p>~ The number of children in the clinical range was significantly greater than expected</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Abbott, C.B., Lamb, M.E, & Guterman, E. (2006). Type of violence, age, and gender differences in the effects of family violence on children's behavior problems: A mega-analysis. <i>Developmental Review, 26</i>, 89-122.</p>		<p>age ~ 986 males; 884 females ~ Sample largely comprised of lower to middle class families ~ 53% were from two-parent families; 23% from single parent families; missing data for 24% ~ 30% of mothers had less than a high school education, 27% graduate from high school, 17% had education beyond high school ~ 47% were White; 34% were non-white; missing data for 19%</p>	<p>conducted within North America utilizing the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL). ~ All assessments of violence made based on Child Protective Services records or through family member reports utilizing the CTS</p>	<p>in the abused-witness group and significantly lower than expected in the no-violence comparison group ~ Witnesses were at greater risk than victims of having both externalizing and internalizing problems within the clinical range, however these differences were not significant ~ The older age groups (7-9 year olds; 10-14 year olds) were significantly more likely to have clinical range internalizing and externalizing scores. ~ No significant differences were found between the genders ~ Victims and witnesses did not differ significantly at any age, indicating that children experiencing either form of violence were similarly likely to have externalizing problems in the clinical range. ~ Comparisons of the three family violence groups to the no-violence group revealed that witnesses and abused-witnesses were at significantly greater risk of clinical-level internalizing problems than the no-violence group</p>
<p>Bogat, G.A., DeJonghe, D., Levendosky, A.A., Davidson, W.S., & von</p>	<p>48 mother-infant pairs</p>	<p>~ Mothers: 66.7% Caucasian; 20.8% African American; 2.1% Latina; 2.1% Native American and</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional sub-sample of the Mother-Infant Study in Michigan including mothers who reported experiencing IPV</p>	<p>~ Mothers indicated that 18 of the 48 infants (37.5%) displayed at least one trauma symptom (assessed using the Infant Traumatic Stress Questionnaire) in the 2 weeks following an episode of witnessed</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Eye, A. (2006). Trauma symptoms among infants exposed to intimate partner violence. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i>, 30, 109-125.</p>		<p>2.1% Asian-American/Pacific Islander; 52.1% single, 27.1% married, 18.7% separated/ divorced; 2.1% widowed; 39.6% only completed high school; 43.8% had some college; 8.3% completed trade school; 4.2% had a BA/BS degree; 4.2% had graduate degree; Mean age of 25.67 years ~ Infants: 16 males, 32 females; 39.6% Caucasian; 22.9% African American; 31.3% multi-racial; 2.1% Asian; 2.1% Native American; Mean age of 1.10 years at first interview.</p>	<p>within the first year of their child's life ~ Mothers had indicated her infant 'saw or heard' one of more of the IPV incidents ~ Maternal report</p>	<p>IPV ~ of the 18 infants with symptoms: 9 had symptoms of increased arousal, 10 had symptoms of numbing or interfering with development, and 10 had new symptoms, fears, or increased aggression; in total 44% of those who witnessed IPV had at least one trauma symptom. ~ Maternal report of number of IPV episodes witnessed (assessed using the Severity of Violence against Women Scale) by the infant was correlated with total number of infant trauma symptoms ~ Maternal trauma symptoms (assessed using the PTSD Scale for Battered Women) predicted the total number of infant trauma symptoms for those infants witnessing severe violence, but not for those infants witnessing less severe violence ~ Maternal depressive symptoms (assessed using the BDI) and difficult infant temperament (assessed using the Toddler Temperament Scale) did not predict infant trauma symptoms for infants witnessing IPV (severe or less severe)</p>
<p>Sternberg, K.J., Lamb, M.E., Guterman, E., & Abbott, C.B. (2006). Effects</p>	<p>110 children</p>	<p>~ Time 1: 61 males, 49 females; range in age from 8-13 years; Mean age 10 years, 7months ~ Time 2: 51 males, 44</p>	<p>~ Longitudinal design; maternal and child report ~ Recruited from 1988-1989 with help from Social Workers from the</p>	<p>~ At time 1, children who experienced family violence had significantly higher externalizing and internalizing behavior problems (assessed using the CBCL/ YSR) and depression scores (assessed using the</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>of early and later family violence on children's behavior problems and depression: A longitudinal, multi-informant perspective. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i>, 30, 283-306.</p>		<p>females; mean age of 15.9 years ~ Children came from lower-class, two-parent Jewish families ~ Families representative of the Jewish social welfare population with respect to ethnic origin (75% of parents born in Middle Eastern or North African countries) ~ Mothers/Fathers on average had completed 9.4 years of formal schooling; 55% of mothers and 35% of fathers were unemployed; all children lived with their biological parents ~ Groups: Victim- n= 33; 18 boys, 13 girls; Witness- n= 16; 8 boys, 8 girls; Abused-Witness- n=30; 21boys, 9 girls; No Violence- n=31; 14 boys, 17 girls.</p>	<p>Department of Family Services in Jerusalem & Tel Aviv Israel ~ Classification into groups originally done by social workers; verified through interviews with parents and children</p>	<p>CDI) than their non-violence counterparts ~ Children reported more externalizing problems, but fewer internalizing problems and less depression at time 2 compared to time 1. ~ Girls had significantly more internalizing problems at time 1 and time 2, higher depression at both assessments, and greater externalizing problems at time 2 ~ Girls had more externalizing problems than boys in the witness group but not in the no-violence & abused-witness groups ~ Children who witnessed abuse had more externalizing and internalizing problems than children who did not witness abuse; the witness only and abused witness group did not differ significantly on any measures. ~ Children who experienced family violence at time 1 averaged significantly greater externalizing problems at time 2, but this association did not hold when controlling for externalizing problems at time 1. ~ According to teacher reports (using the Teacher Report Form of the CBCL), family violence at time 1 was significantly associated with externalizing problems at time 2, and the greatest difference was between the abuse-witness and no-violence groups.</p>
Peek-Asa, C.,	306	~ 169 (55.2%) male;	~ Data from a prospective	~ Parents who reported IPV (assessed using

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Maxwell, L., Stromquist, A., Whitten, P., Limbos, M.A., & Merchant, J. (2007). Does parental physical violence reduce children's standardized test score performance? <i>Annals of Epidemiology</i>, 17, 847-853.</p>	<p>families</p>	<p>137 (44.8%) female; 172 (56.2%) of the children were 12 or younger; 134 (43.8%) were 13+ years old ~ 98% of families identified as 'White' ~ 147 (48%) of parental pairs had at least one parent who continued beyond high school; 88 (28.8%) had at least one parent graduate college or beyond. ~ 157 (51.3%) of mothers were 39 or younger; 141 (46.1%) of fathers were 39 or younger</p>	<p>longitudinal cohort study of rural health in one Iowa county ~ Stratified sampling by residence location ~ Parental report and child's school achievement</p>	<p>the CTS) were more likely to rate as 'good', 'fair' or 'poor', as compared to 'excellent' or 'very good', their child's general health, emotional health, vision or hearing; Parents who reported IPV were more likely to describe their children as having some to quite a few behavioral problems. These outcomes were all significantly associated with decreased test performance (assessed using the Iowa test of Basic Skills at the elementary level and the Iowa Test for Educational Development at the high school level). ~ Children whose parents reported IPV performed an average of 12.2 percentile points lower than children whose parents reported no IPV; these children also scored significantly lower in all test categories. ~ Children in both age groups (12+; 12 and younger) had reduced test score performance, but differences were statistically significant for children 12 and younger- scores were 16.9 percentile points below children 12 and younger not exposed to IPV. ~ Parent reported IPV had stronger negative effects on the test performance of girls than boys.</p>
<p>Maikovich, A.K., Jaffee,</p>	<p>2,925 children</p>	<p>~ Mean age of children at Wave 1 was 9.63</p>	<p>~ Longitudinal design; parental and child report</p>	<p>~ No relationship found between witnessing violence (assessed using the CTS) and</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>S.R., Odgers, C.L., & Gallop, R. (2008). Effects of family violence on psychopathology symptoms in children previously exposed to maltreatment. <i>Child Development, 79(5)</i>, 1498-1512.</p>		<p>years, 10.94 years at Wave 3 & 12.24 years at Wave 4. ~ 46% White (not-Hispanic), 30% Black, 17% Hispanic, and 8% other ethnicities</p>	<p>~ Utilized National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW) data - Nationally representative sample of children in the US who have had contact with Child Protective Services.</p>	<p>changes in externalizing symptoms (assessed using the CBCL) across assessments ~ Witnessing violence in the home did predict a significant change in children's internalizing symptoms (assessed using the CBCL) across assessments. ~ Internalizing problems tended to decline across assessments, however, those who experienced high levels of 'home violence' (children self-reports of witnessing violence assessed using the Violence Exposure Scale for Children) showed more gradual declines and in some cases increases in internalizing problems from baseline to 36 months.</p>
<p>Evans, S.E., Davies, C., & DiLillo, D. (2008). Exposure to domestic violence: A meta-analysis of child and adolescent outcomes. <i>Aggression & Violent Behavior, 13</i>, 131-140.</p>	<p>60 studies reviewed</p>		<p>~ Meta-analysis ~ Included only articles focused on children (18 years and younger)</p>	<p>~ Moderate (small to medium) effects found for both internalizing and externalizing behavior issues in relation to exposure to domestic violence. ~ Strong association between exposure to domestic violence and trauma symptoms, however only assessed in 6 studies reviewed ~ Moderator analyses for gender showed that the relationship between exposure to DV and externalizing problems was significantly greater for boys than girls, however moderation analyses exploring age, age by gender and recruitment setting were not significant.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Holt, S., Buckley, H., & Whelan, S. (2008). The impact of exposure to domestic violence on children and young people: A review of the literature. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect, 32</i>, 797-810.</p>	<p>Literature Review</p>			<p>~ Children and adolescents living with domestic violence are at an increased risk of developing emotional and behavioral problems and of increased exposure to other adversities in their lives. ~ Children are significantly impacted by the experience of domestic violence, and this impact has been further found to resonate intergenerationally with their own involvement with adult violence. ~ Rarely is there a direct causal pathway from exposure to DV to a particular outcome.</p>
<p>Carpenter, G.L., & Stacks, A.M. (2009). Developmental effects of exposure to intimate partner violence in early childhood: A review of the literature. <i>Children and Youth Services Review, 31</i>, 831-839.</p>	<p>Literature Review</p>			<p>~ The effects of exposure to IPV can have a pervasive and complicated effect on children's physiological, emotional, and language-cognitive development. ~ Exposure has been found to have negative influences on all levels of development and a child's sense of security ~ Research on recovery or reversal of these negative effects indicates outcomes may not be permanent.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Kulkarni, M.R., Graham-Bermann, S., Rauch, S.A.M., & Seng, J. (2010). Witnessing versus experiencing direct violence in childhood as correlates of adulthood PTSD. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 26(6), 1264-1281.</p>	<p>1,581 women & infants</p>	<p>~ Pregnant women from Southeast Michigan ~ Mean age of 26 years old ~ Ethnicity- 4.2% Latina, 2.3% Middle Eastern, 7.2% Asian, 44.9% African American, 45.9% European American, .4% American Indian & 1.5% Pacific Islander ~ 23% of sample had average annual household income of less than \$15,000 ~ 46.2% had a high school education or less ~ 60% of participants were currently in a romantic relationship</p>	<p>~ Secondary analysis of data from Stress, Trauma, Anxiety and the Childbearing Year Project (STACY)- a prospective, longitudinal, multiple cohort study that examines the relationship between PTSD and adverse childbearing outcomes from early pregnancy through postpartum period ~ Computer assisted telephone survey</p>	<p>~ Witnessing of domestic violence was assessed using the Abuse Assessment Screen ~ Participants in the witnessed and combined groups (witnessing abuse & child abuse) were at significantly greater sociodemographic risk -they were younger, had lower income, were less educated and were less likely to be currently be in a partnered relationship ~ The three childhood violence exposure groups reported significantly more adulthood abuse trauma (assessed using the Life Stressor Checklist Revised) exposure than the comparison group ~ The three childhood violence exposure groups had significantly more lifetime non-abuse potential trauma exposure (assessed using the Life Stressor Checklist Revised) ~ All proposed predictors, except for only witnessing DV were significantly related to PTSD outcomes (lifetime and current PTSD diagnosis; assessed using the National Women’s Study PTSD Module)</p>
<p>Moylan, C.A., Herrenkohl, T.I., Sousa, C., Tajima, E.A., Herrenkohl, R.C., Russo, M.J. (2010). The</p>	<p>404 children</p>	<p>~ 221 males; 183 females ~ full sample = 80.7% white, 11.2% biracial, and 5.3% African American ~ 86% of children were</p>	<p>~ Lehigh Longitudinal Study ~ Recruited from two county area of Pennsylvania from child welfare abuse and protective services</p>	<p>~ Gender was significantly predictive of all the outcomes except for the BDI; gender only marginally significant in the models for withdrawn behavior and aggressive behavior ~ Females were at increased the risk for internalizing symptoms (assessed using the YSR) after violence exposure; Males were at</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 1. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV on children and adolescents

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>effects of child abuse and exposure to domestic violence on adolescent internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 25, 53-63.</p>		<p>at the initial assessment from 2-parent households; 63% of families had incomes below \$700 per month in 1976-1977 (first assessment).</p>	<p>programs ~ Three waves of data collected (pre-school, school-aged, adolescence) ~ Data from the pre-school and school-aged assessments from parental interviews ~ Data from the adolescent assessment are from face-to-face interviews and individually administered questionnaires with parents and youth</p>	<p>higher risk for externalizing problems (assessed using the YSR); No gender differences were found for adolescent aggression (assessed using the Delinquent Acts measure). ~ 96 respondents (51 males, 45 females) were classified as being exposed to domestic violence only (not abused in childhood). ~ Exposure to DV is significantly related to YSR withdrawn scores, BDI depression scores and delinquency; DV exposure is marginally predictive of total internalizing behaviors and anxious/depression symptoms.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 2. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV into adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Forsstrom-Cohen, B. & Rosenbaum, A. (1985). The effects of parental marital violence on young adults: An exploratory investigation. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i>, 47(2), 467-472.</p>	<p>164 undergraduates</p>	<p>~Three groups: Viewed Violence (24 males; 20 females; Mean age 19.7 years); Viewed Discord (18 males; 25 females; Mean age 20.3 years); Viewed Satisfaction (44 males; 33 females; Mean age 19.7 years) ~ All respondents reared by natural parents; Mean household income of \$46,715; 94% Caucasian, 5% Black, 1% Asian.</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Viewed Discord and Viewed Satisfaction were both considered comparison groups</p>	<p>~ Viewed violence group was significantly more anxious (assessed by Trait subscale of the STAI) than the Viewed Satisfaction group ~ Females in the viewed violence group were significantly more depressed (assessed by the BDI) than women who either had viewed satisfaction or marital discord ~ Overall females who had viewed violence were significantly more depressed than men who had viewed violence ~ Women who had viewed violence were significantly more aggressive (assessed by the Buss-Durkee Inventory) than women who either had viewed marital satisfaction or marital discord.</p>
<p>Silvern, L., Karyl, J., Waelde, L., Hodges, W., Starek, J., Heidt, E., & Min, K. (1995). Retrospective reports of parental partner abuse: Relationships to depression, trauma symptoms and self-esteem among</p>	<p>550 college students</p>	<p>~ 287 females, 263 males ~ 71.8% between 18-19 years of age; 24.9% between 20-23 years of age; 2.3% fell into older categories ~ Sample almost entirely Caucasian, all required to have English as their</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Retrospective reports of childhood ~ Recruited through their being students at a state university</p>	<p>~ Exposure to partner abuse (assessed using the CTS) was significantly associated with adverse scores on all adjustment measures (BDI, Trauma Symptom Checklist, Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory) ~ Women who reported exposure to partner abuse had 'severe' symptoms (on all outcome assessments) at 3x the rate of women without such exposure ~ Women exposed to partner abuse in childhood met the cut-off for depression at approximately 3X the rate of other women (23.7% vs. 7.1%)</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 2. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV into adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
college students. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 10(2), 177-202.</i>		primary language ~ 45.2% of sample reported their parents' combined annual income exceeded \$50,000; 17.2% reported annual parental income: \$0 - \$30,000.		~ For males, only the relationship between exposure to domestic violence and Trauma Symptom Checklist scores was significant; males exposed to DV had mild trauma symptoms at a rate of 22.4% vs. 14.6% in the non-exposed males. ~ Males had virtually the same rate of severe trauma symptoms regardless of parent abuse exposure level
Henning, K., Leitenberg, H., Coffey, P., Turner, T., & Bennett, R.T. (1996). Long-term psychological and social impact of witnessing physical conflict between parents. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11(1), 35-51.</i>	617 women	~ Age range- 19 to 87 years of age; Mean age of 42.5 years ~ 30% never married, 54% currently married, 12% separated or divorced, 4% widowed ~ Mean level of education was 'some college experience' ~ Average family income was \$30,000 ~ 97% of respondents were Caucasian	~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Community sample from Burlington, VT; took part in a large community survey assessing impact of various childhood traumatic experiences on adult women's functioning ~ Women at random, chosen from the voter registration list, were sent questionnaires	~ 20% of respondents reported witnessing some form of physical conflict (assessed using the CTS) between their parents before the age of 16 years old; 32% witnessed both parents perpetrating violence ~ Women who had witnessed parental physical conflict exhibited higher levels of current psychological distress on the General Severity Index of the BSI; 45% of subjects scored in the clinical range ~ The witness group also exhibited lower levels of social adjustment on the Social Provisions Scale ~ The witness group perceived their parents to be less caring and supportive during childhood compared to non-witnesses ~ Women who witnessed both parents use physical aggression during conflict were significantly more distressed on the GSI than women from the non-witness group

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 2. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV into adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Maker, A.H., Kimmelmeier, M., & Peterson, C. (1998). Long-term psychological consequences in women of witnessing parental physical conflict and experiencing abuse in childhood. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13</i>, 574-589.</p>	<p>131 female college students</p>	<p>~ Age range: 18-43; Mean age of 22.2 years ~ 69.9% Caucasian; 14.5% African American; 3.8% Asian. ~ 86.3% never married; 9.2% currently married; 3.8% separated or divorced ~ Majority of the sample came from middle class families ~ 3 groups created: 1) No witnessing DV (control; n=85); 2) Witnessed Moderate DV (n=31); 3) Witnessed Severe DV (n=10)</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Recruited from community colleges in the Midwest</p>	<p>~ 45% of respondents reported they had witnessed acts of DV (assessed using the CTS) between their parents; ~ Witnesses of severe violence experienced more partner violence and exhibited more violent behaviors in their dating relationships (assessed using the CTS) compared to the control and moderate violence groups ~ Witnesses of severe marital violence also exhibited a greater number of antisocial behaviors (assessed using the Antisocial Behavior Checklist) than women in the non-witness group ~ Women who had witnessed moderate and severe levels of violence showed higher levels of depression (assessed using the BDI) than the control group ~ Trauma symptoms (assessed using the Trauma Symptom Checklist) increased with the severity of violence witnessed</p>
<p>Feerick, M.M. & Haugaard, J.J. (1999). Long-term effects of witnessing marital violence for women: The contribution of childhood physical and sexual abuse.</p>	<p>313 undergraduates</p>	<p>~ All female ~ Respondents ranged in age from 17 to 36 years; Mean age of 20 years ~ 74% Caucasian, 5% Latina, 4% African American, 13% Asian, 5%</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Undergraduate students recruited at Cornell University</p>	<p>~ Exposure to domestic violence and child abuse was assessed using the Childhood Sexual Abuse interview & endorsement of a list of potentially traumatic experiences. ~ Women who witnessed marital violence were more likely than women who did not witness violence to report having been physically assaulted by a stranger as an adult; however, these findings disappeared after controlling for</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 2. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV into adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<i>Journal of Family Violence, 14(4), 377- 398.</i>		Other Ethnic groups		<p>demographic characteristics and other risk variables.</p> <p>~ No significant differences were found between witnesses and non-witnesses on the Hopkins Symptom Checklist, the Dysfunctional Sexual Behavior Scale of the Trauma Symptom Inventory, or the Social Avoidance and Distress Scale.</p> <p>~ Witnesses reported significantly more PTSD symptoms (as assessed by the PTSD module of the SCID; The Trust Scale) than non-witnesses.</p>
Caetano, R., Field, C.A., & Nelson, S. (2003). Association between childhood physical abuse, exposure to parental violence, and alcohol problems in adulthood. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18, 240-256.</i>	2,880 adult males and females	<p>~ 1,440 couples</p> <p>~ 1,110 Whites, 716 Blacks, 1,054 Hispanics</p> <p>~ No other demographic information reported.</p>	<p>~Cross-sectional; self-report; retrospective reports of childhood abuse and witnessing IPV</p> <p>~ Multistage household probability sampling procedure from individuals 18+ years of age who were either married or cohabiting and living in households in the 48 contiguous States.</p> <p>~ Hour long face-to-face interviews completed at respondents homes</p>	<p>~ Exposure to interparental violence was assessed by asking whether they had observed their parents or guardians threaten one another with physical violence or were violent with one another.</p> <p>~ Witnessing of violence or threat of violence between parents was significantly associated with alcohol-related problems (assessed using closed ended questions about drinking frequency, quantity and incidence of alcohol related problems) in adulthood among Black males, but not White or Hispanic males.</p> <p>~ Among women, witnessing parental violence or threat of violence was associated with the development of alcohol related problems in adulthood among White and Black females but not among Hispanic females, but differences are not statistically significant.</p> <p>~ Males and females who reported observation of threat or exposure to physical violence between</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 2. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV into adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Davies, C.A., DiLillo, D., & Martinez, I.G. (2004). Isolating adult psychological correlates of witnessing parental violence: Findings from a predominantly Latina sample. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 19</i>(6), 377-385.</p>	<p>142 undergraduates</p>	<p>~ All female ~ Age ranged from 18 to 50 years old; Mean age of 23.57 years. ~ 80% Mexican American, 11% White, 6% African American, 1% Native American, 1% Asian, 1% Other Ethnicity ~ 91% were not married (never been married, cohabiting, separated or divorced); 9% were married ~ Predominantly of middle socioeconomic status</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Retrospective reports of witnessing DV and childhood maltreatment ~ Recruited from Psychology class at an all-female university in south central Texas</p>	<p>parents were more likely than women without these experiences to report alcohol problems</p> <p>~ Women who witnessed domestic violence reported lower self-esteem (assessed using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale), and endorsed more depressive (assessed using the Self-Rating Depression Scale), and trauma symptoms (assessed using the Trauma Symptom Checklist) than women who did not witness DV. ~ Witnessing DV was found to significantly predict all three outcome variables in the negative direction. ~ Witnessing DV continued to predict adult functioning across all three measures beyond that which was explained by other forms of maltreatment (assessed using the Child Maltreatment Interview Schedule-Short Form). ~ Witnessing DV maintained its predictive relationship with trauma symptoms only (no longer increased depressive symptoms or low self-esteem) after controlling for all types of family dysfunction (using the CMIS-SF and the Family Environment Scale); thus, trauma symptomatology was the strongest and most statistically significant correlate of childhood exposure to parent violence.</p>
<p>Fergusson, D.M., Boden, J.M. & Horwood, J. (2006). Examining the intergenerational</p>	<p>1003 adult males and females</p>	<p>~ 1025 (520 women, 505 men) respondents assessed at age 18; 983 (503 women, 480 men)</p>	<p>~ Longitudinal design; Christchurch Health and Development Survey; respondents assessed at ages 18, 21</p>	<p>~ No significant association found between exposure to IPV and increased rates of physical partner violence in respondents current relationships ~ Exposure to interparental violence was</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 2. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV into adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
transmission of violence in a New Zealand birth cohort. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i> , 30, 89-108.		assessed at age 21; 976 (502 women, 474 men) assessed at age 25.	and 25 years ~ Self-report; retrospective reports of witnessing IPV	associated with increased reports of exposure to psychological partner violence (association disappeared when controlling for confounding variables), but not increased rates of physical assault victimization. ~ Significant associations were found between exposure to interparental violence and rates of self-reported violent crimes (assessed using the SRDI) at age 18, 21 and 25; however after controlling for confounding variables the association at age 21 and 25 disappeared and was greatly reduced at age 18.
Renner, L.M. & Slack K.S. (2006). Intimate Partner Violence and child maltreatment: Understanding intra- and intergenerational connections. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i> , 30, 599-617.	1,005 females	~ Mean age at wave 3 was 33.43 ~ 58% never married ~ 63% were teenaged parents ~ 81% Non-Hispanic/Black; 7% Non-Hispanic/White; ~ 50% graduated high school	~ Longitudinal; self-report; retrospective report of witnessing domestic violence ~ Illinois Families Study- longitudinally tracks families receiving TANF; ~ Utilized data from first three waves of collection (1999/2000; 2001; 2002); ~ Official child maltreatment reports between Jan 1980 and June 2002 utilized	~ Witnesses of IPV (assessed using the CTS) in childhood were almost 2 times more likely to be involved in IPV in adulthood than those not exposed in childhood, even after controlling for covariates including family of origin characteristics. ~ Witnessing parental IPV was not associated with the occurrence of child maltreatment only in their adulthood (i.e. maltreatment of their own children), however, it was strongly associated with both IPV only and the co-occurrence of adulthood IPV and child maltreatment of their own children,
McKinney, C.M., Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler,	1615 couples	~ Couples from age 18+ ~ 3 witnessing	~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Multi-stage cluster	~ 18.9% of females and 17.8% of males reported witnessing interparental physical violence in childhood (assessed using the CTS).

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 2. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV into adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>S., & Nelson, S. (2008). Childhood family violence and perpetration and victimization of intimate partner violence: Findings from a national population-based study of couples. <i>Annals of Epidemiology</i>, 19(1), 25-32.</p>		<p>groups and 1 comparison group ~ Non-Reciprocal Male to Female Violence (n=63): 73.8% White; 5.5% Black, 10.8% Hispanic; 9% Mixed/Other; 45% had household income \$40,000+ ~ Non-Reciprocal Female to Male Violence (n=147): 70.9% White; 8.7% Black, 8.3% Hispanic; 12.1% Mixed/Other; 44.6% had household income \$40,000+ ~ Reciprocal IPV (n=239): 61.9% White; 13.0% Black; 7.9% Hispanic; 17.2% Mixed/Other; 36.5% had household income \$40,000+ ~ Non IPV (n=1166): 80.4% White; 5.7% Black;</p>	<p>sampling of U.S. household population in 1995 ~ Face to face interviews; Structured questionnaire</p>	<p>~ Females who witnessed interparental violence or experienced child-family violence were more likely to perpetrate non-reciprocal FMPV than their counterparts ~ Men who witnessed interparental physical violence or experienced severe or moderate child-family violence were more than twice as likely to engage in reciprocal IPV compared to males with no history of childhood family violence ~ Overall, males and females exposed to childhood family violence are at an increased risk of perpetrating non-reciprocal and reciprocal IPV compared to those within no history of childhood family violence ~ Findings also indicate that exposure to childhood family violence is positively associated with being victimized by an intimate partner</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 2. Impact of witnessing mutual physical IPV into adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
		6.5% Hispanic; 7.5% Mixed/Other; 48.5% had household income \$40,000+		

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 3. Impact of witnessing male-perpetrated physical IPV

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Henning, K., Leitenberg, H., Coffey, P., Turner, T., & Bennett, R.T. (1996). Long-term psychological and social impact of witnessing physical conflict between parents. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11(1)</i>, 35-51.</p>	<p>617 women</p>	<p>~ Age range- 19 to 87 years of age; Mean age of 42.5 years ~ 30% never married, 54% currently married, 12% separated or divorced, 4% widowed ~ Mean level of education was 'some college experience' ~ Average family income was \$30,000 ~ 97% of respondents were Caucasian</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Community sample from Burlington, VT; took part in a large community survey assessing impact of various childhood traumatic experiences on adult women's functioning ~ Women at random, chosen from the voter registration list, were sent questionnaires</p>	<p>~ 40% of respondents witnessed only their fathers perpetrate violence ~ The witness group perceived their parents to be less caring and supportive during childhood compared to non-witnesses ~ Women whose fathers were the sole perpetrators of marital violence were significantly more distressed on the GSI than women from the non-witness group</p>
<p>Kilpatrick, K.L. & Williams, L.M. (1997). Post-traumatic stress disorder in child witnesses to domestic violence. <i>American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 67(4)</i>, 639-644.</p>	<p>35 mother/child dyads</p>	<p>~20 witnesses; 15 non-witnesses ~ Children aged 6-12 years old; mean age of 8.1 years (witnesses) and 8.6 years (non-witnesses) ~ Witness group: 13 males, 7 females; non-witness group: 5 males, 10 females ~ All children were Australians of Anglo-Saxton descent</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal and child report ~ Sample recruited through community agencies providing support for disadvantaged families and abused women. ~ Mothers were all victims of DV, not perpetrators</p>	<p>~ Children placed in witness/non-witness groups based on maternal reports using the CTS. ~ Entire non-witness group had scores below cut-off for PTSD diagnoses (assessed using the Child Post-Traumatic Stress Reaction Index) ~ Of the 19 child witnesses who qualified for a diagnosis of PTSD, two were classified as exhibiting a mild level, eight at the moderate level and nine at the severe level of PTSD symptomology ~ A significant association between witness status and PTSD diagnosis, regardless of severity, was found.</p>
<p>Dube, S.R., Anda,</p>	<p>17,337</p>	<p>~ 54% females; 46%</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional;</p>	<p>~ Association found between frequency of</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 3. Impact of witnessing male-perpetrated physical IPV

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>R.F., Felitti, V.J., Edwards, V.J., & Williamson, D.F. (2002). Exposure to abuse, neglect and household dysfunction among adults who witnessed intimate partner violence as children: Implications for health and social services. <i>Violence and Victims, 17 (1)</i>, 3-17.</p>	<p>adult males and females</p>	<p>males ~ Mean age 55 (SD=15.7) for females; 58 (SD=14.6) for males ~ 73% of females and 76% of males were 'White' ~ 47% of females and 53% of males were college graduates ~ 37% of females and 34% of males had some college education</p>	<p>self-report ~ Retrospective reporting on exposure to violence in childhood ~ Adult HMO members completed the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) questionnaire-retrospective assessment of childhood up to age 18. ~ IPV defined as male perpetrated violence against women.</p>	<p>witnessing IPV as a child and the prevalence and/or risk of adulthood self-reported alcoholism, illicit drug use, IV drug use and depressed affect (all defined through closed ended self-reported questions). ~ Witnessing IPV in childhood 'very often' increased the risk of all four of these adverse outcomes two-fold to four-fold.</p>
<p>Mahoney, A., Donnelly, W.O., Boxer, P., & Lewis, T. (2003). Marital and severe parent-to-adolescent physical aggression in clinic referred families: Mother and adolescent reports on</p>	<p>232 adolescents</p>	<p>~ Dual parent families ~Children: Mean age: 14.1, ranged from 11 to 18 years of age; 53% male, 90% Caucasian ~ Mother: mean age 38.2; 76% of mothers were married; 24%</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal and adolescent report ~Recruited from families participating in diagnostic assessment service at a nonprofit, private, community mental health center for</p>	<p>~ Conflict tactics scale was used to assess exposure to parental domestic violence ~ Adolescent reports of father to mother physical aggression was related to both maternal and youth reports of greater externalizing problems (assessed using the CBCL and YSR)</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 3. Impact of witnessing male-perpetrated physical IPV

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>co-occurrence and links to child behavior problems. <i>Journal of family Psychology, 17(1), 3-19.</i></p>		<p>unmarried/cohabiting ~ 24% of household income in \$24,000-\$36,000 range; 29% between \$36,000 and \$60,000; 10% in \$60,000+ range ~ 83% of mothers were biological parents of adolescent respondent; 7% were the step-mother</p>	<p>youths in the Midwest. ~ Conflict Tactics Scale assessed parental physical aggression; Parent-Child CTS assessed parent-child sever physical aggression</p>	
<p>Kaura, S.A. & Allen, C.M. (2004). Dissatisfaction with relationship power and dating violence perpetration by men and women. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19(5), 576-588.</i></p>	<p>648 undergraduates</p>	<p>~ 352 males and 296 female ~ 95% of the sample was 25 years old or younger ~ 80.2% were juniors or seniors in college ~ 88.9% Caucasian, 2.9% African American, 2.9% Asian American, 5.3% Other ~ 23.2% had been a relationship for less than a year, 36.6% were not currently in</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Retrospective reporting of their witnessing parental IPV ~ Recruited from an undergraduate human sexuality class</p>	<p>~ Witnessing interparental violence was a significantly greater predictor of perpetration of IPV within their own relationships than relationship dissatisfaction. ~ Exposure to mother's violence was more strongly related to dating violence perpetration than exposure to father's violence. ~ For women, only exposure to father's violence predict the perpetrating of dating violence; this was not found for men.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 3. Impact of witnessing male-perpetrated physical IPV

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Moretti, M.M., Obsuth, I., Odgers, C. & Reebye, P. (2006). Exposure to maternal vs. paternal partner violence, PTSD and aggression in adolescent girls and boys. <i>Aggressive Behavior</i>, 32, 385-395.</p>	<p>112 youths</p>	<p>a relationship ~ 63 females; 49 males ~ Ranged in age from 12 to 18; mean age of 15.4 years ~ 67% of Euro-Caucasian decent; 22% of Aboriginal decent; 1 youth was African American ~ 89% of females and 92% of males lived with two parental figures</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Sample chosen from referrals for assessment of severe behavior problems ($n=51$) and admissions to youth correctional facilities ($n=61$) in the greater Vancouver, B.C. area</p>	<p>~ All types of aggression were assessed using the CTS ~ 35% of the sample met full PTSD criteria (assessed using the Diagnostic Interview for Children and Adolescents); higher percentage in females (46%) than males (22%). ~ For females: witnessing father's physical aggression toward his partner was strongly related to girls' aggression against fathers, however it was not related to girls' aggression towards mothers, friends or romantic partners. ~ For males: witnessing father's aggression toward his partner was associated with males' aggression toward friends however not related to aggression toward parents or romantic partners.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 4. Impact of witnessing female-perpetrated IPV

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Henning, K., Leitenberg, H., Coffey, P., Turner, T., & Bennett, R.T. (1996). Long-term psychological and social impact of witnessing physical conflict between parents. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11(1)</i>, 35-51.</p>	<p>617 women</p>	<p>~ Age range- 19 to 87 years of age; Mean age of 42.5 years ~ 30% never married, 54% currently married, 12% separated or divorced, 4% widowed ~ Mean level of education was ‘some college experience’ ~ Average family income was \$30,000 ~ 97% of respondents were Caucasian</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Community sample from Burlington, VT; took part in a large community survey assessing impact of various childhood traumatic experiences on adult women’s functioning ~ Women at random, chosen from the voter registration list, were sent questionnaires.</p>	<p>~ 28% of respondents witnessed only their mothers perpetrating violence ~ The witness group perceived their parents to be less caring and supportive during childhood compared to non-witnesses ~ Women who saw only their mothers engage in marital violence did not differ significantly from either the non-witness group or the fathers-only group</p>
<p>Fergusson, D.M. & Horwood, L.J. (1998). Exposure to interparental violence in childhood and psychosocial adjustment in young adulthood. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect, 22(5)</i>, 339-357.</p>	<p>1,265 birth cohort</p>	<p>~ 81% of original sample and 92.3% of all cohort members still alive and resident in New Zealand included in this data</p>	<p>~ Longitudinal; Self-report ~ retrospective reporting of exposure to interparental violence at age 18 ~ Children recruited as part of the Christchurch Health & Development Study (CHDS); assessed as birth (1977), 4 months, 1 years and at annual intervals till age 16, then at age 18.</p>	<p>~ Exposure to mother-perpetrated violence in childhood was significantly related to the following mental health outcomes at age 18 years of age: Conduct disorder, anxiety disorder, major depression, nicotine dependence, alcohol abuse/dependence, cannabis abuse/dependence, other substance abuse/dependence, self-reported 3 or more violent offences, and self-reported 3 or more property offences. ~ A positive correlation was reported between severity of mother-perpetrated violence witnessed and the frequency of all</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 4. Impact of witnessing female-perpetrated IPV

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
				<p>mental health outcomes (except ever attempting suicide); with greater severity meaning greater incidence of negative outcomes at age 18.</p> <p>~ Analyses then completed controlling for the incidence of father-perpetrated violence as the two were highly correlated ($r = .68$). After controlling, mother-perpetrated violence was only significantly related to alcohol abuse/dependence in young adulthood.</p>
<p>Marks, C.R., Glaser, B.A., Glass, J.B., Horne, A.M. (2001). Effects of witnessing severe marital discord on children’s social competence and behavioral problems. <i>The Family Journal</i>, 9(2), 94-101.</p>	<p>23 mother-child dyads</p>	<p>~ 78% of sample were African American; 81% make less than \$20,000 per year ~ Children: 13 males, 10 females; mean age of 5 years</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; parent report ~ Recruited from 4 shelters for abused women and one legal advocacy program servicing this population ~ All results compared to CBCL normative data</p>	<p>~ The witnessing group (assessed using the CTS) had significantly lower levels of social competence and significantly higher levels of behavioral problems and externalizing behavior than the normative sample. ~ Wife-to-husband violence and externalizing behavior problems were significantly positively correlated.</p>
<p>Kernic, M.A., Wolf, M.E., Holt, V.L., McKnight, B., Huebner, C.E. & Rivara, F.P. (2003). Behavioral</p>	<p>167 children and teens</p>	<p>~ Ranged in age from 2-17 years, 19.8% between 2-3 years, 58.1% between 4-11 years, and 22.2% between 12-18 years;</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal report ~ Mothers recruited because they were victims in police or court reported IPV in Seattle</p>	<p>~ All childhood outcomes were assessed using the CBCL. ~ Children exposed to marital violence only were 1.6 time more likely to score within the borderline to clinical range on externalizing behaviors relative to the</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 4. Impact of witnessing female-perpetrated IPV

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>problems among children whose mothers are abused by an intimate partner. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i>, 27, 1231-1246.</p>		<p>~ 52% female, 47.3% male; 30.4% White, 32.9% Black, 13.9% Hispanic, 22.8% Other. ~ Comparison group was the CBCL normative sample (n=2736); 13.5 between 2-3 years, 43.9% between 4-11 years, 42.7% between 12-18 years; 51.4% female, 48.6 male; 73.8 White, 16.2% Black, 6.6% Hispanic, 3.4% Other</p>	<p>(had also participated in the Women’s Wellness Study)</p>	<p>CBCL normative sample. ~ No evidence was found of poorer social competence after exposure to maternal IPV. ~ Children exposed to maternal IPV were 40% more likely to have total behavioral problem scores within the borderline or clinical range ~ Children who were exposed to long-term maternal physical IPV were significantly more likely than those with shorter term exposure to exhibit borderline to clinical levels of total behavioral problems.</p>
<p>Mahoney, A., Donnelly, W.O., Boxer, P., & Lewis, T. (2003). Marital and severe parent-to-adolescent physical aggression in clinic referred families: Mother and adolescent reports on co-occurrence and links to child behavior problems.</p>	<p>232 adolescents</p>	<p>~ Dual parent families ~Children: Mean age: 14.1, ranged from 11 to 18 years of age; 53% male, 90% Caucasian ~ Mother: mean age 38.2; 76% of mothers were married; 24% unmarried/cohabiting ~ 24% of household income in \$24,000-\$36,000 range; 29% between \$36,000 and \$60,000; 10% in</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal and adolescent report ~Recruited from families participating in diagnostic assessment service at a nonprofit, private, community mental health center for youths in the Midwest. ~ Conflict Tactics Scale assessed parental physical aggression; Parent-Child CTS</p>	<p>~ CTS was used to assess exposure to parental domestic violence ~ Adolescent reports of mother to father aggression were related to both maternal and youth reports of greater externalizing problems (assessed using the CBCL and YSR) ~ Mothers’ reports of their own use of marital physical aggression were related only to their own perception of more externalizing problems but not the youth reports of disruptive behavior</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 4. Impact of witnessing female-perpetrated IPV

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<i>Journal of family Psychology, 17(1), 3-19.</i>		\$60,000+ range ~ 83% of mothers were biological parents of adolescent respondent; 7% were the step-mother	assessed parent-child sever physical aggression	
Kaura, S.A. & Allen, C.M. (2004). Dissatisfaction with relationship power and dating violence perpetration by men and women. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19(5), 576-588.</i>	648 undergraduates	~ 352 males and 296 female ~95% of the sample was 25 years old or younger ~ 80.2% were juniors or seniors in college ~ 88.9% Caucasian, 2.9% African American, 2.9% Asian American, 5.3% Other ~ 23.2% had been a relationship for less than a year, 36.6% were not currently in a relationship	~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Retrospective reporting of their witnessing parental IPV ~ Recruited from an undergraduate human sexuality class	~ Witnessing IPV was a significantly greater predictor of perpetration of IPV in adulthood in respondent's own relationships than relationship dissatisfaction. ~ Mother's violence was more strongly related to dating violence perpetration than father's perpetration. ~ For men, only mother's violence predicts dating violence perpetration; this was not found for women.
Moretti, M.M., Obsuth, I., Odgers, C. & Reebye, P. (2006). Exposure to maternal vs. paternal partner violence, PTSD and aggression in	112 youths	~ 63 females; 49 males ~ Ranged in age from 12 to 18; mean age of 15.4 years ~ 67% of Euro-Caucasian decent; 22% of Aboriginal decent; 1 youth was African	~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Sample chosen from referrals for assessment of severe behavior problems (n=51) and admissions to youth correctional facilities	~ All types of aggression were assessed using the CTS. ~ 35% of the sample met full PTSD criteria (assessed using the Diagnostic Interview for Children and Adolescents); higher percentage in females (46%) than males (22%). ~ For females: a positive relation was

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 4. Impact of witnessing female-perpetrated IPV

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
adolescent girls and boys. <i>Aggressive Behavior</i> , 32, 385-395.		American ~ 89% of females and 92% of males lived with two parental figures	(n=61) in the greater Vancouver, B.C. area	found between witnessing maternal IPV and levels of aggression toward friends and romantic partners, however not related to aggression against their parents; ~ For males: witnessing mother's physical aggression towards her partner was related to aggression toward their romantic partner, however not related to aggression against their friends or parents;
McDonald, R., Jouriles, E.N., Tart, C.D., & Minze, L.C. (2009). Children's adjustment problems in families characterized by men's severe violence toward women: Does other family violence matter? <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i> , 33(2), 94-101.	258 mother/child dyads	~ 142 girls, 115 boys ranging in age from 8-12; average age 10.0 (SD=1.45) ~ Mothers: average age of 33.10 (SD=5.40); 39% Caucasian, 31% African American, 30% Hispanic, 1.2% multi-ethnic/other; on average had 11.59 years (SD=3.01) of education; mean annual family income of \$13,692.	~ Cross-sectional; maternal and child report ~ Sample recruited from domestic violence shelters	~ All assessments completed while controlling for male-perpetrated violence. ~ female perpetrated IPV (assessed using the CTS) was significantly associated with children's externalizing problems (assessed using the CBCL) ~ No significant relationship was found between female perpetrated IPV and children's internalizing problems or threat appraisals (assessed using the Children's Perceptions of Interparent Conflict Scale; CPIC).

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Jouriles, E.N., Barling, J., & O’Leary, K.D. (1987). Predicting child behavior problems in martially violent families. <i>Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology</i>, 15(2), 165-173.</p>	<p>55 children</p>	<p>~ 22 males; 23 females ~ Children ranged in age from 5 to 13 years; males mean age of 8.7 years; females mean age of 8.2 years ~ 55% of boys and 35% of girls were living with both parents at the time of assessment ~ Mean household income \$20,000</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal report ~ Children recruited because they had been referred for treatment by their mothers to the Victims Information Bureau of Suffolk County (WIBS), New York. ~ Women were recent victims of physical marital aggression</p>	<p>~ Interspousal aggression and parent-child aggression indicated a highly significant association (both forms of aggression assessed using the CTS). ~ Parent-child aggression was significantly associated with conduct problems, attention problems, anxiety-withdrawal, and motor excess in boys, but only anxiety-withdrawal in girls (all child outcomes assessed using the Revised Behavior Problem Checklist). ~ The relationship between parent-child aggression and parent reports of conduct problems, attention problems, motor excess, and anxiety-withdrawal remained significant even after controlling for the effect of child’s age and interspousal aggression.</p>
<p>Hughes, H.M. (1988). Psychological and behavioral correlates of family violence in children witnesses and victims. <i>Journal of Orthopsychiatry</i>, 58(1), 77-90.</p>	<p>178 children</p>	<p>~ All children between the ages of 3 and 12 years of age; 42 boys; 55 girls; ~ Witness Group (n=40): mother Mean age of 29.7 years; income under 12,000/year- 68%; mother not completed high school- 50%; mother employed- 41%. ~ Abused/Witness</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal and child report ~ Witness group and Abused/Witness group recruited from local battered Women shelter; comparison group recruited through local media (radio, newspaper, television) ~ Mothers had to be currently living with a</p>	<p>~ Witnessing DV was assessed using the CTS (maternal report only) ~ Abused/witness group received significantly higher problem behavior scores than both the witness and comparison groups ~ Intensity scores on the Eyberg Child Behavioral Inventory (ECBI) for the abused/witness group was significantly higher than the comparison group; however, the witness groups’ score did not differ from either group significantly. ~ Total anxiety scores (assessed using the Revised Children’s Manifest Anxiety Scale) were significantly higher for both the</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
		<p>Group (n=55): mother Mean age of 30.6 years; income under 12,000/yr-74%; mother not completed high school-62%; mother employed-31%. ~ Comparison Group (n=83): mother Mean age of 28.9 years; income under 12,000/year- 40%; mother not completed high school- 13%; mother employed-51%</p>	<p>partner.</p>	<p>abused/witness and witness only groups than the comparison group ~ No significant differences between groups on depression scores (assessed using the Child Depression Inventory (CDI). ~ Significant differences were found for the self-esteem scores (assessed using the McDaniel-Piers Young Children’s Self-Concept Scale-younger school aged and Piers-Harris Children’s Self-Concept Scale-older school aged children) in that the comparison group had the highest scores while both witness groups did not differ significantly</p>
<p>Hughes, H.M., Parkinson, D., & Vargo, M. (1989). Witnessing spouse abuse and experiencing physical abuse: A “double whammy”? <i>Journal of Family Violence, 4(2),</i></p>	<p>150 children; 82 families</p>	<p>~ All children between the ages of 4 and 12 years of age ~ Witness Group (n=44); mother Mean age of 29.2 years; income under 12,000/year- 66%; mother not completed high school- 43%; mother employed-</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal and child report ~ Witness group and Abused/Witness group recruited from local battered Women shelter; comparison group recruited from the community</p>	<p>~ Abused/witnesses obtained significantly higher scores than the comparison children on externalizing scores (assessed using the CBCL) ~ Abused/witness children have an overall level of total problem behavior (assessed using the CBCL) which is significantly different from the behavior of the comparison group ~ Abused/witness children were consistently rated as experiencing significantly more difficulties than the comparison group, across internalizing, externalizing and total problems</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
197-209.		38% ~ Abused/Witness Group (<i>n</i> =40): mother Mean age of 27.3 years; income under 12,000/year- 69%; mother not completed high school- 63%; mother employed- 29% ~ Comparison Group (<i>n</i> =66): mother Mean age of 30.0 years; income under 12,000/year- 50%; mother not completed high school- 33%; mother employed- 38%		(assessed through CBCL; maternal report) ~ The witness only and abused witness group's internalizing problem scores (assessed using the Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale) did not differ, but were approximately 4 points higher than the control group scores. ~ Children in all groups did not differ on self-reports of depressive symptoms (assessed using the CDI) ~ Abused/witnesses, on average, had scores reaching clinical range cut-offs, thus, supporting the contention that children who are both physically abused and witnesses to violence are at greater risk for adjustment difficulties
Carlson, B.E. (1991). Outcomes of physical abuse and observation of marital violence among adolescents in placement. <i>Journal of Interpersonal</i>	101 adolescents	~ 55 males; 46 females ~ Ranged in age from 13 to 18 years; mean age of 15.41 years. ~ 76% White; 15% Black; 9% of Other ethnicities. ~ Most came from	~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Recruited from residential treatment agencies (<i>n</i> = 59) and one runaway shelter (<i>n</i> =42)	~ Sense of well-being was found to be significantly lower among subjects who have both been abused and witnessed abuse, compared to those who have experienced either abuse or witnessed IPV or none at all. ~ Approval of violence, use of violence, substance abuse and frequency of running away were unaffected by physical abuse, witnessing marital violence, or exposure to both IPV and

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<i>Violence, 6(4), 526-534.</i>		low-income, multi-problem families; 50% had been placed in care before; fewer than half grew up with both biological parents.		abuse; although not significant, scores were in the predicted direction.
Sternberg, K.J., Lamb, M.E., Greenbaum, C., Cicchetti, D., Dawud, S., Cortes, R.M., Krispin, O. & Lorey, F. (1993). Effects of domestic violence on children's behavior problems and depression. <i>Developmental Psychology, 29(1), 44-52.</i>	110 families	~ 61 male and 49 female 8-12 year olds ~ Lower class, two parent families of Jewish origin ~ 75% had parents born in Middle Eastern and North African countries. ~ Parents had average of 9.4 years of formal education ~ All children lived with both biological parents, average of three siblings ~ 4 groups: Child Abuse (n=33; 18boys; 15 girls); Spouse Abuse (n=16, 8 boys; 8 girls);	~ Cross-sectional; parent and child report ~ Recruited through social workers from the Department of Family Services in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, Israel ~ Domestic violence assessed as at least one incident in the past 6 months according to social workers involved in case ~ 4 groups: Child abuse-experienced physical abuse by one or both parents; Spouse Abuse-witnessed physical violence between their	~ Children in the abused witness, child and spouse abuse groups had significantly higher depression scores on the Childhood Depression Index (CDI) than children in the comparison group; mean scores of children in the three domestic violence groups did not differ statistically from each other ~ Children in the child abuse and abused witness groups reported significantly more internalizing and externalizing behavior problems (assessed using the YSR) than children in the comparison group ~ Mothers of children in the abused witness group reported higher externalizing scores (assessed using the CBCL) than mothers of children in the child abuse only and spouse abuse only groups combined ~ More mothers of children in the abused witness and spouse abuse groups assigned their

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
		Abused Witnesses ($n=30$; 21 boys; 9 girls); Comparison ($n=31$; 14 boys; 17 girls)	parents; Abused Witnesses-both witnessed and been physically abused by one or both parents.	children scores above the clinical cutoff on the Externalizing Behavior Problem scale
O'Keefe, M. (1994). Linking marital violence, mother-child/father-child aggression and child behavior problems. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 9(1)</i> , 63-78.	185 children	~ Children range in age from 7 to 13 years of age; Mean age of 9.5 years. ~ 49% female; 42% Caucasian, 37% Hispanic, 21% Black. ~ 85% from low socioeconomic backgrounds ~ 98% of mothers were biological mothers; 59% of mother's spouse/partners were biological father of child/children	~ Cross-sectional; parental report ~ Recruited from families temporarily living in battered women's shelters ~ All children had witnessed at least one incident of interparental physical aggression during previous 12 months.	~ The amount of mother-child aggression (assessed using the CTS) was significantly related to internalizing and externalizing child behavior (assessed using the CBCL) after controlling for age, race, father status, and other familial aggression. ~ Relationship between father-child aggression and witnessing marital violence (both assessed using the CTS) was significant; however, father-child aggression was not significantly associated to either behavior score (externalizing or internalizing; assessed using the CBCL). ~ For females- amount of mother-child aggression was significantly associated with externalizing behavior problems; age was a significant predictor of externalizing issues with younger girls exhibiting more externalizing problems than older females.
Jouriles, E.N. & Norwood, W.D. (1995). Physical aggression toward boys and girls in	48 mothers; 96 children	~ Children: 33% White; 19% Black; 48% Mexican or Latino American; Mean age was 8.4	~ Cross-sectional; maternal and child report ~ Mothers recruited if they received shelter	~ Boys externalizing problems (assessed using the CBCL) correlated positively with both mother-child and father-child aggression ~ Girls externalizing problems (assessed using the CBCL) correlated positively with both

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
families characterized by the battering of women. <i>Journal of Family Psychology</i> , 9(1), 69-78.		years for boys and 8.4 years for girls ~ Mean years of maternal education was 10.6 years; and mean for fathers was 9.6; 17% of mothers and 58% of fathers were employed; Mean household income was approx. \$14,000	because of physical abuse from an intimate partner ~ Domestic Violence assessed using the Conflict Tactics Scale; families grouped into 'more extreme' and 'less extreme' battering	mother-child and father-child aggression ~ Boys externalizing behavior problems (assessed using the CBCL) correlated positively with their reports of mothers' aggression ~ Mother-child aggression significantly differed by child gender within the extreme battering group in that sons were the most often object of maternal aggression; Sons were also more likely to be the victim of the father's aggression than were daughters.
O'Keefe, M. (1995). Predictors of child abuse in martially violent families. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 10(3), 3-25.	184 children; 120 families	~ Children ranged in age from 7 to 13 years; Mean age of 9.5 years ~ 51% were male; 49% female ~ 37% were Hispanic; 21% African American; 42% Caucasian ~ 85% came from low socioeconomic backgrounds	~Cross-sectional; maternal and child report ~ Recruited from battered women's shelters	~ All forms of violence were assessed using the CTS ~ Significant main effect of externalizing behavior problems (assessed using the CBCL) with abused/witnesses scoring significantly higher than the witness only group ~ In comparison to children from martially violent homes in which child abuse does not occur, children who were abused/witnesses were more likely to live in families with a greater frequency and severity of marital violence and less marital satisfaction (assessed using the Marital Adjustment Test) ~ Abused/witnesses also perceived the quality of father-child relationship (assessed using a single item measure created by the authors) as more

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
				<p>problematic and are more likely to exhibit aggressive behaviors than children from the witness-only group</p> <p>~ Children exposed to marital violence are at increased risk for both internalizing and externalizing behavioral problems; children who witness marital violence and are victims of abuse are at an even higher risk for behavioral problems, specifically externalizing problems.</p>
<p>O’Keefe, M. (1996). The differential effects of family violence on adolescent adjustment. <i>Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal</i>, 13(1), 51-68.</p>	<p>935 high school students</p>	<p>~ 378 males (41%); 557 females (59%)</p> <p>~ Mean age of 16.9 years; range: 14 through 20 years old</p> <p>~ 53% Latino; 20% White; 13% African American; 6.7% Asian American; 7% ‘Other’</p> <p>~ 52% from low socioeconomic families; 28% from middle SES families; 20% from high SES families</p> <p>~ 60% lived with both biological parents; 12% lived in</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report</p> <p>~ Retrospective reports of witnessing DV in childhood & child abuse</p> <p>~ Study part of a larger study of adolescents’ exposure to violence in different social settings; recruited from high schools in the Los Angeles area</p>	<p>~ Sample reported witnessing severe acts of violence between their parents – over 33% of both males and females reported witnessing one parent hit the other with an object; over 16% witnessed one parent beat up the other; and 11% reported that they witnessed one parent threaten the other with a knife/gun</p> <p>~ Parent-child violence and interparental violence witnessed (both assessed using the CTS) were significantly correlated with each other as well as with internalizing and externalizing problem scores (assessed using the Youth Self-Report)</p> <p>~ Higher scores on both witnessing interparental violence and parent-child violence were significant predictors of higher externalizing behavior scores.</p> <p>~ Effects of witnessing interparental violence depended on the level of parent-child violence</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
		stepfamilies; 21% lived in single-parent families		<p>experienced; however, when the level of parent-child violence was high, the effects of witnessing interparental violence on adjustment were negligible.</p> <p>~ For internalizing problems, when level of parent-child violence was high, again, the effects of witnessing interparental violence on adjustment were also negligible.</p>
<p>Appel, A.E., & Holden, G.W. (1998). The co-occurrence of spouse and physical child abuse: A review and appraisal. <i>Journal of Family Psychology, 12</i>(4), 578-599.</p>	<p>31 studies reviewed</p>		<p>~ Literature review ~ Split articles by 1-type of sample (community, battered women, maltreated children); 2-assessment method (self-report, agency records, hospital records, clinical impressions)</p>	<p>~ Children who live in martially violent homes are at an increased risk of being physically abused as there is a considerable overlap between domestic violence and physical child abuse</p> <p>~ 80% of studies reviewed using samples of either battered women or maltreated children found a co-occurrence rate of 40% or more</p> <p>~ Conceptual framework for understanding possible relations among family members living within violent households: 5 models of directionality: 1) Single perpetrator model; 2) Sequential perpetrator model; 3) Dual perpetrator model; 4) Marital violence model; 5) Family dysfunction model</p> <p>~ Authors infer that the rate of co-occurrence in the US general population is approximately 6% (not looking at high risk or convenience samples). However, through a stratified sample of violent homes, using conservative criteria to</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
Fantuzzo, J.W., & Mohr, W.K. (1999). Prevalence and effects of child exposure to domestic violence. <i>Domestic Violence and Children</i> , 9(3), 21-32.	Literature Review			<p>identify child abuse, the authors conclude that the co-occurrence rate appears to be about 40%.</p> <p>~ Studies reviewed found that between 45% and 70% of children exposed to domestic violence are also victims of physical abuse, and that as many as 40% of child victims of child physical abuse are also exposed to domestic violence</p> <p>~ Children in domestically violent homes are at an increased risk for sexual abuse than were children in non-violent households</p> <p>~ Negative outcomes were more likely for children who experienced both DV and child maltreatment than for children who had experienced only one form of violence or no violence at all</p>
Edelson, J.L. (1999). The overlap between child maltreatment and women battering. <i>Violence Against Women</i> , 5, 134-154.	35 studies reviewed		<p>~ Literature review</p> <p>~ Focused on all studies mentioning an overlap between male perpetrated partner abuse and child abuse</p>	<p>~ Very limited picture of the overlap of child abuse and male perpetrated partner abuse in the same families as studies are largely conducted separately and reported in different journals.</p> <p>~ 30%-60% of families where either child maltreatment or adult domestic violence is occurring one will find the other form of violence</p> <p>~ Studies reviewed found that adult domestic violence occurred in 26% to 73% of families studied</p> <p>~ Co-occurrence ranged from a low of 6.5% overlap to a high of 97%, almost half of the</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
				<p>studies found the overlap to be in the range of 30% to 60% of families with children.</p> <p>~ From the child maltreatment studies- majority of perpetrators are female, 44.1% were male and males were the perpetrators of the most severe forms of abuse</p>
<p>Jouriles, E.N., Spiller, L.C., Stephens, N., McDonald, R., & Swank, P. (2000). Variability in adjustment of children of battered women: The role of child appraisals of interparent conflict. <i>Cognitive Therapy and Research</i>, 24(2), 233-249.</p>	<p>154 mother/child dyads</p>	<p>~ Families had at least one child between 8 and 12 years of age</p> <p>~ Children: 71 girls, 83 boys; girls mean age of 9.6 years; boys mean age of 9.3 years.</p> <p>~ Mothers: 40% Caucasian, 32% African American, 27% Hispanic, 1% other ethnicity; Mean age of 33 years; 25% were cohabitating, 8% were unmarried and not residing with batterer; mothers had a mean of 11.3 years of education; and mean family income</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal and child report</p> <p>~ Sample recruited from battered women's shelters</p> <p>~ Threat appraisals were assessed with the Threat subscale of the CPIC and modified version of the Fear of Abandonment subscale of the CBAPS</p> <p>~ Child Depression was assessed using the Child Depression Inventory (CDI) and Anxiety was assessed using the Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS).</p>	<p>~ Witnessing domestic violence and experiencing childhood abuse were assessed using the CTS.</p> <p>~ Child physical abuse was associated with higher levels of CBCL externalizing problems but not with levels of CBCL internalizing problems</p> <p>~ Self-blame (assessed using the Self-blame subscale of the Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale and the Self-Blame Subscale of the Children's Beliefs about Parental Separation Scale) was found to be significantly associated with CBCL externalizing scores after controlling for physical child abuse.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Huth-Bocks, A.C., Levendosky, A.A., & Semel, M.A. (2001). The direct and indirect effects of domestic violence on young children's intellectual functioning. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 16</i>(3), 269-290.</p>	<p>100 mother-child dyads</p>	<p>of \$20,000; ~ Children ranged from 3.0-5.9 years; Mean age of 4.4 years; 43% were African American, 24% Biracial, 21% Caucasian, 11% Hispanic/ Latino, and 1% Asian. ~ Mothers ranged in age from 19 to 46; Mean age of 27.9 years; Avg. monthly income of \$1320; 42% of mothers were single, 25% married; 13% divorced, 10% separated and 10% cohabiting; 41% had graduated high school, 57% had graduated college</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal report ~Participants recruited with flyers placed at local Head Start pre-schools, Family Independence agencies, local domestic shelters and community postings in a Midwestern city</p>	<p>~ No significant differences were found between children who had been exposed to domestic violence (assessed using the Severity of Violence against Women scales) only, those who experienced childhood abuse (assessed using the parent-child version of the CTS) and those who experienced both on intellectual functioning.</p>
<p>Yexley, M., Borowsky, I., & Ireland, M. (2002). Correlation</p>	<p>21,249 High school students</p>	<p>~ Respondents ranged in age from 11 to 20 years; mean age of 14.3 years ~ 37.2% from grade</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional data obtained from the longitudinal 1998 Minnesota Student Survey; anonymous</p>	<p>~ Direct victims of family violence were more likely to engage in self- and other-directed violence (ever attempted suicide; fighting in the last 12 months; carried gun to school in last 30 days) than were youth who only witnessed</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>between different experiences of intrafamilial physical violence and violent adolescent behavior. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 17, 707-720.</p>		<p>6; 36% from grade 9; 26.9% from grade 12 ~ 65% of the sample lived with both biological parents; 83% were White, 1% American Indian, 4% Black; 2% Mexican/Latin American, 5% Pacific Islander/Asian American</p>	<p>questionnaire administered in public schools every 3 years since 1989 ~ Self-report; all outcomes and IPV questions assessed with closed ended questions; no standardized measures used.</p>	<p>violence ~ Being both the direct victim and witnessing physical violence in the family was most strongly associated with all three measures of aggression (ever attempted suicide; fighting in the last 12 months; carried gun to school in last 30 days) ~ Associations between a history of family violence and violent behavior against self or others remained significant even after controlling for race, school grade and family structure.</p>
<p>English, D.J., Marshall, D.B., & Stewart, A.J. (2003). Effects of family violence on child behavior and health during early childhood. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 18(1), 43-57.</p>	<p>261 children & parent pairs</p>	<p>~ 68% of parental respondents were the child's biological mother, 8% were biological fathers, 9% were grandmothers and 3% were adoptive mothers.</p>	<p>~ Longitudinal; ~ Respondents are a subset from the Longitudinal Studies of Child Abuse and Neglect (LONGSCAN). ~ Cohort referred to CPS for abuse/neglect; may or may not have been substantiated.</p>	<p>~ Domestic violence status (no violence, history of violence, current violence; assessed using the CTS) was not significantly related to child behavior problems measured using the CBCL. ~ Domestic violence status was not significantly related to total child health problems. ~ Results from controlling for other variables indicate that the effects of domestic violence on child behavior and health are primarily indirect.</p>
<p>Mahoney, A., Donnelly, W.O., Boxer, P., & Lewis, T. (2003).</p>	<p>232 families</p>	<p>~ Dual parent families ~Children: Mean age: 14.1, ranged from 11</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal and adolescent report ~Recruited from</p>	<p>~ CTS was used to assess exposure to parental domestic violence and childhood abuse (adolescent report) ~ Number of cases including co-occurrence was</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Marital and severe parent-to-adolescent physical aggression in clinic referred families: Mother and adolescent reports on co-occurrence and links to child behavior problems. <i>Journal of Family Psychology, 17(1), 3-19.</i></p>		<p>to 18 years of age; 53% male, 90% Caucasian ~ Mother: mean age 38.2; 76% of mothers were married; 24% unmarried/cohabiting ~ 24% of household income in \$24,000-\$36,000 range; 29% between \$36,000 and \$60,000; 10% in \$60,000+ range ~ 83% of mothers were biological parents of adolescent respondent; 7% were the step-mother</p>	<p>families participating in diagnostic assessment service at a nonprofit, private, community mental health center for youths in the Midwest. ~ Conflict Tactics Scale assessed parental physical aggression; Parent-Child CTS assessed parent-child sever physical aggression</p>	<p>10% according to maternal reports; 16% according to adolescent report; 22.4% according to either-party reporter data. ~ No significant interactive effects were found for marital and severe parental physical aggression in predicting levels of child maladjustment; youths who were exposed to both forms of family violence did not exhibit greater externalizing or internalizing behavior problems (assessed using the CBCL) than those who had experienced only one type.</p>
<p>Wolfe, D.A., Crooks, C.V., Lee, V., McIntyre-Smith, A., & Jaffee, P.G. (2003). The effect of children's exposure to domestic violence: A meta-analysis</p>	<p>41 articles reviewed</p>		<p>~ Meta-analysis</p>	<p>~ Only 4 studies included comparisons between those who witnessed DV only and those who witnessed DV and were victims of child abuse ~ Small effect size for the differences between children who were combined witness/victims and those who were witnesses only; there is evidence that this difference is greater for externalizing behaviors.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>and critique. <i>Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review</i>, 6(3), 171-187.</p>				
<p>Kernic, M.A., Wolf, M.E., Holt, V.L., McKnight, B., Huebner, C.E. & Rivara, F.P. (2003). Behavioral problems among children whose mothers are abused by an intimate partner. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i>, 27, 1231-1246.</p>	<p>167 children and teens</p>	<p>~ Ranged in age from 2-17 years, 19.8% between 2-3 years, 58.1% between 4-11 years, and 22.2% between 12-18 years; ~ 52% female, 47.3% male; 30.4% White, 32.9% Black, 13.9% Hispanic, 22.8% Other. ~ Comparison group was the CBCL normative sample ($n=2736$); 13.5 between 2-3 years, 43.9% between 4-11 years, 42.7% between 12-18 years; 51.4% female, 48.6 male; 73.8 White, 16.2% Black, 6.6%</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal report ~ Mothers recruited because they were victims in police or court reported IPV in Seattle & women who participated in the Women's Wellness Study</p>	<p>~ All childhood outcomes were assessed using the CBCL. ~ 24 children within the sample (14.4%) were also found to be victims of child maltreatment ~ Children exposed to both IPV and child maltreatment were 3.0 times more likely to have an externalizing behavior score in the borderline or clinical range (assessed using the CBCL) ~ No evidence was found for an effect of IPV and child maltreatment on social competence scores. ~ Children exposed to both child maltreatment and parental IPV were 2.1 times more likely to receive total behavioral problem scores within the borderline and clinical range ~ Children who were exposed to long-term maternal physical IPV only were significantly more likely than those with shorter term exposure to exhibit borderline to clinical levels of total behavioral problems, however relative risks on all children's behavior scores were even greater for children exposed to both maternal</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Smith-Slep, A.M. & O’Leary, S.G. (2005). Parent and partner violence in families with young children: Rates, patterns and connections. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73</i>(3), 435-444.</p>	<p>453 families</p>	<p>Hispanic, 3.4% Other ~Adult Males: Mean age of 37 years; average of 14 years of education; 20.8% minorities; 93.2% employed full-time; 94.5% were biological parent of target child ~ Adult Females: Mean age of 35.1 years; average of 14.3 years of education; 18.1% minorities; 30% employed full time; 37.7% employed part-time; 99.3% were biological parent of target child ~ 94.5% of couples were married; average of 2.4 children in the household; target child was on average 5.4 years of age</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Recruited through random digit dialing procedure modeled after the one used for the 1985 National Family Violence Survey. ~ Adults had to be living as a couple for at least 1 year, parenting biological children of at least one adult between 3 and 7 years of age; one child chosen at random ~ CTS utilized to assess domestic violence and the Parent-Child CTS was used to assess child abuse</p>	<p>IPV and child maltreatment ~ Conflict Tactics Scale was used to assess both domestic violence and child abuse was assessed using the Parent-child version ~ Partner physical aggression was reported by 49% of families, 33% of which reported the aggression was perpetrated by both husband and wife ~ Severe partner aggression reported by 24% of families, with 10% being attributed to both husband and wife ~ Of target children- 87% were physically aggressed against by their parents; 59% of children were aggressed against by both parents; 13% experienced severe aggression with only 1.5% of those cases being from both parents ~ Presence of both partner and parent abuse was found in 45% of families with 5% reporting co-occurring severe partner and parent aggression ~ Both genders were more likely to perpetrate any physical aggression against their children than against their partner and were more likely to perpetrate severe aggression toward their partner than their children ~ Both parents being physically aggressive toward their child but not against each other was the most prevalent pattern</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Sternberg, K.J., Baradaran, L.P., Abbott, C.B., Lamb, M.E., & Guterman, E. (2006). Type of violence, age, and gender differences in the effects of family violence on children's behavior problems: A mega-analysis. <i>Developmental Review</i>, 26, 89-122.</p>	<p>1870 children</p>	<p>~ Children ranged in age from 4 to 14 years of age ~ 986 males; 884 females ~ Sample largely comprised of lower to middle class families ~ 53% were from two-parent families; 23% from single parent families; missing data for 24% ~ 30% of mothers had less than a high school education, 27% graduate from high school, 17% had education beyond high school ~ 47% were White; 34% were non-white; missing data for 19% ~ 4 groups: comparison (n=705); Victims only (n=156); Witnesses only (n=338);</p>	<p>~ Mega-analysis of data from 15 different studies conducted within North America utilizing the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) ~ All assessments of violence made based on Child Protective Services records or through family member reports utilizing the CTS</p>	<p>~ The number of children in the clinical range was significantly greater than expected in the abused-witness group and significantly lower than expected in the no-violence comparison group ~ Abused witnesses were 2.91 times more likely of have severe externalizing problems and 2.57 times more likely to have severe internalizing problems than the no-violence comparison children. ~ Abused-witnesses were 1.49 and 1.85 times more likely than victims of having externalizing and internalizing problems, respectively, to be in the clinical range. ~ Abused-witnesses were at greater risk than witnesses and witnesses were at greater risk than victims of having both externalizing and internalizing problems within the clinical range, however these differences were not significant ~ The older age groups (7-9 year olds; 10-14 year olds) were significantly more likely to have clinical range internalizing and externalizing scores. ~ No significant differences were found between the genders ~ In general, experiencing both forms of violence did not make clinically high externalizing problems significantly more likely</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
		Abused-Witnesses (n=761).		than did experiencing only one form of violence. ~ Comparisons of the three family violence groups to the no-violence group revealed that abused-witnesses were at significantly greater risk of clinical-level internalizing problems than the no-violence group; for internalizing problems, experiencing two forms of violence had a greater negative effect than experiencing only one form of violence
Sternberg, K.J., Lamb, M.E., Guterman, Eva, & Abbott, C.B. (2006). Effects of early and later family violence on children's behavior problems and depression: A longitudinal, multi-informant perspective. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i> , 30, 283-306.	110 children	~ Time 1: 61 males, 49 females; range in age from 8-13 years; Mean age 10 years, 7months ~ Time 2: 51 males, 44 females; mean age of 15.9 years ~ Children came from lower-class, two-parent Jewish families ~ Families representative of the Jewish social welfare population with respect to ethnic origin (75% of parents born in	~ Longitudinal design; maternal and child report ~ Recruited from 1988-1989 with help from Social Workers from the Department of Family Services in Jerusalem & Tel Aviv Israel ~ Classification into groups originally done by social workers; verified through interviews with parents and children	~ At time 1, Children who experienced family violence had significantly higher externalizing and internalizing behavior problems (assessed using the CBCL/ YSR) and depression scores (assessed using the CDI) than their non-violence counterparts; children who experienced physical abuse (victim and abused-witness groups) had significantly higher scores of all outcomes measures than children who did not. ~ At time 1, Children who were abused witnesses averaged significantly higher scores on outcome assessments than those who only witnessed abuse, but did not have significantly higher scores than those who were only victims of physical abuse ~ At time 2, the means for the abused-witness group were higher than those for the witness and no-violence groups on the three outcome measures (CBCL, YSR, & CDI), however these

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
		<p>Middle Eastern or North African countries) ~ Mothers/Fathers on average had completed 9.4 years of formal schooling; 55% of mothers and 35% of fathers were unemployed; all children lived with their biological parents ~ Groups: Victim- <i>n</i>=33; 18 boys, 13 girls; Witness- <i>n</i>= 16; 8 boys, 8 girls; Abused-Witness- <i>n</i>=30; 21boys, 9 girls; No Violence- <i>n</i>=31; 14 boys, 17 girls.</p>		<p>differences were only significant for the internalizing behavior; abused-witness children did not average higher scores than children who were only abuse victims. ~ Girls had more externalizing problems than boys in the victim and witness groups but not in the other two groups (no-violence & abused-witness groups) ~ Girls in the victim group had significantly more externalizing problems than girls in the witness and no-violence groups, whereas boys in the abused witness group had significantly more problems than boys in each of the other groups ~ Children who witnessed abuse had more externalizing and internalizing problems than children who did not witness abuse- the witness only and abused witness group did not differ significantly on any measures. ~ Children who experienced family violence at time 1 averaged significantly greater externalizing problems at time 2, but this association did not hold when controlling for externalizing problems at time 1. ~ According to teacher reports, family violence at time 1 was significantly associated with externalizing problems at time 2, and the greatest difference was between the abuse-witness and no-violence groups.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
				<p>~ Average internalizing scores for the victim, witness, and no-violence groups dropped from time 1 to time 2, whereas the average score for children in the abused witness group increased sharply</p>
<p>Antle, B.F., Barbee, A.P., Sullivan, D., Yankeelov, P., Johnson, L., & Cunningham, M.R. (2007). The relationship between domestic violence and child neglect. <i>Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention</i>, 7, 364-382.</p>	<p>2,350 families</p>	<p>~ Victims were 41% male and 59% Caucasian ~ Caregiver relationship: 48% biological mother; 22% biological father; 3% stepmother, 7% stepfather; 5% extended family; 7% parental paramour ~ Perpetrator relationship: 50% biological mother, 20% biological father</p>	<p>~ File review of all neglect cases reported in Jefferson county, Kentucky ~ Domestic violence assessed as either present or absent from the case reports; those assessed as present also in many cases had reports to Adult Protection Services (used as further substantiation)</p>	<p>~ 29% of the sample had both neglect and reports of domestic violence ~ 61% of cases were fully substantiated for neglect and 27% of those cases were co-morbid for neglect and DV ~ Of the 11% of cases considered as being 'found and substantiated' for neglect, 33% were co-morbid for DV ~ 28% of cases were considered as having 'some indication' of neglect and 31% of those cases were co-morbid for DV</p>
<p>Herrenkohl, T.I., Sousa, C., Tajima, E.A., Herrenkohl, R.C., & Moylan, C.A. (2008). Intersection of child abuse and</p>	<p>Literature Review</p>			<p>~ Considerable evidence exists that domestic violence and child abuse co-occur ~ Rate of overlap between child abuse and domestic violence or strength of the association varies, though the relationship remains consistent. ~ Family factors associated with child abuse and</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>children's exposure to domestic violence. <i>Trauma Violence Abuse, 9(2), 84-99.</i></p>				<p>DV exposure include poverty, parental unemployment, substance abuse, mental illness, crime, financial or parenting stress, poor health and lower education.</p> <p>~ Environmental factors associated with child abuse and DV exposure include poverty, neighborhood disadvantage, and violence outside the home</p> <p>~ Consequences of the co-occurrence include: increases in feelings of isolation, shame, fear, guilt, and low self-esteem. Increased levels of PTSD, anxiety, and depression have been consistently found. In terms of behavioral consequences: eating disorders, teen pregnancy, school dropout, suicide attempts, delinquency, violence and substance use. Relationally, those exposed have less secure attachments, poor conflict resolution skills and vulnerability to further victimization or perpetration of violence</p> <p>~ Few studies have attempted to disentangle the unique effects of exposure to child abuse and domestic violence</p> <p>~ Several studies do show a 'double whammy' effect in that when children have been exposed to both types of violence fare worse than those only exposed to one or the other</p> <p>~ Few studies have looked at gender differences and existing evidence is inconsistent, although</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Jouriles, E.N., McDonald, R., Smith Slep, A.M., Heyman, R.E., Garrido, E. (2008). Child abuse in the context of domestic violence: Prevalence, explanations, and practice implications. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 23(2), 221-235.</p>	<p>20 studies reviewed</p>		<p>~ Literature review ~ Split articles into 1- those with stringent definitions and 2- those with broader definitions of child abuse ~ Reviewed articles that focused on a domestically violent family as opposed to recruitment within the context of child abuse</p>	<p>suggestive of differences between the genders. ~ Articles with a stringent definition of child abuse had a broad range (18% to 67%) of estimates of physical child abuse in domestically violent families. ~ This broad range of estimates may have to do with the fact that child abuse may be less prevalent in domestically violent families identified in community surveys compared to domestically violent families in which women are seeking refuge from violence at a shelter or the family is seeking clinical services. ~ Majority of articles reviewed found higher rates of child abuse in domestically abusive families, however there were some studies that found no differences ~ When domestic violence is more frequent, parental aggression toward children is also more frequent; a positive correlation between frequency of domestic violence and parental aggression toward children. ~ Some evidence supports that boys in domestically violent families are at a higher risk for parental aggression than girls. ~ Children within domestically violent families are at a substantially elevated risk for physical child abuse compared to children in homes without domestic violence</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Maikovich, A.K., Jaffee, S.R., Odgers, C.L., & Gallop, R. (2008). Effects of family violence on psychopathology symptoms in children previously exposed to maltreatment. <i>Child Development</i>, 79(5), 1498-1512.</p>	<p>2,925 children</p>	<p>~ Mean ages of children: Wave 1 of 9.63 years, Wave 3 of 10.94 years, Wave 4-12.24 years ~ 46% White (not-Hispanic), 30% Black, 17% Hispanic, and 8% other ethnicities</p>	<p>~ Longitudinal design; parental and child report ~ Utilized National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW) data - nationally representative sample of children in the US who have had contact with Child Protective Services.</p>	<p>~ No relationship found between witnessing violence (assessed using the CTS) and changes in externalizing symptoms (assessed using the CBCL) across assessments, however, experiencing harsh physical discipline did predict significant changes in children's externalizing symptoms across assessments ~ Overall externalizing symptoms on average decreased over time, children who experienced high levels of harsh physical discipline showed more gradual declines and in some case increases in externalizing problems; this finding remained significant after controlling for child and family risk factors ~ No relationship was found between harsh physical discipline and change in internalizing symptoms across assessments, however, witnessing violence in the home did predict significant changes in children's internalizing symptoms across assessments. ~ Internalizing problems tended to decline across assessments, however, those who experienced high levels of 'home violence' (children self-reports of witnessing violence assessed using the Violence Exposure Scale for Children) showed more gradual declines and in some cases increases in internalizing problems from baseline to 36 months</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Kaslow, N.J. & Thompson, M.P. (2008). Associations of child maltreatment and intimate partner violence with psychological adjustment among low SES, African American children. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i>, 32, 888-896.</p>	<p>152 mother-child dyads</p>	<p>~ 69 boys, 83 girls; children ranged in age from 8 to 12; Mean age 10 years ~ All children lived with their mothers at least 50% of the time during the prior year ~ Mothers mean age of 32.33, ranged between 22 and 52 years ~ Mothers: All African American women; all from low SES backgrounds; 65% were unemployed; 39% had not graduated high school; 14% considered themselves to be homeless; 26% indicated their individual monthly income was between \$0 and \$249; 29% were single/never</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; maternal and child report ~ Mothers recruited from large, inner city hospital where they were seeking services due to an IPV incident</p>	<p>~ IPV status (assessed using the Index of Spouse Abuse) of the mother was significantly related to the mother-reported internalizing and externalizing problems (assessed using the CBCL) of the child ~ Child maltreatment (assessed using the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire) was significantly related to all of the outcome variables (CBCL, YSR, and Trauma Symptom Checklist), with higher levels of maltreatment associated with higher levels of child distress levels. ~ Younger children were more likely to have self-reported internalizing problems and anxiety ~ Higher levels of childhood maltreatment were related to significantly higher levels of maternal reported internalizing and externalizing problems, child reported internalizing and externalizing problems, anxiety, depression, PTSD, dissociation and sexual concerns ~ With high levels of IPV, childhood maltreatment was related to increased levels of mother-reported internalizing problems of the child, as well as child reported externalizing problems, anxiety, depression, anger, PTSD and dissociation, however child maltreatment levels were not significantly related to any of the dependent variables when mothers reported</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables - Table 5. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in childhood and adolescence

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
		<p>married, 18.5% were married, 15% were separated/divorced, 18.5% had current partner, 17% were cohabiting; 60% were Baptist</p>		<p>lower levels of IPV.</p>
<p>Moylan, C.A., Herrenkohl, T.I., Sousa, C., Tajima, E.A., Herrenkohl, R.C., Russo, M.J. (2010). The effects of child abuse and exposure to domestic violence on adolescent internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 25, 53-63.</p>	<p>404 children</p>	<p>~ 221 males; 183 females ~ 80.7% white, 11.2% biracial, and 5.3% African American ~ 86% of children were at the initial assessment from 2-parent households; 63% of families had incomes below \$700 per month in 1976-1977 (first assessment).</p>	<p>~ Lehigh Longitudinal Study ~ Recruited from two county area of Pennsylvania from child welfare abuse and protective services programs ~ Data collected from parental and adolescent interviews ~ Data from the adolescent assessment are from face-to-face interviews and individually administered questionnaires with parents and youth</p>	<p>~ 101 respondents (46 males, 55 females) were categorized as in the ‘double whammy’ group - they had been exposed to both domestic violence and child abuse. ~ Compared to non-exposure, dual exposure was associated with all tested outcomes (YSR, BDI & delinquency- assessed using ‘Delinquent Acts’ measure). ~ Dual exposure was found to be significantly predictive of all the externalizing outcomes and some internalizing behaviors (anxious/depressed and BDI depression); dual exposure found to be a marginally significant predictor of somatic complaints. ~ When dual exposure group used as a reference group to which the ‘abuse-only’ or the ‘DV-only’ groups were compared - only in the models for depression and delinquency were child abuse only or DV only significantly lower on outcomes than the dual exposure group.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Neidig, P., & Thorn, G. (1995). Violent marriages: Gender differences in levels of current violence and past abuse. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> , 10(2), 159-176.	199 adult couples	~ Husbands: Mean age of 26 years (SD= 5.6 years); mean years of education- 12.1 years (SD= .93); 48.7% African American, 47.7% Caucasian; ~ Wives: Mean age of 24.7 years (SD= 6.0 years); mean years of education- 11.6 years (SD=1.54); 46.7% African American, 47.2% Caucasian. ~ Couples married on average 3.7 years (SD=4.08 years) ~ 85% of couples living together at intake	~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Retrospective reports of subjects witnessing domestic violence between their parents. ~ Recruited from military couples mandated for marital violence treatment at several U.S. military installations	~ 83% of couples were classified as mutually physically aggressive; ~ For husbands, the level of childhood victimization was significantly correlated with the level of marital violence perpetrated; relationship held after partialling out the effects of witnessing parental marital violence ~ Significant correlations were reported between childhood victimization and level of marital victimization obtained for both husbands and wives, even after controlling for childhood witnessing of parental IPV. ~ For husbands, the level to which they were hit by their mothers accounted for 9% of the variance in predicting their current perpetration of marital violence. ~ For wives, the level at which their mothers yelled at them accounted for 9% of the variance in predicting their current perpetration of marital aggression. ~ For both husbands and wives, the only significant predictor of their current victimization in their marriage was whether they were beaten by their father as a child – for wives this accounted for 21% of the variance, while for husbands it accounted for 9% of the variance.
Silvern, L., Karyl, J., Waelde, L., Hodges, W.,	550 college students	~ 287 females, 263 males ~ 71.8% between	~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Retrospective	~ Of the 118 women who reported exposure to DV, 61 (51.7%) reported childhood physical abuse, 40 (34.2%) reported childhood sexual

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Starek, J., Heidt, E., & Min, K. (1995). Retrospective reports of parental partner abuse: Relationships to depression, trauma symptoms and self-esteem among college students, <i>Journal of Family Violence, 10</i>(2), 177-202.</p>		<p>18-19 years of age; 24.9% between 20-23 years of age; 2.3% fell into older categories ~ Sample almost entirely Caucasian, all required to have English as their primary language ~ 45.2% of sample reported their parents' combined annual income exceeded \$50,000; 17.2% reported annual parental income of \$30,000 or less.</p>	<p>reports of childhood ~ Recruited through classes at a state university</p>	<p>abuse; 23 (20%) reported experiencing both childhood physical and sexual abuse ~ Of the 85 men who reported exposure to DV, 30 (35.3%) reported childhood physical abuse, 10 (11.8%) reported childhood sexual abuse, and 6 (7.0%) reported experiencing both childhood physical and sexual abuse. ~ For both men and women, reports of exposure to parental partner abuse were significantly associated with reports of childhood physical and sexual abuse. ~ A slight reduction was seen in adjustment scores for females when childhood abuse exposure was controlled for, however exposure to parental abuse was still significantly related to BDI and Coopersmith Self-Esteem scores, Trauma Symptom Checklist scores no longer reached significance ~ For both genders, when childhood abuse was partialled out, the TSC was reduced to a non-significant trend, suggesting that concomitant child abuse substantially contributed to relationships of partner abuse to the TSC.</p>
<p>Henning, K., Leitenberg, H., Coffey, P., Turner, T., & Bennett, R.T. (1996). Long-term</p>	<p>617 women</p>	<p>~ Age range- 19 to 87 years; Mean age of 42.5 years ~ 30% never married, 54% currently married,</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Community sample from Burlington, VT; took part in a large community survey</p>	<p>~ Significantly more respondents in the witness group (42.9%) reported having been physically abused during childhood, compared to only 10.9% within the non-witness group ~ The witness (assessed using the CTS) and non-witness groups continued to be significantly</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>psychological and social impact of witnessing physical conflict between parents. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11(1), 35-51.</i></p>		<p>12% separated or divorced, 4% widowed ~ Mean level of education was ‘some college experience’ ~ Average family income was \$30,000 ~ 97% of respondents were Caucasian</p>	<p>assessing impact of various childhood traumatic experiences on adult women’s functioning ~ Women at random, chosen from the voter registration list, were sent questionnaires</p>	<p>different on both outcome measures (Brief Symptom Inventory & Social Provisions Scale) even after controlling for experiencing physical abuse in childhood ~ 96% of the witness group had at least one of the other three family risk factors assessed: physical child abuse, witnessing inter-parental verbal discord and lower perceived parental caring</p>
<p>Maker, A.H., Kemmelmeier, M., & Peterson, C. (1998). Long-term psychological consequences in women of witnessing parental physical conflict and experiencing abuse in childhood. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13, 574-589.</i></p>	<p>131 female college students</p>	<p>~ Age range: 18-43; Mean age of 22.2 years ~ 69.9% Caucasian; 14.5% African American; 3.8% Asian. ~ 86.3% never married; 9.2% currently married; 3.8% separated or divorced ~ Majority of the sample came from middle class families ~ 3 groups created: 1) No witnessing</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Recruited from community colleges in the Midwest</p>	<p>~ Experiencing childhood sexual abuse (assessed using Finkelhor’s Childhood Victimization Questionnaire) was significantly related to witnessing any marital DV in childhood ~ Witnessing DV in their family of origin was significantly related to all negative outcomes of antisocial behaviors (assessed using the Antisocial Behavior Checklist), depressive symptoms (assessed using the BDI), trauma symptoms (as assessed using the Trauma Symptom Checklist) compared to controls; however, these significant differences were no longer found after controlling for childhood sexual and physical abuse. ~ Multivariate comparisons still significant after controlling for exposure to sexual and physical abuse.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
		DV (control; $n=85$); 2) Witnessed Moderate DV ($n=31$); 3) Witnessed Severe DV ($n=10$)		
Feerick, M.M. & Haugaard, J.J. (1999). Long-term effects of witnessing marital violence for women: The contribution of childhood physical and sexual abuse. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 14</i> (4), 377- 398.	313 undergraduates	~ All female ~ Respondents ranged in age from 17 to 36 years; Mean age of 20 years ~ 74% Caucasian, 5% Latina, 4% African American, 13% Asian, 5% Other Ethnic groups	~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Undergraduate students recruited at Cornell University	~Exposure to domestic violence and child abuse was assessed using the Childhood Sexual Abuse interview & endorsement of a list of potentially traumatic experiences. ~ High proportions of women who witnessed marital violence also reported childhood physical and sexual abuse experiences ~ Women who witnessed marital violence, were more likely than women who did not witness, to report having been physically and/or sexually abused as a child; however, these significant findings disappeared after controlling for demographic characteristics and abuse variables. ~ No effects of witnessing marital violence or interactions between witnessing marital violence and childhood physical or sexual abuse on the Hopkins Symptom Checklist, Dysfunctional Sexual Behavior Scale of the Trauma Symptom Inventory, or the distress subscale of the Social Avoidance and Distress Scale. ~ A significant effect of witnessing marital violence on the number of PTSD symptoms (as assessed using the PTSD module of the SCID;

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
				<p>The Trust Scale) reported, indicating that witnesses reported more PTSD symptoms than non-witnesses.</p> <p>~ A significant interaction was found between witnessing marital violence and childhood physical abuse on the Avoidance subscale of the Social Avoidance and Distress Scale with witnesses with histories of childhood physical abuse had increased social avoidance.</p>
<p>Dube, S.R., Anda, R.F., Felitti, V.J., Edwards, V.J., & Williamson, D.F. (2002). Exposure to abuse, neglect and household dysfunction among adults who witnessed intimate partner violence as children: Implications for health and social services. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 17(1), 3-17.</p>	<p>17,337 adult males and females</p>	<p>~ 54% females; 46% males ~ Mean age 55 for females; 58 for males ~ 73% of females and 76% of males were Caucasian ~ 47% of females and 53% of males were college graduates ~ 37% of females and 34% of males had some college education</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Retrospective reporting on exposure to violence in childhood ~ Adult HMO members completed the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) questionnaire-retrospective assessment of childhood up to age 18 ~ ACEs include: verbal abuse; physical abuse; sexual abuse; emotional neglect; physical neglect; household substance</p>	<p>~ Positive correlation between frequency of witnessing IPV (assessed using the CTS) and the likelihood of experiencing childhood emotional, physical and sexual abuse, and emotional and physical neglect.</p> <p>~ Every category of ACEs was strongly associated with growing up with a battered mother</p> <p>~ Of the female respondents who reported witnessing IPV, 39% reported the co-occurrence of emotional neglect, 26.7% physical neglect, 37.7% emotional abuse, 58.8% physical abuse, and 42.6% sexual abuse.</p> <p>~ Of the male respondents who reported witnessing IPV, 31.9% reported the co-occurrence of emotional neglect, 28.7% physical neglect, 25.2% emotional abuse, 61.4% physical abuse, and 28.4% sexual abuse.</p> <p>~ Females who grew up with a battered mother were 3.9 times more likely to suffer emotional</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
			abuse; mental illness in household; parental separation and divorce; incarcerated household member ~ IPV defined as male perpetrated violence against women.	abuse while males were 4.1 time more likely to suffer emotional abuse
Dong, M., Anda, R.F., Dube, S.R., Giles, W.H., Felitti, V.J. (2003). The relationship of exposure to childhood sexual abuse to other forms of abuse, neglect, and household dysfunction during childhood. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i> , 27, 625-639.	17,337 adult males and females	~ 9,367 (54%) female; 7,970 (46%) male ~ Mean age 55 (SD=15.7) for females; 57 (SD=14.6) for males ~ Caucasian: 75% of females, 76% of males ~ College graduate: 35% of females, 45% of males ~ Some college education: 37% of females, 34% of males ~ No high school graduation: 8% of females, 6% of males	~ Cross-sectional; self-report; Retrospective report of witnessing domestic violence ~ Secondary analysis of one wave of data from the longitudinal Adverse Child Experiences (ACE) study ~ All variables assessed through the ACE questionnaire containing detailed questions about childhood abuse, neglect, and growing up with household dysfunction ~ All questions focused on the first 18	~ Witnessing domestic violence was assessed using the CTS, childhood sexual abuse was assessed using four questions from Wyatt (1985) and all other forms of childhood abuse were assessed using the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire. ~ 21% of the whole sample reported having experienced sexual abuse in childhood (24.7% of females, 16% of males); 13% reported having been exposed to the battering of their mother (13.7% of females, 11.5% of males) ~ Of those who were sexually abused in childhood 23.6% of those females and 20.5% of those males were also exposed to battering of their mother. ~ Females who were sexually abused in childhood were 2.6 times more likely to be exposed to the battering of their mother compared to those not sexually abused ~ Males who were sexually abused in childhood were 2.3 times more likely to be exposed to the

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Caetano, R., Field, C.A., & Nelson, S. (2003). Association between childhood physical abuse, exposure to parental violence, and alcohol problems in adulthood. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18</i>, 240-256.</p>	<p>2,880 adult males and females</p>	<p>~ 1,440 couples ~ 1,110 Whites, 716 Blacks, 1,054 Hispanics ~ No other demographic information reported.</p>	<p>years of life ~Cross-sectional; self-report; retrospective reports of childhood abuse and witnessing IPV ~ Multistage household probability sampling procedure from individuals 18+ years of age who were either married or cohabiting and living in households in the 48 contiguous States. ~ Hour-long face-to-face interviews completed at respondents homes</p>	<p>battering of their mother compared to those not sexually abused ~ Exposure to interparental violence was assessed by asking whether they had observed their parents/guardians had threatened one another with physical violence or were violent with one another. Childhood abuse was assessed by asking whether their parents/guardians had ever hit them, beaten them up, burned/scalded etc. ~ Alcohol related problems (assessed using closed ended questions about drinking frequency, quantity and incidence of alcohol related problems) were 2 times higher among White and Black males and 1.5 times higher among Hispanic males who reported severe childhood physical abuse than among those who did not have such an experience ~ Observation of violence or threat of violence between parents is significantly associated with alcohol-related problems in adulthood among Black males, but not White or Hispanic males ~ For males, the presence of childhood physical abuse together with the observation of threat or actual violence between parents was protective against alcohol problems.</p>
<p>Clemmons, J.C., DiLillo, D., Martinez, I.G., DeGue, S., &</p>	<p>112 females</p>	<p>~ Entire sample of Mexican American descent ~ Mean age of 22.63</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Undergraduate sample from university</p>	<p>~ Both witnessing domestic violence and childhood maltreatment assessed using the Child Maltreatment Interview Schedule-Short Form ~ Of those exposed to domestic violence, 89%</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Jeffcott, M. (2003). Co-occurring forms of child maltreatment and adult adjustment reported by Latina college students. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i>, 27, 751-767.</p>		<p>and ranged from 18 to 49 years of age ~ 90% of the sample were unmarried (never married, cohabiting, separated/divorced)</p>	<p>in south central Texas ~ Recruited from an undergraduate psychology class</p>	<p>reported witnessing their father hit their mother. ~ Of those witnessing abuse 47% reported viewing bi-directional violence between parents and 47% reported witnessing violence that necessitated medical treatment of police involvement. ~ Significant differences were found on Trauma Symptom Checklist (TSC) scores between those who had experienced 2+ forms of maltreatment compared to those who experienced no maltreatment. ~ No differences were found between TSC scores of those with one maltreatment type and those who had not been maltreated. ~ Females who had experienced 2+ types of maltreatment reported experiencing more severe maltreatment than those with single types of maltreatment.</p>
<p>Davies, C.A., DiLillo, D., & Martinez, I.G. (2004). Isolating adult psychological correlates of witnessing parental violence: Findings from a predominantly</p>	<p>142 undergraduates</p>	<p>~ All female ~ Age ranged from 18 to 50 years old; Mean age of 23.57 years. ~ 80% Mexican American, 11% White, 6% African American, 1% Native American, 1% Asian, 1% Other</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Retrospective reports of witnessing DV and childhood maltreatment ~ Recruited from Psychology class at an all-female university in south central Texas</p>	<p>~ Witnessing DV continued to predict adult functioning across all three measures (self-esteem assessed using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; Depression assessed using the Self-Rating Depression Scale; and trauma symptoms assessed using the Trauma Symptom Checklist) beyond that which was explained by other forms of maltreatment ~ Neither childhood physical nor sexual abuse (assessed using the Child Maltreatment Interview Schedule-Short Form) significantly predicted</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Latina sample. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 19(6), 377-385.</i></p>		<p>Ethnicity ~ 91% were not married (never been married, cohabiting, separated or divorced); 9% were married ~ Predominantly of middle socioeconomic status</p>		<p>trauma-related symptoms, depressive symptoms, or poor self-esteem in adulthood.</p>
<p>Dong, M., Anda, R.F., Felitti, V.J., Dube, S.R., Williamson, D.F., Thompson, T.J., Loo, C.M., & Giles, W.H. (2004). The interrelatedness of multiple forms of childhood abuse, neglect and household dysfunction. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect, 28, 771-784.</i></p>	<p>8,629 adult males and females</p>	<p>~ 54% female; Mean age for females was 55 years, for males 57 years ~ 73% of females and 75% of males were Caucasian, 32% of females, and 42% of males were college graduates; another 42% of females, and 39% of males had some college education</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report; retrospective reports of witnessing domestic violence ~ Secondary analysis of one wave of data from the longitudinal Adverse Child Experiences (ACE) study ~ All variables assessed through the ACE questionnaire containing detailed questions about childhood abuse, neglect, and growing up with household</p>	<p>~ Domestic violence and emotional/physical childhood abuse was assessed using the CTS (only asked about male perpetrated violence); emotional and physical neglect assessed using the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ) ~ Of participants who reported witnessing domestic violence: 31.3% also experienced emotional abuse; 57.5% also experienced physical abuse; 36.4% also experienced sexual abuse; 35.9% also experienced emotional neglect; and 27.5% also experienced physical neglect.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Renner, L.M. & Slack K.S. (2006). Intimate Partner Violence and child maltreatment: Understanding intra- and intergenerational connections. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i>, 30, 599-617.</p>	<p>1,005 females</p>	<p>~ Mean age at wave 3 was 33.43 ~ 58% never married ~63% were teenaged parents ~ 81% Non-Hispanic/Black; 7% Non-Hispanic/White; ~ 50% graduated high school</p>	<p>dysfunction ~ All questions focused on the first 18 years of life ~ Longitudinal; self-report; retrospective report of witnessing domestic violence ~Illinois Families Study- longitudinally tracks families receiving TANF; ~Utilized data from first three waves of collection (1999/2000; 2001; 2002); ~Official child maltreatment reports between Jan 1980 and June 2002 utilized</p>	<p>~ Strongest association found between childhood physical abuse and witnessing IPV (assessed using the CTS) in childhood ~ Never marrying is inversely associated with the co-occurrence of IPV and child maltreatment ~ Childhood physical abuse, sexual abuse and witnessing of IPV were all positively associated with the occurrence of IPV during adulthood ~ Respondents with a history of childhood sexual or physical abuse were three times more likely to have IPV and child maltreatment co-occur in adulthood (i.e. they were more likely to perpetrate or their partner was more likely to perpetrate).</p>
<p>McKinney, C.M., Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & Nelson, S. (2008). Childhood family violence and perpetration and victimization of intimate partner</p>	<p>1615 couples</p>	<p>~Couples from age 18+ ~ 3 witnessing groups and 1 comparison group ~ Non-Reciprocal Male to Female Violence (n=63): 73.8% White; 5.5%</p>	<p>~ Cross-sectional; self-report ~ Multi-stage cluster sampling of U.S. household population in 1995 ~ Face to face interviews; Structured questionnaire</p>	<p>~ Witnessing domestic violence was assessed using the CTS; experiencing childhood abuse was assessed by structured questions. ~ 65.4% of males reported a history of childhood physical abuse, 6.9% of which were within the severe category; 51% of females reported a history of childhood physical abuse, 8.1% of which were within the severe category ~ Males who experienced child-family violence</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>violence: Findings from a national population-based study of couples. <i>Annals of Epidemiology</i>, 19(1), 25-32.</p>		<p>Black, 10.8% Hispanic; 9% Mixed/Other; 45% had household income \$40,000+ ~ Non-Reciprocal Female to Male Violence (n=147): 70.9% White; 8.7% Black, 8.3% Hispanic; 12.1% Mixed/Other; 44.6% had household income \$40,000+ ~ Reciprocal IPV (n=239): 61.9% White; 13.0% Black; 7.9% Hispanic; 17.2% Mixed/Other; 36.5% had household income \$40,000+ ~ Non IPV (n=1166): 80.4% White; 5.7% Black; 6.5% Hispanic; 7.5% Mixed/Other; 48.5% had household income</p>		<p>were more than three times as likely to perpetrate non-reciprocal MFPV relative to men with no history of childhood family violence ~ Females exposed to child-family violence appeared to be more than twice as likely to be victims of non-reciprocal MFPV compared to women without this childhood history ~ Males who were exposed to child-family violence appeared more likely to be victims of non-reciprocal FMPV compared to men without this history. ~ Females who experienced child-family violence were more likely to perpetrate non-reciprocal FMPV than their counterparts ~ Men who experienced severe or moderate child-family violence were more than twice as likely to engage in reciprocal IPV compared to males with no history of childhood family violence ~ Females who experienced severe child-family violence were more than three times as likely to engage in reciprocal IPV compared to women with not childhood family violence history.</p>

PASK#7 Online Tables – Table 6. The impact of exposure to IPV and child maltreatment in adulthood

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method & Design	Results
<p>Kulkarni, M.R., Graham-Bermann, S., Rauch, S., & Seng, J. (2010). Witnessing versus experiencing direct violence in childhood as correlates of adulthood PTSD. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26(6)</i>, 1264-1281.</p>	<p>1,581 women</p>	<p>\$40,000+</p> <p>~ Pregnant women from Southeast Michigan</p> <p>~ Mean age of 26 years old</p> <p>~ Ethnicity- 4.2% Latina, 2.3% Middle Eastern, 7.2% Asian, 44.9% African American, 45.9% European American, .4% American Indian & 1.5% Pacific Islander</p> <p>~ 23% of sample had average annual household income of less than \$15,000</p> <p>~ 46.2% had a high school education or less</p> <p>~ 60% of participants were currently in a romantic relationship</p>	<p>~ Secondary analysis of data from Stress, Trauma, Anxiety and the Childbearing Year Project (STACY)- a prospective, longitudinal, multiple cohort study that examines the relationship between PTSD and adverse childbearing outcomes from early pregnancy through postpartum period</p> <p>~ Computer assisted telephone survey</p>	<p>~ Witnessing of domestic violence was assessed using the Abuse Assessment Screen</p> <p>~ 20.6% of sample reported witnessing IPV, 7.7% reported experiencing child abuse and 13.6% reported both witnessing abuse and experiencing child abuse</p> <p>~ Participants in the witnessed and combined groups (witnessing abuse & child abuse) were at significantly greater socio demographic risk- they were younger, had lower income, were less educated and were less likely to be currently be in a partnered relationship</p> <p>~ The combined group endorsed significantly more adulthood trauma (assessed using the Life Stressor Checklist Revised) than the witness group but did not significantly differ from the abuse group</p> <p>~ The combined group also had significantly more lifetime non-abuse potential trauma (assessed using the Life Stressor Checklist Revised) exposure than did the abused and witness groups</p> <p>~ The combination of witnessing DV and experiencing child abuse group had the highest percentages of both current and lifetime diagnoses of PTSD (assessed using the National Women’s Study PTSD Module)</p>