

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Understanding the Nexus: Domestic Violence and Substance Abuse Among the Arrestee Population in Albuquerque

Author(s): Sandra Woerle ; Paul Guerin ; Mary L. Smith

Document No.: 196667

Date Received: October 03, 2002

Award Number: 98-IJ-CX-0031

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

<p>Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.</p>

**UNDERSTANDING THE NEXUS:
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE AMONG
THE ARRESTEE POPULATION IN ALBUQUERQUE**

JANUARY 2002

196667
c.1

PROPERTY OF
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

SUBMITTED BY

**SANDRA WOERLE
PROJECT MANAGER**

**PAUL GUERIN
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR**

**MARY LINDSEY SMITH
RESEARCH COORDINATOR**

FINAL REPORT

Approved By: _____

Date: _____

Archie
[Signature]
8/25/02
PR 4/2/02

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

NIJ GRANT #98-IJ-CX-0031

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Understanding the Nexus: Domestic Violence and Substance Abuse Among the Arrestee Population In Albuquerque (Grant #98-IJ-CX-0031) awarded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to the Institute for Social Research (ISR) held great promise of providing much needed information on the concurrence of substance abuse and domestic violence. The then recent award of Albuquerque as the 25th Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (ADAM) site provided a platform from which to administer a domestic violence addendum. The combining of the two interview instruments would provide a wealth of information enhanced by the verification of recent drug use available through urine specimen results. Unfortunately, the original intent of the project could not be met under the protocols of the ADAM program. Adaptations were made to the domestic violence instrument to accommodate the interviewing of a sample of all recent arrestees, not simply those arrested for domestic violence, to examine their self-reported drug use during the most recent incidence of domestic violence. A total of 696 domestic violence interviews were conducted over six collection periods during the years 1999-2001.

The primary research questions were:

- Are acts of domestic violence committed while the offender is taking some sort of illicit psychoactive substances as ascertained by self-reports?
- For those individuals with domestic violence charges, do urinalyses conducted within 48 hours of an individual's arrest indicate the recent use of a psychoactive substance?
- Which substances are most prevalently associated with incidents of domestic violence?
- Is there a difference in levels of aggressive behavior that is relational to the individual?
- Does the severity of domestic violence increase with the presence of psychoactive substances?

- What differences (if any) exist between batterers who take psychoactive substances and batterers who do not?

In response to the questions presented above, between 28.8 percent and 38.3 percent of domestic violence cases were committed while the abuser was taking a psychoactive substance prior to the episode. Verification of drug use during an incidence of domestic violence was possible for only 59 cases. While this sample size is too small to make any kind of predictive statement, it is interesting to note that nearly half (48.9%) tested positive for some type of illegal drug. Self-reported drug use was lower than ADAM-reported drug use. For Albuquerque arrestees, multiple drug use is most prevalently associated with incidents of domestic violence with marijuana the most frequently named drug.

From the analysis of the data, it was found that:

- A high rate of interaction is involved between the abuser and the abused. In other words, those who abuse are also abused and those who are abused are also abusers.
- A history of family violence is consistently significant in models predicting intimate partner violence and level of severity for domestic violence.
- Drug and/or alcohol use prior to the most recent incident of domestic violence increases the likelihood that the acts of partner violence will be severe.
- Females are more likely to be the victim of severe domestic violence. Women are over-represented in the number who experienced choking (63.0%), been slammed against a wall or other hard surface (54.7%), beaten-up (61.2%), burned or scalded on purpose (41.9%), forced to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex (75.0%), or had oral, anal, or vaginal sex because of threats.
- 70% of all females in the sample were victims of intimate partner violence in their lifetime, while 66.5% of the males had been victims in their lifetimes.
- 51.8% of the males and 67.5% of the females admitted to abusing an intimate partner at some point in his/her life.

Differences in levels of aggressive behavior as measured by the severity of the

domestic violence act taken from the modified Conflict Tactic Scale were attributed to a history of family violence in family of orientation and drug or alcohol use prior to the most recent incidence of domestic violence. The presence of a psychotic substance in connection with domestic violence increased the likelihood that the act will be severe. In addition, females are less likely than males to commit a severe act of domestic violence, and they are more likely to suffer from a severe act of domestic violence.

Due to limitations of the study, it is recommended that this study be restricted in its use for practitioners and policy makers. A responsible use of the findings would focus on the availability of treatment services in the Albuquerque area and an examination of treatment methodologies to ensure an integrated system that can provide appropriate care for individuals who experience both substance abuse and domestic violence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	7
Introduction.....	8
Overview of Domestic Violence.....	10
Battering Typologies.....	14
Substance Abuse and Domestic Violence.....	17
Research Questions.....	20
Difficulties in Study Completion.....	26
Description of Data.....	31
Alcohol and Drug Use in the Sample.....	40
Analysis of the Data.....	43
Discussion of the Findings.....	50
Conclusion.....	53
Bibliography.....	55
Appendix A (Instrument).....	62
Appendix B (Codes).....	70

CHARTS AND TABLES

Table 1: Race/Ethnic Background by Sex.....	32
Table 2: Violent Behavior by Sex.....	37
Table 3: Injuries Received/ Caused by Sex.....	39
Table 4: Logistic Regression Coefficients of Being an Abuser of an Intimate Partner in Past 12 Months.....	45
Table 5: Logistic Regression Coefficients of Level of Abuse Committed by an Abuser in Past 12 Months.....	46
Table 6: Logistic Regression Coefficients of Being Abused by an Intimate Partner in Past 12 Months.....	48
Table 7: Logistic Regression Coefficients of Level of Abuse Received from an Intimate Partner in Past 12 Months.....	49

ABSTRACT

This study examined violence between intimate partners within an arrestee population in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The study employed logistic regression to identify social indicators that may increase the likelihood of a respondent being a perpetrator of intimate partner violence. The focus of the study was to determine the difference between arrestees who have battered an intimate partner and those who did not, and what role drug and/or alcohol use may have played in the level of abuse. Results from various models showed drug or alcohol use prior to the most recent incident of domestic violence and a history of violence in the family of orientation were statistically significant in predicting severe intimate partner abuse. Additionally, this study revealed a high rate of violent interaction between abuser and abused. Unfortunately, several methodological problems prevent the generalizability of this study thus limiting its usefulness for policy development.

INTRODUCTION

This study is situated within the larger context of aggressive behavior in general and, more specifically, family violence. While family violence takes on many forms (e.g., spousal abuse, child abuse, sibling brawls, and elderly abuse), this study addresses violence between intimate partners within an arrestee population in the Albuquerque metropolitan area. The focus of this study is to examine levels of aggressive behavior during incidents of domestic violence in relation to self-reported drug and alcohol use. Along the way, social factors that contribute to intimate partner violence among arrestees are identified.

The investigator initiated grant, *Understanding the Nexus: Domestic Violence and Substance Abuse Among the Arrestee Population in Albuquerque* (Grant #98-IJ-CX-0031) awarded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to the Institute for Social Research (ISR), was proposed to enhance national understanding of the relationship among substance abuse, domestic violence, and contributing personal and environmental factors. Yet, of greater importance, were the implications for Bernalillo County and the State of New Mexico. That is, prior to this data collection, there were no data available in New Mexico that systematically documented the concurrence of substance abuse and domestic violence; however, scattered data sources indicated the prevalence of domestic violence in Albuquerque. For example, in 1999, there were 6,653 incidents of domestic violence reported to law enforcement agencies within Bernalillo County. In addition, service calls to the Albuquerque Police Department (APD) totaled more than 15,000; and domestic violence-related filings in Metropolitan Court totaled over 5,000.

The selection of Albuquerque by NIJ as the 25th site in the newly revamped Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) program provided the framework for this study on domestic violence. The ISR gained access to pre-established connections with the local criminal justice system via the Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (ADAM) program and, hence, facilitated the data collection process by establishing a national sample protocol. The selection of an arrestee population as the focus of study limited the generalizability of the final results; however, the ADAM platform provided timely data for analysis.

The design of the domestic violence instrument used in this study took into account feminist critiques of the Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS) by including a contextual field regarding episodes of violence and a listing of injuries resulting from domestic violence. However, this domestic violence study is, by no means, exhaustive in its attempt at differentiating male and female violence since its main goal is to examine the relationship between substance abuse and domestic violence. Therefore, rather than using a sociocultural approach that identifies characteristics of society that promote social tolerance of violence (Carlson, Worden, van Ryn, and Bachman 2000:17), this study uses a more conducive approach that analyzes social structural risk markers. The social structural risk markers approach includes social and economic factors that increase the probability of involvement in domestic violence such as income, residence, available services, relationship status, and history of family violence (Carlson *et. al.* 2000:17-24). Although the availability of some of these variables was limited, the ISR made every attempt to collect these variables within the parameters of the ADAM protocol.

Further, this study takes into account an individual's early influences within the family of orientation while remaining mindful of external forces such as age, race, and gender.

Although personality behavioral models have been employed heavily in other disciplines (Cesar 1986; Elbow 1977; Hamberger and Hastings 1986; Saunders 1987; Wodarski 1987), no such models were employed in this study. Moreover, in this study, the identification of batterers follows from an analysis of self-reported behavior in relation to severity and type of violence and self-reported use of drugs and/or alcohol. A limited application of the ADAM program's urine analysis was conducted in conjunction with the domestic violence project and the levels of alcohol use examined in the study rely on self-reported data. A subset of questions in this study relate to the differences between arrestees who have battered an intimate partner in the past 12 months and those who did not, and what role drug and/or alcohol use may have played in the level of severity. This study examines self-reported batterers and explores what social factors account for differences between batterers and non-batterers. The ISR identifies which of these social factors are more strongly associated with intimate partner violence. Moreover, this report employs logistic regression to ascertain the likelihood of a respondent being a perpetrator of intimate partner violence. This employment allows for the identification of social indicators that may increase the likelihood of a person committing an act of domestic violence. This information is essential in acknowledging the role chemical abuse plays in domestic violence and how best to design an intervention to the problem.

OVERVIEW OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

According to the U.S. Department of Justice, *assault* is defined as an unlawful physical attack by one person upon another. It is estimated that between three to four million women in the U.S. experience physical abuse by their intimate partners (Harris

and Cook 1994:553), making the home the most dangerous place for risk of assault, physical injury, and murder (Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz 1980). According to Tjaden and Thoennes (2000), 1.3 million women and 834,732 men were physically assaulted by an intimate partner in the U.S. during a 12-month study period. Acts of violence between members of the same family is an age-old phenomenon and, yet, research, theory, and practice in this field are less than three decades old. Domestic violence incurs medical expenses of at least three billion dollars annually; businesses lose another one hundred million in sick leave, absenteeism, and non-productivity (LaFree, Guerin, and Morrison 1997). A national survey of criminal justice practitioners revealed that over 90 percent of police, sheriffs, prosecutors, and public defenders reported that domestic violence cases were moderate to major contributors to their workload (U.S. Department of Justice 1994). As reported in the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), victimization by intimates (spouses, ex-spouses, boyfriends, girlfriends, and former boyfriends and girlfriends) accounts for 21 percent of the violent crime experienced by women and approximately 2 percent experienced by men.

Definitions of domestic violence are difficult to construct because the types of attacks associated with this form of violence encompass more than physical attacks and include the use of threats, insults, and isolation. Possibly, the most widely used definition of violence was proposed by Straus, Gelles, and Steinmentz (1980) in their landmark national survey of family violence referred to as the National Family Violence Survey (NFVS). In this survey, violence was defined as "an act carried out with the intention, or perceived intention, of causing physical pain or injury to another person" (Straus *et. al.* 1980:20). Using this definition, family violence may vary in extent from a shove to the

use of a lethal weapon against another household member, but excludes the emotional, sexual, and psychological aspects of intimate partner violence. Definitions employed within the National Violence Against Women (NVAW) Survey expanded the concept of violence against intimate partners to include specific episodes of rape and stalking, although intimate partner violence only included the physical aspects of violence. Unlike the NFVS, the NVAW Survey included both same-sex and opposite-sex couples regardless of cohabiting status. However, both national surveys omitted the equally damaging psychological aspects of violence that have been included in some smaller-scale studies (Marshall 1999; O'Leary 1999; Tolman 1999).

With greater research on domestic violence, the acts of intimate partner violence were refined to differentiate among varying degrees of violent behavior; for instance, Straus and Gelles (1986) distinguish between mild and severe forms of partner violence. Through their research efforts, Straus and Gelles (1986) developed the CTS that now functions as a standard measurement instrument for a continuum of confrontational tactics of domestic violence. These tactics may include minor offenses such as throwing something, pushing, grabbing, shoving, and slapping; severe violence includes biting, punching, hitting with an object, beating up, choking, burning or scalding, threatening with a gun or knife, and using a gun or knife (Straus *et. al.* 1980). However, critics of the CTS claim that a woman who slaps her husband's hand is placed into the perpetrator category along with the man who slaps his wife in the face. The validity of such criticisms that address the overlooking of actions taken by women in self-defense and confounding acts with outcomes led to the current paradigmatic divide between

perspectives of the “family violence approach” represented by Straus *et. al.* and the “feminist approach” seen in the work of Dobash and Dobash (1979) and Yllo (1988).

The work of Straus and Gelles, *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families* (1990) was based on the first attempt to measure the incidence of violence in a large and representative sample of American families. The results of this work were controversial in that family violence was presented as a pervasive, almost normal occurrence in a significant number of American families and that partner abuse was mutually conducted. The national survey took the emphasis off of selected populations of study but created hotly contested debates by confounding acts with outcomes and ignoring context according to its critics. Modifications to the CTS included a listing of injuries suffered from an intimate partner and a rephrasing of screening questions in order to appear less leading to the respondent (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000:23). These changes brought differing results to the nature of domestic violence even though the NVAW Survey was conducted by similar procedures to the NFVS. For example, the NFVS showed that men and women were equally likely to be physically assaulted by their intimate partner while the NVAW Survey reported that women were more likely to report being victimized by an intimate partner (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000:13-17).

Straus *et. al.* along with subsequent studies employing a specific methodology, found that the most common family situation was for both partners to be violent, with women physically assaulting men as often as men assaulted women (Fiebert 1997; Straus 1999; Straus and Gelles 1986). However, results from analyses of various studies involving the CTS on an offense-by-offense basis support the claim that men, in general, are more

violent than women because men are more likely to repeat the violence and render more serious damage to their victims (Saunders 1986; Straus *et. al.* 1980; Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). In addition, the number of wives who threw things at their husbands is found to be almost twice as large as the number of husbands who threw things at their wives, but husbands have a greater rate of pushing, shoving, slapping, beating-up, and actually using a knife or gun (Straus *et. al.* 1980:38). Interestingly, rates for kicking and hitting with an object (two more severe offenses) were higher for wives than for husbands; feminist scholars explain this by noting women need to employ self-defense techniques during episodes of partner violence. Therefore, the failure to capture the context of domestic violence episodes is the main weakness of the CTS.

Battering Typologies

Before 1975, research on domestic violence was restricted to a small number of studies of special populations that included college students, treatment clients, and even military personnel. In fact, researchers tended to view domestic violence as a rare occurrence and considered perpetrators as mentally ill or morally defective. The possibility that social factors such as race, income, education, and regional differences were related to violence in the family structure was often overlooked in early studies of domestic violence. Further, when social factors were considered, most researchers considered family violence as a lower, socio-economic class problem without considering why such members of this lower class stratum dominated the sample. While all families experience stress, the likelihood of experiencing the environmental stressors that contribute to family violence may be higher among members of minority and/or low-income groups since these populations tend to have lower incomes, lower educational

attainment, and lower life expectancy (Asbury 1993). In addition, unemployment dramatically increases the likelihood of violence in the home and increases the likelihood of a person's involvement with the criminal justice system.

To evaluate the relationship between substance abuse and domestic violence, demographic and environmental variables should be considered. That is, differences in income, race, educational attainment, and age must be documented in examining rates of domestic violence. Although no single risk factor predicts intimate partner violence, past research has shown that a number of factors might increase the likelihood of becoming a perpetrator and/or victim of domestic violence (Carlson *et. al.* 2000). These factors include: income, economic dependence, urban residence, lack of intervention services, cohabitation, age, and childhood exposure to violence (Carlson *et. al.* 2000:17-23).

In past studies, it was difficult to distinguish which factors contributed more to domestic violence such as belonging to a racial minority or being unemployed, because these studies did not consider the effects of socioeconomic status. Findings that racial groups tend to have the highest rates of violence led to the development of theories involving stress, discrimination, and frustration. Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980) concluded that race was more strongly related to types of family violence. For example, wife-to-husband abuse is more severe in minorities rather than simply overall higher prevalence. Another study that compared rates of spousal violence among Mexican-Americans, African-Americans, and Anglos found no evidence that indicated a greater propensity for violence among either Mexican-Americans or African-Americans (Neff, Holamon, and Schluter 1995). Yet, Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) found nonwhite women and men reported significantly more partner violence than whites.

In terms of educational attainment, early studies supported the view that the poorly educated were the most violent; however, later, more broadly based studies, showed a more complex relationship between intimate partner violence and education. For example, in the Straus *et. al.* study, the uneducated were the least likely to be violent. Further, the most violent fathers and husbands were those who had graduated from high school, while the least violent were grammar school dropouts and men with some college education (Straus *et. al.* 1980:146). In addition, age affects the rate of domestic violence. That is, while abuse occurs in every age group, the rates of each type of family violence are uniformly the highest in families where the respondent was under thirty years old; therefore, as the age increases the rate of violence decreases (Straus *et. al.* 1980:142). Further, according to Bonnie E. Carlson, *et. al.* (2000), age is one of the best determinants for physical and sexual violence for both victims and perpetrators, with younger people being at greater risk. Therefore, these contributing factors should be considered in any analysis of domestic violence data.

A compilation of studies reveals the social profile of a perpetrator of domestic violence to be a young husband under 30 years of age without a college education and low-income status (Condolg 1988; Gondolf 1999; Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart 1994; O'Leary, Malone, and Tyree 1994; Sugarman and Hotaling 1986). While studies that involved demographic information were an important early contribution, later, more sophisticated, studies of male batterers created exhaustive typologies that were developed from analysis of internal and external risk factors. Attempts to identify the characteristics of men who batter is crucial for those researchers in the treatment field since unique psychological and behavioral problems may be exhibited by specific types of batterers.

From these studies, varying forms of treatment interventions were designed to meet the needs of individual men.

In a multivariate analysis to examine risk markers in three differentiated groups, Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) found three primary correlates: high levels of marital conflict, lower socioeconomic status, and greater exposure to violent role models in the home of origin. Further analysis revealed six characteristics of male perpetrators: lower self-esteem, lower income levels and occupational status, more frequent abuse of alcohol, physical abuse as a child, and witness to parental violence while growing up. Similarly, an application of logistic regression found that occupational and employment status, subjective economic strain, and observance of parental violence positively affect spousal violence by men (Howell and Pugliesi 1988). A commonality to these individual risk marker studies is the presence of a history of violence in the family of origin. In fact, Carlson *et. al.* (2000:23) found that exposure to violence between one's parents or being the recipient of violent punishment are risk factors for violence toward intimates as an adult. A possible contributing factor to the perpetration of domestic violence, found missing in past studies, is the documentation for the presence of psychoactive substances prior to an episode of violent behavior.

Substance Abuse and Domestic Violence

Although studies on both substance abuse and family violence have grown independently as fields of research, there has been a gradual but steady recognition recently that these issues do not exist independently of each other but, rather, are highly related (Hayes and Emshoff 1993). Experts agree there is a connection between drug and alcohol abuse and domestic violence, but the precise nature remains unclear (US

Department of Health and Human Services, Tip 25). Even so, the nature of the association between domestic violence and alcohol has not been fully explored, while the association between family violence and the use of other psychoactive substances is articulated even less clearly (Conner and Ackerley 1994). In fact, research shows that both perpetrators and victims of domestic violence exhibit problems with substance abuse (Aldarondo and Kantor 1997; Collins 1998; Kaufman, Kantor and Jasinski 1998; Teets 1997). However, most studies that link substance abuse with domestic violence have focused upon alcohol, not illicit substances.

Complications arise in studies of victimization because substance abuse is both a predictor and effect of violent victimization (Kilpatrick 1997). Victims and batterers often turn to substance abuse for the numbing effects (US Department of Health and Human Services Tip 25). Although correlational data finds that over 50 percent of assailants are intoxicated at the time the violence was committed, it is difficult to draw causal inferences about the relationship between alcohol and aggression due to the confounding of several variables (Bushman 1997). It is unclear if the batterer is drunk and then violent or if drinking reduces inhibitions against violent behavior (Labell 1979). Sometimes alcohol reduces violence in some people. And, the fact remains, that non-substance abusing individuals also batter.

Despite gaps in the research, studies of sexual assault frequently document high rates of alcohol and other drug involvement (Ullman, Karabatsos, and Koss 1999). In general, alcohol and drug use is associated with a substantial proportion of human violence, and perpetrators of violent acts are often under the influence of one of more substances at the time of the violent act (Eighth Special Report to the U.S. Congress on Alcohol and

Health 1993). The use of alcohol in connection with other drugs, namely cocaine, is believed to increase the likelihood of an individual engaging in violent behavior (Denison, Paredes, and Booth 1997). While substance abuse is neither an excuse for, nor a direct cause of, family violence, several theories propose a relationship between the use of psychoactive substances and family violence. In addition, these theories typically rely upon such explanations as shared risk factors. For instance, some authors point out that violence and substance abuse share common individual, familial, and environmental risk factors (Hayes and Emshoff 1993). On the other hand, there are those researchers who maintain that the relationship between substance abuse and aggression is spurious, asserting that the association rests on cultural beliefs about the purpose and effects of substances rather than their actual properties. In other words, certain behaviors may be viewed with acceptance and even encouraged when an individual is under the influence of alcohol or some other psychoactive substance (Conner and Ackerley 1994).

The connection between alcohol, aggression, and intimate partner violence is evidenced by estimates that report the presence of alcohol in between 20 percent to 80 percent of marital violence situations (Barnett and Fagan 1993:2). According to other sources, 13 percent to 20 percent of intimate partners batter while under the influence of some other substance (Barnett and Fagan 1993:2). A dual problem with alcohol and other drugs is even more likely to be associated with more severe battering incidents than alcohol abuse alone (Hayes and Emshoff 1993). The wide discrepancy in the rate of chemical involvement in events of intimate violence makes it difficult for researchers to state absolutely that alcohol and/or drugs are a causal agent of domestic violence.

This study does not assume a linear-causal relationship between substance abuse and domestic violence. To do so, would imply that the cessation of substance use will lead to the cessation of violence (or vice versa), a limiting assumption that inhibits a sophisticated formulation of the relationship between domestic violence and substance abuse. However, the ISR staff does agree that alcohol and drugs lower the inhibitions that keep people from acting upon violent or sexually aggressive impulses and that substance use has the potential to exacerbate any psychiatric disorder or emotional instability the chemical user may have (Cicchetti and Olsen 1990; Curtis 1986; Finkelhor 1983). In addition, alcohol and other drug abuse affects the victims of domestic violence as well as the perpetrators.

“Abuse of alcohol or drugs, which may have origins in childhood victimization and the ongoing distress it causes, appears to be associated with the kind of lifestyle and male relationships that increase women’s risks for victimization and makes it more difficult for women to terminate abusive relationships” (Carlson *et al* 2000:24).

Ideally, the relationship between intimate partner violence and substance abuse should be examined from both the perpetrator and victim perspectives. However, this research project was designed specifically to examine perpetrators of domestic violence although we do take into account an individual’s history of victimization.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The original objective of this study was to document the presence or absence of substance use at the time that individuals were arrested for domestic violence. The main question, as stated in the original proposal, is “What particular type of drug (if any) was connected with intimate partner violence?” Verification was to come from the ADAM

urine analysis; however, due to ADAM protocol, domestic violence arrestees were not the sole respondents to our survey. In fact, recent arrestees for domestic violence charges were very few of the total sample. Therefore, adaptations were made to the domestic violence instrument in order to assess the influence of environmental factors to the occurrence of domestic violence. The contributions of alcohol and substance abuse on domestic violence were examined based on information gathered from self-reports of a sample from among all arrestees in Bernalillo County, New Mexico. Our primary research questions include:

- Are acts of domestic violence committed while the offender is taking some sort of illicit psychoactive substances as ascertained by self-reports? For those individuals with domestic violence charges, do urinalyses conducted within 48 hours of an individual's arrest indicate the recent use of a psychoactive substance?
- Which substances are most prevalently associated with incidents of domestic violence?
- Is there a difference in levels of aggressive behavior that is relational to an individual's demographic variables (income, education, ethnicity, and age) or environmental variables (past child abuse and parental conflict)?
- Does the severity of domestic violence increase with the presence of psychoactive substances?
- What differences (if any) exist between batterers who take psychoactive substances and batterers who do not?

In past studies most of the research about domestic violence relies upon victim accounts of perpetrator intoxication during incidents of domestic violence (Walker 1984).

Rarely do the offenders themselves constitute a source of data about the connection between substance abuse and domestic violence. This study takes an innovative approach to exploring the research questions by examining a population charged with particular illegal acts. In a limited number of cases, we document actual drug use in connection with self-reported data.

METHODOLOGY

This research strategy is modeled after the data collection protocol used in the NIJ ADAM project. Data presented in this study are based on voluntary, anonymous interviews that included self-reports of alcohol and drug use. In addition, the ISR used on a limited basis the results from ADAM urine analysis taken from a sample of arrestees at the Bernalillo County Detention Center (BCDC) in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

The ADAM program, formerly the DUF program, has been conducted nationally since 1987 and administered in Albuquerque since 1998. Currently, there are 35 sites around the U.S. Bernalillo County is ideal for sampling the State of New Mexico's arrestee population since it has the largest population and contains the State's largest metropolitan area, Albuquerque. Conveniently, BCDC is the only booking and holding facility in Bernalillo County. Of added interest, is that New Mexico is one of the poorest regions in the U.S. with a per capita income ranked 44th nationally and where 21 percent of the population lives below the poverty line.

The success of ADAM was not the only reason it was chosen to model the domestic violence collection strategy. Inclusion in ADAM facilitated the data collection process by allowing access to pre-established connections with the local criminal justice system

and allowing for efficient and cost-effective research on domestic violence. In addition, interviewing and drug testing through the ADAM program provides a platform from which communities can assess the dimensions of their particular local substance abuse problems; evaluate, in a low-cost manner, programs and interventions that serve or target the criminally active population; and plan policy responses that are appropriate for that population (NIJ Annual Report). In fact, ADAM is a unique resource of information that provides data on drug use patterns and trends in a timely fashion at the local level.

The original grant proposal called for interviewing only those offenders brought in on domestic violence charges; however, ADAM protocol would not accommodate this arrangement and the collection of domestic violence data was predicated on the ADAM sampling strategy. Since all Bernalillo County arrestees are included in the sample frame, interviews could not be limited to domestic violence offenders; therefore, the ISR staff adapted the domestic violence instrument to focus the respondent's attention on the most recent incident of domestic violence for self-reports of drug or alcohol. Similarly, responses to the CTS and the injury listing were directed toward incidents during a respondent's lifetime with follow-up questions directed toward incidents of domestic violence within the past 12 months. Sixty domestic violence cases were collected during six quarters of ADAM; however, by including all offenders and adapting the domestic violence instrument, the ISR staff increased the number of domestic violence cases to 477.

The ADAM program consists of two components: 1) one questionnaire, administered by a trained interviewer to an arrestee within 48 hours of arrest; and 2) one urine specimen collected from the respondent that is used to corroborate self-reports of recent

drug use. Standard ADAM procedures require four quarters of data collection throughout the calendar year. Each collection period, conducted once during a 3-month period, is 14 consecutive days with each collection day lasting 8-hours. The present study is based upon survey results from ADAM collection during the third and fourth quarters of 1999; the first, second, and third quarters of 2000; and first quarter of 2001.

Drug testing by urinalysis is one unique and important feature of the ADAM program. ADAM uses an immunoassay, (EMIT) Enzyme Multiplied Immunoassay Testing system, to screen for the presence of 11 drugs in urine. Beginning in 1999, rates of *any drug* pertain to drug positives in any of the NIDA-5 drugs and *multiple drug* pertains to testing positive for more than one drug in the five core drug panel (NIJ 1999 Annual Report). The five core panel drugs include cocaine, marijuana, methamphetamine, opiates, and PCP. However, ADAM also tests for amphetamines, barbiturates, benzodiazepines, methadone, methaqualone, and propoxyphene, but a positive in this grouping without a positive in the NIDA-5 will result in a negative test for overall national reporting purposes. This system affected Albuquerque by a 3 percent difference in reporting of positive any-drug rates for 1999. Unfortunately, due to the limitations of the domestic violence instrument, the full potential of the ADAM urinalysis could not be used in this study.

Once an arrestee agreed to be interviewed, he/she was assigned a unique identification number for tracking purposes only. No one connected with the Albuquerque ADAM site had the capabilities to match name with identification number. After the ADAM interview and urine collection process was completed, the respondent was presented with the option of participating in the domestic violence study. Permission to be interviewed

was again obtained from the arrestee. Total agreement rate for completing the domestic violence survey was 92.2 percent with no differences in refusals between male and female interviewers who conducted the domestic violence survey.

Initial inclusion in the ADAM sample was conducted by a predetermined sampling plan designed by the federal subcontractor. In 2000, sample selection dramatically changed in the ADAM program from convenience sampling to probability-based sampling. Probability sampling for the male arrestee population was given priority by the national subcontractor while the female sampling plan was considered secondary. Based on jail census numbers, it was established that ADAM personnel in BCDC were to collect 12 complete male interviews and 5 complete female interviews per collection day for a total of 168 complete male samples and 70 complete female samples for the 2-week period. A complete ADAM interview included a face sheet containing demographic information, a questionnaire, and a urine specimen. The 12 male interviews were categorized into 7 *stock* arrestees and 5 *flow* arrestees, female interviews were categorized into 3 *stock* arrestees and 2 *flow* arrestees. Stock arrestees are those booked into BCDC during the 16 hours that ADAM interviewing was not being conducted. In a typical Albuquerque ADAM collection period, this 16-hour duration is from 11:01pm the preceding day to 2:59pm the day of interviewing. Flow arrestees are those booked into BCDC during the 8-hour period when ADAM interviewers were in the jail facility. This 8-hour period is from 3:00pm to 11:00pm of any collection day. Prior to the implementation of the probability-based sampling, the convenience-based sampling plan simply instructed ADAM interviewers to collection as many of the eligible arrestees as possible in an 8-hour period.

Difficulties in Study Completion

Several methodological and logistical issues affected this study of domestic violence. Difficulties resulted from changes in both the ADAM and domestic violence instrument, shifts in national sample collection protocol, jail facility staffing shortages, and the merging of data sources.

In June 1999, NIJ convened a meeting of ADAM sites that were then administering local variations of a domestic violence survey. These sites included Omaha, Sacramento, Oklahoma City, and San Diego as well as Albuquerque. The intent was to construct a core domestic violence instrument that consisted of consensus-generated questions in order to make cross-site comparisons. While the Albuquerque site kept several of its original domestic violence questions, it added many questions from the NIJ sponsored meeting thus creating an instrument substantially different from its original proposal. Creation of a new domestic violence instrument delayed the collection start date, but improvements in the final instrument justified the delay. Data collection on the revised domestic violence instrument began during third quarter of 1999 using the then current ADAM instrument, which was patterned after the DUF program. A complete domestic violence instrument appears as Appendix A.

Construction of the Albuquerque domestic violence survey relied on the ADAM instrument to provide many of the demographic variables such as age, marital status, living arrangement, education, and income. There appeared to be no reason to ask similar questions regarding this basic demographic information on the domestic violence survey, because, to do so, would only increase the length of total interview time.

However, Albuquerque researchers were unaware that changes in the reporting of this basic information would occur within the ADAM instrument. Several of the variables changed in format (i.e., education) while others were dropped (i.e., income) all together. For example, on the old ADAM instrument, level of education was asked as "What is the highest grade you have successful finished in school?" A raw score is recorded such as 9th grade= 9; high school graduate= 12; one year college= 13; and so on. The new ADAM instrument asked, "What is the highest educational degree you have?" and records level of education categorically so that 1= high school or GED; 2= vocational or trade school; 3= some college or 2-year associate degree, including nursing and teaching certification; 4= 4-year college degree or higher; and 5= no degree. Of course, a simple recoding of the education information was conducted by the ISR staff, but it should be noted that information was lost. In terms of income, this information was no longer being asked on the new ADAM instrument and would not be available for the analysis of domestic violence. Although a review of the literature would suggest variables such as residence location, marital status, and income should be included in the analysis, it was not possible to obtain these data on a sufficient number of respondents. As is the standard procedure for many studies of this type, in order to prevent too large a loss of cases, ISR staff dropped the above-mentioned variables from the logistic analysis (Stevens 1996:33). The complete recoding of variables from the old ADAM instrument and the new ADAM instrument to the ISR data set appears as Appendix B.

Moving to a probability-based sample greatly improved the usefulness of the ADAM data, but created difficulties at local ADAM sites. For example, the construction of the stock sample frame was arranged in chronological order for each collection day that stock

interviewees were selected. This posed a problem, for not only ADAM collection, but also for drawing a suitable number of potential respondents for the domestic violence addendum. That is, the length of time required to construct the listing severely limited collection time; hence, Albuquerque did not reach target collection numbers. Therefore, the domestic violence study was affected by the restricted number of completed ADAM surveys from which to draw respondents. In addition, the focus on probability-based sampling for the male arrestees left little collection time for the female sample. Time and budget restraints forced the Albuquerque site to collect male samples first, then females, if time remained. Those females sampled during the duration of the domestic violence study were not selected by random assignment, but by the older DUF method of convenience sampling. The ISR staff discussed concerns that a switch in sampling procedures affected the type of person who agreed to be interviewed. The ISR staff conducted statistical tests on group comparability for the two groups of males and found no significant differences. The same procedure was not conducted on the female sample since sample selection had not changed for this group.

Although standard ADAM procedures require four quarters of data collection during the calendar year, BCDC experienced staffing shortages in late 2000 that resulted in limited access to arrestees during the third quarter and the suspension of fourth quarter collection. The ISR project administrators decided to collect one additional quarter of domestic violence data in order to increase total numbers for the domestic violence study. This allowed the domestic violence study to meet proposal expectations.

Extensions for the project's completion were required due to the unforeseen difficulties in matching ADAM quarterly data sets into a domestic violence data set. In

attempting to match first, second, and third 2000 ADAM quarters together, the ISR staff discovered that each of these subsets contained particular string variable properties that prevented one quarter from matching with another quarter. Consequently, the ISR staff had to hand-match variables and change variable properties in order for the sets to merge. In addition, codes for *missing*, *not applicable*, and *refusal* data changed from 99, 77, and 88 to 9999, 7777, and 8888, respectively, which prevented merging of data. However, a blanket command changed these responses and the merge was completed.

Situating Studies of Domestic Violence

Studies in the field of domestic violence find little consensus around numerous issues that range from definition, prevalence, contributing factors, and treatment options. Differences in terminology, methodology, and ideology make comparisons between studies difficult, but important, so as to more fully understand the social phenomenon in question. Of particular importance to our study were results from the NFVS or what Straus collectively called "Family Conflict Studies," and the NVAW Survey, due to their wide acceptance. The NVAW survey found that women were more likely than men to report being a victim whether within the past 12 months or ever in their lives, and women were 7 to 14 times more likely to experience severe partner violence than men. On the other hand, the NFVS and others like it, consistently showed that men and women are nearly equally likely to be physically assaulted by a partner.

For purposes of this study, the ISR staff defined a partner as a person with whom the respondent had an intimate, romantic, or sexual relationship, whether they lived together or not. We included both same-sex and opposite sex intimate partners in the definition. However, only one case of same-sex domestic violence was reported in our study. For

report purposes, we used the terms intimate partner violence and domestic violence interchangeably as it is defined in New Mexico's statutes:

“. . . any incident by a household member against another household member resulting in any of the following: physical harm, severe emotional distress, bodily injury or assault, a threat causing imminent fear of bodily injury, criminal trespass, criminal damage to property, repeatedly driving by a residence or work place, telephone harassment, stalking, harassment, or harm or threatened harm to children” (New Mexico Laws, Chapter 40, Article 13: Family Violence Protection).

According to state law, the word “household member” may signify a spouse, former spouse or family member, including a relative, parent, present or former step-parent, present or former in-law, a co-parent of a child or a person with whom a person has had a continuing personal relationship. Cohabitation is not necessary to be deemed a household member. Specifically, this study focused on violence between intimate partners 18 years or older regardless of legal marital status or residency.

Without question, more work needs to be conducted on the relationship between, and possible differences in, male and female domestic violence. Unfortunately, that work remains outside the scope of this project. This study focuses on respondents who self-reported that they committed a particular violent act against an intimate partner while holding a number of variables (i.e., sex, race, age) constant in order to identify those factors that contributed to intimate partner violence. Criticisms of the CTS and overlooking a situation's context may be applied to the present study; however, the CTS was the most appropriate method to record occurrence and frequency of domestic violence in connection with drug abuse. Teasing out the differences between motivation and act must be left for other studies. This study examined a population of arrestees; however, inclusion in the male sample was conducted by random assignment, allowing

for greater statistical applications, and the study remains mindful of environmental influences sometimes ignored in other studies.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA

Of the 796 completed ADAM interviews, 696 (87.4%) respondents completed the domestic violence addendum. Total males in the sample were 496 (71.3%) and total females were 200 (28.7%). Demographic information from the ADAM instrument revealed that of those who reported their marital status, 43.5 percent were single while only 16.9 were married. Age ranged from 18 to 63 years with 31 years as the average age. The average age for a respondent in our sample to first experience being a victim of domestic violence was 21 years with 22 years being the average age a respondent first committed domestic violence against a partner.

Self-reports of race/ethnicity reflect an over-representation of minorities among Albuquerque's arrestee population. It is difficult to compare Albuquerque's 2000 U.S. census figures to ADAM data due to the treatment of terms such as *race* and *ethnicity*; however, Hispanic, Black, and Native American proportions in the sample were larger than in Albuquerque at-large, while the non-Hispanic White proportion was smaller. According to the 2000 U.S. census, 40 percent of Albuquerque's population is Hispanic (of any race), 3 percent is Black (of any ethnicity), and 4 percent is Native American. The ADAM data reveals 53.9 percent of the respondents report themselves as Hispanic, 9.4 percent as Black, and 9.1 percent as Native American. Whites represent 23 percent of the respondents and another 1.2 percent claims the category *Other*, which includes Asian,

Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, and multi-racial. Table 1 provides race/ethnicity by sex for the sample.

Table 1: Race/Ethnic Background by Sex

Race/Ethnicity	Male	Female	Total
White	127	34	161
% within race/ethnicity	78.9%	21.1%	100%
% within sex	25.9%	17.3%	23.4%
Black	42	25	67
% within race/ethnicity	62.7%	37.3%	100%
% within sex	8.6%	12.7%	9.8%
Hispanic	264	122	386
% within race/ethnicity	68.4%	31.6%	100%
% within sex	53.9%	61.9%	56.2%
Native American	50	15	65
% within race/ethnicity	76.9%	23.1%	100%
% within sex	10.2%	7.6%	9.5%
Other	7	1	8
% within race/ethnicity	87.5%	12.5%	100%
% within sex	1.6%	27.1%	1.4%

Total N= 696

As stated earlier, variables such as education and income lost too many cases to be included in the final analysis, and are not described here. However, of interest to our study was the incident of past abuse in the family of orientation. Respondents were asked a series of questions to ascertain the presence of family violence (father on mother, mother on father, sibling on sibling, and parent on child) prior to the age of 18. From our total sample, 25.8 percent of the respondents reported some form of family violence in their family of orientation. Among the females, 26.9 percent experienced past family violence prior to 18 years of age, and among the males, 25.4 percent reported the same experience.

Noteworthy is that 12.2 percent of our respondents reported being sexually abused before the age of 18 and 25.8 percent were physically abused prior to 18 years old. Among the females, 28.8 percent had been sexually abused and 26.9 percent physically abused before the age of 18 years. For the males, 6.1 percent reported being sexually abused and 25.4 percent had been physically abused prior to the age of 18 years. Bivariate analysis of being sexually abused and being physically abused were not significant; therefore, these variables were omitted from the logit regression. A history of family violence did prove statistically significant in the bivariate analysis and was included in the final logit regression.

The design of the domestic violence instrument mandated that all respondents were asked questions relating to the CTS (see Appendix A). Fifteen different types of violent behaviors were presented to the respondents. First, respondents were asked if they had ever experienced as a victim a particular type of violent behavior. If the respondents answered positively, they were then asked how many times in the past 12 months. A rephrasing of the same question asked the respondents if they had ever committed a particular violent act against an intimate partner, and if a positive response was given, they were asked how many times in the past 12 months. Of the 696 respondents, 226 (32.5%) claimed to have never been victimized by an intimate partner in any of the 15 violent acts. Among the females, 30.0 percent stated they had never experienced any form of intimate partner violence while 33.5 percent of the males claimed the same. Examples of domestic violence acts include slapping, pushing, threatening, stabbing, shooting, choking, burning, and beating up. The remaining 470 respondents (140 females and 330 males) claimed to have experienced at least one of these violent acts since the

age of 18 years. Among the females, 70.0 percent have experienced some form of victimization, while among the males, 66.5 percent reported some form of this same behavior. While the rate of being abused is higher for females, it would appear that there was a great amount of partner abuse that was mutually conducted within this arrestee-based population. In our sample, 67.5 percent of all respondents experienced some form of intimate partner violence in their adult lifetime.

An examination of the same questions from the perpetrator's perspective revealed that 304 (43.7%) of the respondents claimed to have never committed any of the 15 violent acts against a partner. Of those 392 who reported committing at least one of the 15 violent acts against an intimate partner, 257 or 51.8 percent of the males and 135 or 67.5 percent of the females admitted to abusing an intimate partner at some point in his/her adult life. For the sample, 65.6 percent of the abusers were male and 34.4 percent were female. Abusers averaged one domestic violence dispute in the past 12 months with values ranging from zero to 40.

Examinations of the violent behaviors on an offense-by-offense basis revealed that pushing, grabbing, or shoving was the number one offense most suffered by both women and men. Of the women, 61.5 percent had been pushed, grabbed, or shoved by a partner compared to 55.6 percent of the males. Along similar lines, 47.5 percent of the women and 43.8 percent of the men had pushed, grabbed, or shoved their partner. Being slapped (53.5% females/50.0% males) and having something thrown at you (46.0% females/49.0% males) were ranked as offenses two and three, respectively, on both the male and female listing of types of violence most likely to be experienced. Women were more likely to slap their partner (43.5%) and throw something with the intention of

hurting their partner (42.0%) than men who reported committing the acts at a rate of 29.2 percent and 12.9 percent, respectively. However, there is a definite change in the type of violent behavior suffered by women and men as we moved in the scale towards more severe behaviors.

For the women, 44.5 percent have been threatened with harm and 44.0 percent have been slammed against the wall, while only 27.6 percent and 14.7 percent of the men have experienced the same violence. A substantial number of the women had been punched (40.0%), beaten-up (41.0%), kicked (36.5%) and choked (34.0%) as compared to the men who showed percentage rates of 32.5 percent, 10.5 percent, 33.5 percent and 8.1 percent, respectively, for the same offenses. Women were over-represented in the number of who had experienced choking (63.0%), been slammed against a wall or other hard surface (54.7%), beaten-up (61.2%), burned or scalded on purpose (41.9%), forced to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex (75.0%), or had oral, anal, or vaginal sex because of threats (75.9%). However, women were also over-represented among the perpetrators for behaviors such as stabbing or shooting a partner (86.7%) and burning a partner on purpose (50%).

What is striking in the offense data is the proportion of women who reported ever committing a severe violent act in relation to the proportion of men who reported ever committing the same acts. For example, 24.5 percent of the women in our sample claimed to have threatened to harm a partner while only 17.9 percent of the men responded positively to the same question. Taking the example further, we see that 8.5 percent of the women and only 3.4 percent of the men self-reported threatening a partner with a gun or knife. The highest level of severity in regards to this type of behavior deals with actually stabbing or shooting a partner, and, again, the data show that female rates

are higher. Among the females sampled, 6.5 percent claimed to have stabbed or shot a partner while only 0.4 percent of the males reported the same behavior. Other offenses of particular interest were:

	Male	Female
Have you ever beaten up a partner?	9.7%	11.5%
Have you ever burned or scalded a partner on purpose?	0.4%	1.0%
Have you ever kicked a partner?	11.9%	21.5%
Have you ever threatened to harm a partner's property or pet?	8.9%	8.5%

Similar to Straus *et. al.*, a large number of females were kicking, hitting with something that could hurt, and throwing objects; however, females were also threatening their partner with harm and actually using a weapon. All of these above-mentioned behaviors could be driven by the need for self-defense measures but, due to study constraints, the context of the interaction was not available for analysis. It appears that in this arrestee-based sample both males and females were extremely violent. Table 2 provides totals and percentages for those respondents who reported positively to each offense. The first column shows raw totals for a particular offense while the second and third columns provide the percentage this raw figure represents within the sample and the sex groupings, respectively.

Table 2: Violent Behaviors by Sex

	Total	Of the Sample	Of the Sex
Have you ever been slapped by a partner?	248 Males 107 Females	69.9% 30.1%	50.0% 53.0%
Have you ever slapped a partner?	145 Males 87 Females	62.5% 37.5%	29.2% 43.5%
Have you ever had something thrown at you with the intent to hurt you by a partner?	243 Males 92 Females	72.5% 27.5%	49.0% 46.0%
Have you ever thrown something with the intent to hurt a partner?	64 Males 84 Females	43.2% 56.8%	12.9% 42.0%
Have you ever been pushed, grabbed, or shoved by a partner in anger?	276 Males 123 Females	69.2% 30.8 %	55.6% 61.5%
Have you ever pushed, grabbed, or shoved a partner in anger?	217 Males 95 Females	69.6% 30.4%	43.8% 47.5%
Have you ever been threatened with harm by a partner?	137 Males 89 Females	60.6% 39.4%	27.6% 44.5%
Have you ever threatened to harm a partner?	89 Males 49 Females	64.5% 35.5%	17.9% 24.5%
Have you ever been threatened with a knife or a gun by a partner?	75 Males 47 Females	61.5% 38.5%	15.1% 23.5%
Have you ever threatened a partner with a knife or a gun?	17 Males 17 Females	50.0% 50.0%	3.4% 8.5%
Have you ever been stabbed or shot by a partner?	32 Males 18 Females	64.0% 36.0%	6.5% 9.0%
Have you ever stabbed or shot a partner?	2 Males 13 Females	13.3% 86.7%	0.4% 6.5%
Have you ever been punched or hit with something that could hurt you by a partner?	161 Males 80 Females	66.8% 33.2%	32.5% 40.0%
Have you ever punched or hit your partner with something that could have hurt?	54 Males 50 Females	51.9% 48.1%	10.9% 25.0%
Have you ever been choked or strangled by a partner?	40 Males 68 Females	37.0% 63.0%	8.1% 34.0%
Have you ever choked or strangled a partner?	35 Males 10 Females	77.8% 22.2%	7.1% 5.0%
Have you ever been slammed against the wall or other hard surface by a partner?	73 Males 88 Females	45.3% 54.7%	14.7% 44.0%
Have you ever slammed your partner against a wall or other hard surface?	95 Males 20 Females	82.6% 17.4%	19.2% 10.0%
Have you ever been beaten up by a partner?	52 Males 82 Females	38.8% 61.2%	10.5% 41.0%
Have you ever beaten up a partner?	48 Males 23 Females	67.6% 32.4%	9.7% 11.5%
Have you ever been burned or scalded on purpose by a partner?	18 Males 13 Females	58.1% 41.9%	3.6% 6.5%
Have you ever burned or scaled a partner on purpose?	2 Males 2 Females	50.0% 50.0%	0.4% 1.0%
Have you ever been kicked by a partner?	166 Males 73 Females	69.5% 30.5%	33.5% 36.5%
Have you ever kicked a partner?	59 Males 43 Females	57.8% 42.2%	11.9% 21.5%
Have you ever been forced to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex by a partner?	11 Males 33 Females	25.0% 75.0%	2.2% 16.5%
Have you ever used force to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with a partner?	5 Males 0 Females	100.0% 0.0%	1.0% 0.0%
Have you ever had oral, anal, or vaginal sex because of threats from a partner?	7 Males 22 Females	24.1% 75.9%	1.4% 11.0%
Have you ever used threats to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with a partner?	4 Males 0 Females	100.0% 0.0%	0.8% 0.0%
Has your property or pet ever been threaten with harm by a partner?	81 Males 44 Females	66.9% 33.1%	16.3% 20.0%
Have you ever threatened to harm a partner's property or pet?	44 Males 17 Females	72.1% 27.9%	8.9% 8.5%

Total N=696

A bivariate analysis of ever committing an offense by sex revealed that the relationship was significant, at the .05 level. The ISR staff then examined the relationship for reports of domestic violence during the past 12 months. From the total sample of 696, 29.2 percent stated they had abused an intimate partner in the past 12 months. Among the men, 26.8 percent (N=133) had abused a partner during the past 12 months and 35.0 percent (N=70) of the women claimed the same. The bivariate analysis of abused a partner in past 12 months and sex showed that the relationship was significant. In rephrasing the question, we were able to obtain information on being abused in the past 12 months. Of the total sample, 37.1 percent stated they had been abused by an intimate partner in the past 12 months. Among the women, 37.0 percent reported they had been abused in the past 12 months and 37.1 percent of the men claimed the same. In other words, nearly half of our sample experienced domestic violence in the past 12 months.

Following the guidelines established by Strau, *et al.*, the data was recoded to ascertain the level of abuse. On level of abuse committed in past 12 months by sex, the relationship was not significant; however, the bivariate on level of abuse suffered in past 12 months by sex was significant, at the .05 level. Females are more likely to be the victim of severe domestic violence. Although it appears that males and females were engaging in violent behaviors at a nearly equal rate, an examination of the injury listings indicated females suffered greater consequences for their actions. Similar to Tjaden and Thoennes (2000), women were more likely than men to be seriously injured during an episode of domestic violence.

After the Washington D.C. collaborative meeting sponsored by NIJ, the ISR staff revised its domestic violence instrument to include a listing of 13 specific injuries. Each respondent was first asked to continue thinking about all of the intimate, romantic, or sexual relationships they have had in their lifetime. The respondents were asked if they had ever received any of the specific injuries while engaged in a domestic dispute with an intimate partner. Once the list had been completed from the victim perspective, the question was rephrased so that the respondent reported which of the specific injuries they caused to any of their partners.

Of the 274 respondents who reported giving an injury, 182 (66.4%) were men and 92 were women (33.6%). For all males in the sample, 36.7 percent gave an injury, while for all females in the sample, 46.5 percent gave an injury. Table 3 provides percentages as to the number of respondents who reported positively to either receiving or causing any of the listed injuries.

Table 3: Injuries Received/Caused During an Episode of Domestic Violence

Rec'd an Injury			Caused an Injury	
Male	Female		Male	Female
11.9%	40.0%	Black Eye	14.5%	14.8%
28.7%	54.6%	Bloody Lip or Welts on Face	17.4%	23.5%
13.8%	46.0%	Bruising or Welts on Neck	11.0%	8.6%
51.4%	62.0%	Small Scratches, Scrapes, or Cuts	25.9%	50.6%
12.2%	28.2%	Deep Cut or Burn	1.8%	5.6%
10.1%	52.1%	Severe Bruising	12.2%	10.5%
2.5%	27.0%	Knocked Unconscious or Passed Out	2.8%	4.9%
3.9%	16.6%	Chipped or Knocked Out Teeth	1.4%	1.9%
4.8%	28.8%	Broken/Fractured Bones or Broken Nose	2.8%	2.5%
1.6%	10.4%	Internal Injuries	0.5%	1.9%
0.3%	17.8%	Miscarriage or Complications of Pregnancy	1.6%	0
21.1%	48.8%	Sore Muscles, Sprains, Strains, or Pulls	19.3%	15.4%
1.8%	9.3%	Irritated or Bleeding Genitals	0.9%	1.9%

Total N= 696

Of the 381 respondents who reported receiving an injury, 255 (66.9%) were males while 126 (33.1%) were females. For all males in the sample, 52.4 percent reported they had experienced at least 1 of the 13 injuries given to them by an intimate partner. For females in the sample, 63.0 percent reported they had experienced at least one of the listed injuries. From past research, it is no surprise that the females experienced more injuries and that these injuries were of a more serious nature than the males. However, in this study, the ISR staff was taken by the number of females who claimed to have caused injuries to their partner when compared to the number of males who claimed to have caused the same injuries to their partners. For each injury listed, male and female rates of injury caused were nearly equal and, when they were not, the female rate was higher except for causing miscarriage or complications to pregnancy. From the NCVS, 49 percent of those persons interviewed reported no injury during an episode of domestic violence and, in Family Conflict Studies, no injuries are reported at a rate of nearly 99 percent (Straus 1999:24). In this study, no injuries are reported in only 45.3 percent of the cases.

Alcohol and Drug Use in the Sample

As previously discussed, standard ADAM procedures could not accommodate the original domestic violence proposal of interviewing all domestic violence arrestees, and, thereby, provide urinalysis on each incident of domestic violence. As such, the full potential of the ADAM urinalysis could not be utilized in examining the connection between domestic violence and illegal substances. However, it may be of interest to note that according to ADAM data, Albuquerque's adult arrestee population tested positive for

any illegal drug use at 64.9 percent for men and 57.5 percent for women. Among the 59 cases of domestic violence offenders interviewed during the ADAM project, 48.9 percent tested positive for some type of drug. However, 25.9 percent of the arrestees brought in for domestic violence offenses self-reported positively when asked if they had taken any illegal drug before the most recent incident of domestic violence. As expected, self-reported drug use was lower than ADAM-reported drug use. For those respondents brought in on domestic violence charges, and of those who tested positive for illicit drug use, 29.8 percent tested positive for multiple drug use. Although the 59 cases were too small a sample to make any analytical statements, it is interesting to note the descriptions of the population. That is, of the 59 respondents charged with domestic violence offenses, 45 or 76.3 percent were male and 14 or 23.7 percent were female. Approximately, one-half (45.6 percent) claimed to have been drinking prior to the most recent incident of domestic violence. Albuquerque ADAM data do not test for the presence of alcohol in the urinalysis.

In the section of our domestic violence survey that deals with the most recent episode of domestic violence, 466 respondents (69.3% male and 30.7% female) completed the section. Of this group, 29.4 percent self-reported they had taken an illegal drug before the most recent domestic violence dispute. From this self-reported drug use prior to the most recent incident of domestic violence group, 11.5 percent claimed to have taken marijuana. Marijuana use among all adult male arrestees for Albuquerque was 47.3 percent. Other self-reported drug use rates before the most recent incidence of domestic violence group were: Crack Cocaine, 5.6 percent; Powder Cocaine 3.0 percent; Heroin, 2.4 percent; and Methamphetamine, 2.4 percent. Self-reports of drug and/or alcohol use

prior to the most recent episode of domestic violence were used in examining differences between batterers who used a psychoactive substance and those who did not. We also used the self-reported alcohol and/or drug use information obtained from our section on the most recent incident of domestic violence to examine levels of severity among the batterers.

In conducting logistic regression on likelihood of committing domestic violence in past 12 months, we used self-reported past 12-month alcohol and self-reported past 12-month drug use from the ADAM data as an estimator that violence and substance abuse share common individual, familial, and environmental risk factors. The ISR staff does not assume or imply a causal relationship between substance use and domestic violence since there is no direct urinalysis for each survey self-reported episode of domestic violence. Self-reported drug use among all respondents of the domestic violence survey revealed that 54.6 percent of the interviewees had taken at least one of the NIDA five drugs in the past 12 months. Percentage rates for each drug taken were: Marijuana, 60.3 percent; Crack Cocaine, 62.8 percent; Powder Cocaine, 38.3 percent; Heroin, 57.4 percent; and, Methamphetamine, 40.2 percent. Among the males in our sample, 50.6 percent self-reported illegal drug use in the past 12 months while 64.5 percent of the females reported positively for the same. Self-reported alcohol use in the past 12 months was 83.1 percent with 83.5 percent of the males reporting positively and 82.1 percent of the females.

Self-reported alcohol use among those who reported on their most recent incident of domestic violence revealed 44.6 percent of the respondents drank alcohol before the most recent episode of domestic violence. Of those who reported alcohol use, 24.2 percent

were females and 75.8 percent were males. Fewer females reported drinking after the most recent incident (28.8%), while more males drank after the most recent domestic violence episode (71.2%). In combining the variables for self-reported drug or alcohol use, the ISR staff arrived at a working figure for those respondents who were taking a psychoactive substance at the time of their most recent domestic violence dispute. That is, for those individuals who reported to us on their most recent episode of domestic violence, 42.2 percent claimed no drug or alcohol use, 41.5 percent reported either alcohol or drug use, and 16.1 percent stated they had taken an illegal drug and consumed alcohol. Among the females who reported their most recent disputes, 51.8 percent were taking a psychoactive substance while 60.2 percent of the males had taken some sort of substance.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The ISR staff utilized logistic regression to model the probability of being an abuser of an intimate partner during the past 12 months due to the constraints of the dependent variable. In examining the likelihood of being an abuser in the past 12 months, the ISR staff first set up a model based upon those factors deemed relevant from past research. As previously discussed, education, marital status, and income were not available for our final analysis. Sufficient information was available on age, sex, race, and history of family violence.

From preliminary bivariate analyses, each ethnic/racial category was shown not to be statistically significant in predicting being an abuser of an intimate partner. Therefore, because of the real-life significance, a minority variable was created to capture the

concept without adversely affecting our degrees of freedom in a relatively small sample size. Minority was re-coded as 0=white and 1=minority. Age was a continuous variable; however, it showed the classic pattern of being curvilinear and, therefore, a term for age-squared was added to the model. Sex was coded as 0=male and 1=female. The variable "History of Family Violence" represents the presence of at least one of the indicators as presented in the domestic violence survey: 0=no history of family violence and 1=a history of family violence.

For Model 2 we included the term "Victim." The high rate of mutual partner abuse prompted the ISR to include a variable that captured the interchange between abuser and abused. If the respondent reported on how many times he/she had been abused by an intimate partner in the past 12 months, the response was re-coded as 1. Model 3 brings in the presence of a high-risk lifestyle as reflected in the use of drugs and alcohol. Dummies were created for "Past 12-Month Alcohol Use," "Past 12-Month Illegal Drug Use," and "Past 12-Month No Drug Use." Our reference category was "Past 12-Month No Drug Use." Table 4 provides results from the logistical regression to model the probability of being an abuser of an intimate partner in the past 12 months.

Results from the logit revealed that age was not statistically significant in any of the three models. Sex was statistically significant for models two and three. The direction of the relationship may be of some surprise since the results showed that being female increased the likelihood of being an abuser. It is believed that this result is an effect of methodological difficulties and will be discussed below. The level of statistical significance decreased for history of family violence from Model 1 to Model 3. Past 12-month alcohol or drug use was not statically significant and the inclusion of drug and/or

alcohol factors did not increase the explanatory power of the model for predicting intimate partner violence in the past 12 months. This may be due to the crudeness of the measurement itself or because of the large number of respondents who had used either alcohol or drugs in the past 12 months. There may have been little variation between the two groups for this variable to have any explanatory power. Moreover, belonging to a minority group was not statistically significant in any of the models. Of particular interest is that being a victim of domestic violence increased the likelihood of committing violence, and that this relationship was statistically significant at the more restrictive level of .01.

Table 4: Logit Coefficients for the Regression of Being an Abuser of an Intimate Partner in the Past 12 Months

Characteristic	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Age	-.015	.088	.065
Age-Squared	.000	-.002	-.001
Sex	.283	.729**	.650**
Minority	.167	.323	.373
History of Family Violence in Family of Orientation	.977***	.139	.136
Victim		4.078***	4.059***
Past 12-Month Alcohol Use			.341
Past 12-Month Drug Use			-.364
Constant	-1.005	-4.806	-4.314
-2 Log Likelihood	693.43	393.33	365.58
Degrees of Freedom	5	6	8

*** (p < .01)

** (p < .05)

*(p < .10)

Logistical regression was performed within the batterer group to determine the level of severity. Two models were constructed; one used relevant variables as determined by the literature review, and the other brought in self-reported drug and alcohol use as recorded on the domestic violence instrument. Self-reports of drug and/or alcohol use were recoded as 0=no psychoactive substance taken prior to most recent incident of domestic violence and 1=psychoactive substance taken prior to most recent incident of domestic violence. Table 5 provides the results of the regression on level of abuse committed during the past 12 months on an intimate partner.

Table 5: Logit Coefficients for Regression of Level of Abuse Committed by an Abuser on an Intimate Partner in the Past 12 Months

Characteristic	Model 1	Model 2
Age	.069	.067
Age-Squared	-.001	-.001
Sex	-.174	-.033
Minority	-.189	-.148
History of Family Violence in Family of Orientation	.812**	.697***
Drug or Alcohol Use Prior to Most Recent Incident of Domestic Violence		.614***
Constant	-1.185	-1.544
-2 Log Likelihood	236.03	222.65
Degrees of Freedom	5	6
***(p< .01)	** (p< .05)	*(p< .10)

Unlike the regression of being an abuser, for the regression on level of abuse committed, sex was not statistically significant; however, the direction of the relationship

changed. That is being a female decreased the likelihood that the respondent committed severe domestic violence. Again, age and minority group membership is not statistically significant. The presence of a psychoactive substance in a batterer increased the likelihood that the abuse will be severe and this relationship was statistically significant at the .01 level. Model 2 was a significant improvement over Model 1 for predicting level of abuse. Analysis of the injuries sustained during an episode of domestic violence showed only that the sex of the batterer was statistically significant. Females are less likely to give a serious injury when compared to males. Although the original grant did not propose an examination of the victims of domestic violence, the ISR staff wanted to explore the relationship between being abused and the already established variables. Table 6 presents the results from a regression of being abused by an intimate partner. The same variables were used as described in the regression of being an abuser (Table 4) except that "victim" was replaced with "abuser."

The regression on the likelihood of being abused by an intimate partner showed that a history of family violence was consistently significant in all three of the models. Being an abuser increased the likelihood that a respondent would also be abused. Both of these relationships were statistically significant at the .01 level. Age is not statistically significant. In Model 3, the ISR staff found that taking an illegal drug in the past 12 months increased the likelihood of being abused, and this was statistically significant at the .05 level. Again, the ISR staff included this variable as an indicator of a relatively high-risk lifestyle and the inclusion was not intended to demonstrate any causal effect.

Table 6: Logit Coefficients for Regression of Being Abused by Intimate Partner in Past 12 Months

Characteristic	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Age	-.067	-.107	-.092
Age-Squared	.001	.001	.001
Sex	-.068	-.538*	-.539*
Minority	-.015	-.262	-.340
History of Family Violence in Family of Orientation	1.220	1.141***	1.123***
Abuser		4.063***	4.06***
Past 12-Month Alcohol Use			1.62
Past 12-Month Drug Use			.587**
Constant	.285	-.086	-.868
-2 Log Likelihood	741.41	441.86	407.23
Degrees of Freedom	5	6	8

***(p< .01)

** (p< .05)

*(p< .10)

Although Model 3 was a statistical improvement over Model 2, past 12-month alcohol use was not statistically significant within Model 3.

From the regression of level of abuse, the ISR staff already knows that a batterer's use of drugs or alcohol prior to the most recent incident of domestic violence increased the level of abuse committed; however, the staff was also interested in ascertaining if the presence of drugs or alcohol prior to the most recent incident of domestic violence increased the level of abuse received by a victim. Results from the regression of level of abuse received from an intimate partner are presented in Table 7. The ISR staff followed the same coding procedures presented in Table 5.

Table 7: Logit Coefficients for Regression of Level of Abuse Received from Intimate Partner

Characteristic	Model 1	Model 2
Age	.022	-.005
Age-Squared	-.001	.000
Sex	.526	.695**
Minority	-.214	-.276
History of Family Violence in Family of Orientation	.672**	.582
Drug or Alcohol Use Prior to Most Recent Incident of Domestic Violence		.052
Constant	.292	.753
-2 Log Likelihood	270.14	256.89
Degrees of Freedom	5	6

***($p < .01$)

**($p < .05$)

*($p < .10$)

The presence of drug and/or alcohol prior to the most recent episode of domestic violence was not statistically significant in predicting the level of abuse a victim would receive from an intimate partner. Unlike our model for predicting level of abuse committed by an abuser, our model for predicting level of abuse received was not statistically significant. A history of family violence was statistically significant at the .05 level for Model 1, but the significance of this relationship decreased when the variable of drug and/or alcohol use was added. A regression on the level of injuries received showed that sex and history of past family violence were statistically significant. For this study, females were more likely to experience a severe injury than males.

In this study, drug and/or alcohol use was only useful in predicting the level of abuse an abuser would commit against an intimate partner. The presence of drugs and/or alcohol increased the likelihood that the abuse committed would be severe.

Differences Among Batterers

The ISR staff conducted an examination of the 474 respondents who provided information regarding their most recent incidence of domestic violence to differentiate between a batterer who takes a psychoactive substance and batterers who claim not to have taken any psychoactive substance prior to the most recent incidence of domestic violence. Among this group, 57.8 percent self-reported that they had taken a psychoactive substance prior to the most recent episode of intimate partner violence. Logistic regressions were performed on likelihood of taking a psychoactive substance prior to most recent episode of domestic violence, with limited results. Consistently, across various models, only a history of family violence was statistically significant. What was most apparent in these analyses was the high rate of shared lifestyle risk factors for persons who have a history of violence in the family of orientation, take drugs, and commit intimate partner violence.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

From the examinations of our domestic violence data, the ISR staff is able to provide answers to the previously stated research questions. These ISR data reveal between 28.8 percent and 38.3 percent of domestic violence cases were committed while the abuser was taking a psychoactive substance prior to the episode of intimate partner violence. For those individuals with domestic violence charges, the most common situation was a

combination of drug use, with marijuana as the most commonly reported illegal substance from the urinalysis. For self-reported substance users, the most common substance was alcohol, with marijuana as the most common illicit substance.

Contrary to the literature, age was not statistically significant in predicting who would commit an act of domestic violence. Other factors that were not significant in predicting intimate partner violence were ethnicity/race, membership in a minority group, and self-reported past 12-month drug and alcohol use. The significance of sex in predicting intimate partner violence was not a surprise to the ISR staff; however, the direction of the relationship caused some concern. In the ISR sample, females were statistically more likely to commit an act of domestic violence than the males. This finding may be the result of three issues, two of which were external to the intent of this research and the other potentially related to the methodology.

In discussions regarding the possible explanations for the high rate of female violence, one area of concern was the concept of police discretion in cases of domestic violence. The APD is not mandated to exercise an arrest in cases of domestic violence. The ISR staff hypothesized that perhaps the females who were brought in on domestic violence charges were of an unusually violent nature and, as outliers, influenced the data. The other factor external to the research design that may have affected the level of female violence is the availability of services for victims of domestic violence. Recent studies showed that more available services in a community decreased the level of female violence directed toward their male partners. Further, it is possible in Bernalillo County that fewer available services limit the options for female domestic violence victims who strike back against intimate partners when faced with no other alternatives. Both police

discretion and available services were outside the scope of this project but, nonetheless are interesting institutional factors that may drive the female rate of violence in the Albuquerque metropolitan area, and should be explored in the future.

The third possible influence on female intimate partner violence rates in this study may be related to the change in ADAM sampling protocol. As previously stated, in 2000 the ADAM project switched to a probability based sampling design. The emphasis on the male population left little collection time for the female sample. The interviewers who sampled females toward the end of each night shift may have interviewed only those females with more violent offenses. It is reasonable to speculate that perhaps those females who could not make bail due to more serious offenses were the ones remaining in the facility for ADAM collection. If this was the case, a replication of the study with a strict adherence to the sampling plan for females would correct for this oversight. Of course, it may possible that the female self-reported rates from the CTS offered a more accurate depiction than the males' perception of their own behavior.

In analyzing the differences in levels of aggressive behavior committed against an intimate partner, two factors were statistically significant. First, both the presence of drugs or alcohol in the respondent prior to the incident, and a history of family violence prior to the age of 18 years for the respondent, increased the likelihood that an arrestee would commit severe violence against an intimate partner. Second, in examining the level of injury received from an intimate partner, the ISR staff found sex to be statistically significant. That is, females were less likely to inflict serious injury on an intimate partner.

The logistic regression for likelihood of being abused by an intimate partner showed that sex of the respondent was again significant in the models. Further, a history of family violence and past 12-month drug use both increased the probability that an arrestee experienced domestic violence in the past 12-month period. Attempts at predicting the level of abuse experienced proved to be difficult, and no variables in the ISR data set were capable of helping to explain the varying levels of abuse received.

Additionally, this study of domestic violence revealed that a high rate of interaction occurred between the abuser and the abused. In both of the logistic regressions for being an abuser and being abused, the term that represented the mutual partner abuse was statistically significant. In other words, those individuals who abuse their partners are also being abused themselves and those individuals who are being abused also abuse. From this study, the ISR staff found that the presence of drugs and/or alcohol increased the level of severity in the type of offense committed.

A history of violence in the family of orientation is one of the most important factors in understanding domestic violence. The presence of this factor: 1) increased the likelihood that someone would commit severe intimate partner violence, 2) increased the likelihood that someone would receive abuse from an intimate partner, and 3) increased the likelihood that someone who is a batterer is more likely to take a psychoactive substance prior to the domestic violence incident.

CONCLUSION

As is the case with most research, the end of a project leaves more questions to be answered. The observed level of violence within the sampled population appears to be

extreme but, without other similar research on arrestee population, it is difficult to confirm. The rate of "being abused" and "being the abuser" among the participants in the ISR sample causes alarm. From the ISR sample, staff observed that there is a great deal of mutual partner violence being conducted in Bernalillo County. Comparisons to the NVAW Survey and Family Conflict Studies were made in order to set some benchmark; however, both of these studies were conducted nationally on households rather than a selected population. Questions as to the origins of the significantly higher rate of violence among the females need to be addressed; specifically, what domestic violence services are available to this particular population, and to what extent are these services utilized? The generalizability of our domestic violence study is restricted. It was hoped the information would be useful to policymakers and practitioners in New Mexico who deal with at-risk populations; however, study problems prohibit the full use of this data.

The timing of this domestic violence study was unfortunate due to the loss of data during the ADAM instrument transition and the possible adverse affects that the change in protocol caused to the sampling of females. However, further studies should be conducted in conjunction with the ADAM project due to the greater analytical power of ADAM data following the 2000 adjustments. Moreover, a redesigned domestic violence instrument may be able to take full advantage of ADAM urinalysis. In fact, a domestic violence instrument that is designed specifically to accompany the ADAM instrument would have enormous potential for contributing to community and national programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Buzawa, Carl G.; Buzawa, Eve S. (1996). Domestic Violence: The Criminal Justice Response. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Campbell, Jacquelyn; Ghez, Marissa; Klein, Ethel; Soler, Esta;. (1997). Ending Domestic Violence: Changing Perceptions/Halting the Epidemic. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Cook, Phillip W. (1997). Abused Men: The Hidden Side of Domestic Violence. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Gelles, Richard J. (1972). The Violent Home: A Study of physical aggression between husbands and wives. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Harway, Michèle; O'Neil, James M. (1999). What Causes Men's Violence Against Women?. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hersen, Michel; Morrison, Randall L and Bellack, Alan S; Van Hasselt, Vincent. (1988). Handbook of Family Violence. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Leventhal, Beth; Lundy Sandra. (1999). Same Sex Domestic Violence. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Straus, Murray A.; Gelles, Richard J.; Steinmetz, Suzanne K. (1980). Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
- Straus, Murray A.; Gelles, Richard J. (1990). Physical Violence in American Families. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

JOURNAL ARTICLES

- Anderson, Kristin L. (1997). Gender, Stratus, and Domestic Violence: An Integration of Feminist and Family Violence Approaches. Journal of Marriage and the family, 59, 655-669.
- Bard, Morton; Zacker, Joseph. (1974). Assaultiveness and Alcohol Use in Family Disputes. Criminology, 12, 281-292.
- Barling, Julian; O'Leary, K. D.; Jouriles, E. N.; Vivian, D.; and MacEwen, K. E. (1987). Factor Similarity of the Conflict Tactics Scales Across Samples, Spouses, and Sites: Issues and Implications. Journal of Family Violence, 2, 37-54.
- Barnett, Ola W.; Fagan, Ronald W. (1993). Alcohol Use in Male Spouse Abusers and

- Their Female Partners. Journal of Family Violence, 8, 1-25.
- Brown, T. G.; Werk, A.; Caplan, A.; Shields, N.; and Seraganian, P. (1998). The Incidence and Characteristics of Violent Men in Substance Abuse Treatment. Addictive Behaviors, 23, 573-586.
- Brown, T.G.; Caplan, T.; Werk, A.; Seraganian, P. (1999). The Comparability of Male Violent Substance Abusers in Violence or Substance Abuse Treatment. Journal of Family Violence, 14, 297-314.
- Brown, T.G.; Caplan, T.; Werk, A.; Seraganian, P. (1999). Violent Substance Abusers in Domestic Violence Treatment. Violence and Victims, 14, 179-190.
- Buss, Arnold H.; Durkee, Ann. (1957). An Inventory for Assessing Different Kinds of Hostility. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21, 343-349.
- Cadsky, Oto; Crawford, Michael. (1988). Establishing Batterer Typologies in a Clinical Sample of Men Who Assault Their Female Partners. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 7, 119-127.
- Chi, S. Kenneth and Houseknecht, Sharon K. Protestant Fundamentalism and Marital Success: A Comparative Approach. Sociology and Social Research, 69, 350-375.
- Collins, R. Lorraine. (1996). The Role of Ethnic Versus Nonethnic Sociocultural Factors in Substance Use and Misuse. Substance Use and Misuse, 31, 95-101.
- Connor, Kenneth R. and Ackerly, Gary D. (1994). Alcohol-Related battering: Developing Treatment Strategies. Journal of Family Violence, 9, 143-155.
- Dobash, R. P.; Dobash, R. E.; Wilson, M.; Daly, M. (1992). The Myth of Sexual Symmetry in Marital Violence. Social Problems, 39, 71-91.
- Easton, Caroline, J.; Swan, Suzanne; Sinha, Rajita. (2000). Prevalence of Family Violence in Clients Entering Substance Abuse Treatment. Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 18, 23-28.
- Edleson, J.L.; Brygger, M.P. (1986). Gender Differences in Reporting of Battering Incidences. Family Relations, 35, 377-382.
- Ellison, Christopher G.; Bartkowski, John P.; Anderson, Kristin L. (1999). Are There Religious Variations in Domestic Violence? Journal of Family Issues, 20, 87-114.
- Ellison, Christopher G. and Sherkat, Darren E. (1993). Conservative Protestantism and Support for Corporal Punishment. American Sociological Review, 58, 131-144.
- Eugenia Fernández-Esquer, Maria; McCloskey, Laura Ann. (1999). Coping With Partner

Abuse Among Mexican American and Anglo Women: Ethnic and Socioeconomic Influences. Violence and Victims, 14, 293-310.

- Fairchild, David G.; Fairchild, Molly Wilson. (1998). Prevalence of Adult Domestic Violence Among Women Seeking Routine Care in a Native American Health Care Facility. American Journal of Public Health, 88, 1515-1521.
- Filsinger, Erik E. and Wilson, Margaret R. (August 1984). Religiosity, Socioeconomic Rewards, and Family Development: Predictors of Marital Adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 663-670.
- Flynn, Clifton P. (2000). Woman's Best Friend: Pet Abuse and the Role of Companion Animals in the Lives of Battered Women. Violence Against Women, 6, 162-177.
- Follingstad, D.R.; Laughlin, J.E.; Polek, D.S.; Rutledge, L.L.; Hause, E.S. (1991). Identification of Patterns of Wife Abuse. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2, 187-204.
- Garthoeffner, J.L.; Henry, C. S.; Robinson, L. C. (1993). The Modified Interpersonal Relationship Scale: Reliability and Validity. Psychological Reports, 73, 995-1003.
- Glenn, Norvald. (August 1982). Interreligious Marriage in the United States: Patterns and Recent Trends. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 555-566.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1995). Alcohol Abuse, Wife Assault, and Power Needs. Social Service Review, 274-284.
- Gondolf, E.W.; Fisher, E.; McFerron, J.R. (1988). Racial Differences among Shelter Residents: A Comparison of Anglo, Black, and Hispanic Battered. Journal of Family Violence, 3, 39-51.
- Gondolf, E.W.; White, R.J. (2000). Consumer Recommendations for Batterers Problems. Violence Against Women, 6, 198-217.
- Hansen, Gary L. (1987). The Effect of Religiosity on Factors Predicting Marital Adjustment. Social Psychology Quarterly, 50, 264-269.
- Harris, R.J.; Cook, C.A. (1994). Attributions About Spousal Abuse: It Matters Who the Batterers and Victims Are. Sex Roles, 30, 553-565.
- Heaton, Tim B. (August 1984). Religious Homogamy and Marital Satisfaction Reconsidered. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 729-733.
- Heaton, Tim B. and Pratt, Edith L. (1990). The Effects of Religious Homogamy on Marital Satisfaction and Stability. Journal of Family Issues, 11, 191-207.

- Hertel, Bradley R. and Hughes, Michael. (1987). Religious Affiliation, Attendance, and Support for "Pro-Family" Issues in the United States. Social Forces, 65:3, 858-882.
- Hilbert, Judith C.; Kolia, Raiza; VanLeeuwen, Dawn M. (1997). Abused Women in New Mexican Shelters: Factors That Influence Independence on Discharge. Affilia, 12, 391-407.
- Hill, Hope M.; Hawkins, Stephanie R.; Raposo, Manuel; Carr, Peggy. (1995). Relationship Between Multiple Exposures to Violence and Coping Strategies Among African-American Mothers. Violence and Victims, 10, 55-71.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, Amy; Stuart, Gregory L. (1994). Typologies of Male Batterers: Three Subtypes and the Differences Among Them. Psychological Bulletin, 116, 476-497.
- Hornung, Carlton A.; McCullough, B. Claire; Sugimoto, Taichi. (1981). Status Relationships in Marriage: Risk Factors in Spouse Abuse. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 675-691.
- Hotaling, Gerald T.; Sugarman, David B. (1989). Violent Men in Intimate Relationships: An analysis of Risk Markers. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19, 1034-1048.
- Hotaling, Gerald T.; Sugarman, David B. (1990). A Risk Marker Analysis of Assaulted Wives. Journal of Family Violence, 5, 1-13.
- Howell, M. J.; Pugliesi, K. L. (1988). Husbands Who Harm: Predicting Spousal Violence by Men. Journal of Family Violence, 3, 15-27.
- Jankowski, M. Kay; Leitenberg, Harold; Henning, Kris and Coffey, Patricia. (1999). Intergenerational transmission of Dating Aggression as a Function of Witnessing Only Same Sex Parents vs. Opposite Sex parents vs. Both parents as Perpetrators of Domestic Violence. Journal of Family Violence, 14, 267-279.
- Kantor, Glenda K. (1989). Substance Abuse as a Precipitant of Wife Abuse Victimization. American Journal of Drug Alcohol Abuse, 15, 173-189.
- Kantor, Glenda K.; Jasinski, Jana L.; Aldarondo, Etiony. (1994). Sociocultural Status and Incidence of Marital Violence in Hispanic Families. Violence and Victims, 9, 207-222.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J.; Neidig, P.; and Thorn, G. (1995). Violent Marriages: Gender Differences in Levels of Current Violence and Past Abuse. Journal of Family Violence, 10, 159-173.

- Locke, L. M.; Richman, C. L. (1999). Attitudes toward Domestic Violence: Race and Gender Issues. Sex Roles, 40, 227-247.
- Lockhart, Lettie L. (1987). A Reexamination of the Effects of Race and Social Class on the Incidence of Marital Violence: A Search for Reliable Differences. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49, 603-610.
- Lynch, Shannon; Graham-Bermann, Sandra A. (2000). Woman Abuse and Self-Affirmation: Influences on Women's Self-Esteem. Violence Against Women, 6, 178-197.
- Maiden, R. Paul. (1997). Alcohol Dependence and Domestic Violence: Incidence and Treatment Implications. Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly, 15, 31-50.
- Makepeace, James M. (1986). Gender Differences in Courtship Violence Victimization. Family Relations, 35, 383-388.
- Mcfarlane, Judith; Wilson, Pamela. (2000). Intimate Partner Violence. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15, 158-171.
- Miller, Michael V. (1979). Variations in Mexican American Family Life: A Review Synthesis of Empirical Research. Aztlan, 9, 209-231.
- O'Farrell, Timothy J.; Choquette, Keith. (1991). Marital Violence in the Year Before and After Spouse Involved Alcoholism Treatment. Family dynamics Addict, 1, 32-40.
- Ortega, Suzanne T.; Whitt, Hugh P.; William Jr., J. Allen. (1988). Religious Homogamy and Marital Happiness. Journal of Family Issues, 9, 224-239.
- Peek, Charles W.; Lowe, George D.; Williams, L. Susan. (1991). Gender and God's Word: Another Look at Religious Fundamentalism and Sexism. Social Forces, 69, 1205-1221.
- Perilla, Julia L.; bakeman, Roger; Norris, Fran H. (1994). Culture and Domestic Violence: the Ecology of Abused Latinas. Violence and Victims, 9, 325-339.
- Robinson, Amanda L.; Chandek, Meghan S. (2000). The Domestic Violence Arrest Decision: Examining Demographic, Attitudinal, and Situational Variables. Crime and Delinquency, 46, 18-34.
- Smith, Tom W. (1990). Classifying Protestant Denominations. Review of Religious Research, 31, 225-245.
- Sorenson, Susan B. and Telles, Cynthia A. (1991). Self-Reports of Spousal Violence in a Mexican-American and Non-Hispanic White Population. Violence and Victims, 6, 3-15.

- Stets, J. E. (1991). Cohabiting and Marital Aggression: The Role of Social Isolation. . Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53, 669-680.
- Strauss, Murray A. (February 1979). Measuring Intrafamily Conflict and Violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales*. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 75-89.
- Strauss, Murray A. Kantor, Glenda Kaufman. (1987). The Drunken Bum Theory of Wife Beating. Social Problems, 34, 213-231.
- Straus, Murray A.; Hamby, Sherry L; Boney-McCoy, Sue; and Sugarman, David B. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and Preliminary Psychometric Data. Journal of Family Issues, 17, 283-316.
- Telch, Christy F.; Lindquist, Carol Ummel. (1984). Violent Versus Nonviolent Couples: A Comparison of Patterns. Psychotherapy, 21, 242-248.
- Tjaden, Patricia; Thoennes, Nancy. (2000). Prevalence and Consequences of Male-to-Female and Female-to-Male Partner Violence as Measured by the National Violence Against Women Survey. Violence Against Women, 6, 142-161.
- Umberson, Debra; Anderson, Kristin; Glick, Jennifer. (1998). Domestic Violence, Personal Control, and Gender. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60, 442-452.
- Van Hasselt, Vincent B.; Morrison, Randall L.; Bellack, Alan S. (1985). Alcohol Use In Wife Abusers and Their Spouses. Addictive Behaviors, 10, 127-135.
- Weis, Lois; Fine, Michelle; Proweller, Amira; Bertram, Corrine; Marusza, Julia. (1998). I've Slept in Clothes Long Enough: Excavating the Sounds of Domestic Violence Among Women in the White Working Class. The Urban Review, 30, 1-27.
- Welsh, Sandy. (2000). The Multidimensional Nature of Sexual Harassment: An Empirical Analysis of Women's Sexual Harassment Complaints. Violence Against Women, 6, 118-141.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

- National Criminal Justice Reference Service. (1999). The Influence of Alcohol and Drugs on Women's Utilization of the Police for Domestic Violence. Charlotte, NC: Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Submitted to The National Institute of Justice.
- US Department of Health and Human Services. (2002). Substance Abuse Treatment and Domestic Violence. TIP 25.

WEBSITES

Gross, David. Husband Battering.

<http://www.vix.com/pub/men/battery/commentary/dgross-hbat.html>

06/09/00 2:33pm.

Jasinski, Jana L.; Williams, Linda M. and Brewster, Albert with Finkelhor, David; Giles-Sims, Jean; Hamby, Sherry L.; Kantor, Glenda Kaufman; Mahoney, Patricia; Weaver, Terri L.; West, Carolyn M. and Wolak, Janis. Partner Violence: A 20 Year Review and Synthesis Executive Summary.

http://www.agnr.umd.edu/nfr/research/pv/pv_execsumm.html 06/12/00 6:18pm.

Saltzman, Linda E.; Fingerhug, Lois A.; Rand, Michael R.; Visher, Christy. Building Data Systems for Monitoring and Responding to Violence Against Women.

<http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/rr4911a1.htm> 06/20/01.

APPENDIX A: INSTRUMENT

ADAM DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ADDENDUM

Revised May 2000

Institute for Social Research

University of New Mexico

____ / ____ / ____ Interview Date

Respondent Identification Sticker

NOTE: INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS ARE IN CAPITAL LETTERS. READ ALL ANSWER CHOICES TO THE RESPONDENT ONLY WHEN INSTRUCTED TO DO SO. UNDERLINED WORDS INDICATE THE NEED FOR EMPHASIS.

TIME IN: _____

INTERVIEWER INITIALS: _____ TIME OUT: _____

HINT TO INTERVIEWER: 999= REFUSAL; 888= DON'T KNOW; 777= NOT APPLICABLE

READ: INFORMED CONSENT HERE	(CIRCLE ONE) 1 Agreed to interview 2 Declined 3 Not available (ill, asleep, taken to court) 4 Other reason not interviewed (specify) _____
SECTION A. READ AS WRITTEN: For the purposes of this study, we define a partner as a person with whom you had an intimate, romantic, or sexual relationship, <u>whether you lived together or not</u> . For example, a girlfriend/ex-girlfriend, boyfriend/ex-boyfriend, spouse (husband or wife)/ex-spouse.	
1. Do you currently have an intimate partner?	0 No (GO TO QUESTION 10 AT TOP OF NEXT PAGE) 1 Yes
2. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being very unhappy and 5 being very happy, please tell me how happy you are in this relationship?	VUNHAPPY UNHAPPY HAPPY VERYHAPPY 1 2 3 4 5
3. What is the sex of your current partner?	0 Male 1 Female
4. How old is your current partner?	IN YEARS _____
5. How long have you been in this current relationship?	GIVE IN YEARS AND MONTHS _____
6. Which of the following best describes the race/ethnicity of your current partner?	(READ ALL CHOICES: CIRCLE ONLY ONE) 1. African-American (non-Hispanic) 2. White (non-Hispanic) 3. Hispanic 4. Native American or Alaskan Native 5. Asian or Pacific Islander 6. Other (specify) _____
7. Does your current partner have a particular religious affiliation?	0 No 1 Yes ASK QUESTION 7a
7a. What affiliation is that?	
8. What are the living arrangements with your	(READ ALL CHOICES: CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

current partner?	0 Living Together 1 Living Separately 2 Occasional Night Stay 3 Other (specify)		
9. Have you ever experienced physical, emotional, verbal, or sexual abuse in this current relationship?	0 No 1 Yes		
10. How many partners have you had an intimate, romantic, or sexual relationship with over the past 12 months? Please do not include cases of prostitution or "one night stands."	PROBE FOR BEST ESTIMATE _____		
SECTION B. I'm going to read you a list of specific events. First, I'd like you to tell me if any of these things have ever happened to you or if you have ever done any of these things to a partner. AFTER READING ENTIRE LIST, GO BACK AND ASK HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS AND 30 DAYS. (CIRCLE "0" FOR NO AND "1" FOR YES)			
	EVER?	Times in 12 Months	Times in 30 Days
11a. Have you ever been slapped by a partner?	0 1		
11b. Have you ever slapped a partner?	0 1		
12a. Have you ever had something thrown at you with the intent to hurt you by a partner?	0 1		
12b. Have you ever thrown something with the intent to hurt a partner?	0 1		
13a. Have you ever been pushed, grabbed, or shoved in anger by a partner?	0 1		
13b. Have you ever pushed, grabbed, or shoved a partner in anger?	0 1		
14a. Have you ever been threatened with harm by a partner?	0 1		
14b. Have you ever threatened to harm a partner?	0 1		
15a. Have you ever been threatened with a knife or gun by a partner?	0 1		
15b. Have you ever threatened a partner with a knife or gun?	0 1		
16a. Have you ever been stabbed or shot by a partner?	0 1		
16b. Have you ever stabbed or shot a partner?	0 1		
17a. Have you ever been punched or hit with something that could hurt by a partner?	0 1		
17b. Have you ever punched or hit your partner with something that could have hurt?	0 1		
18a. Have you ever been choked or strangled by a partner?	0 1		
18b. Have you ever choked or strangled a partner?	0 1		
19a. Have you ever been slammed against a wall or other hard surface by a partner?	0 1		
19b. Have you ever slammed your partner against a wall or other hard surface?	0 1		
20a. Have you ever been beaten up by a partner?	0 1		

20b. Have you ever beat up a partner?	0	1		
21a. Have you ever been burned or scalded on purpose by a partner?	0	1		
21b. Have you ever burned or scalded a partner on purpose?	0	1		
22a. Have you ever been kicked by a partner?	0	1		
22b. Have you ever kicked a partner?	0	1		
23a. Have you ever been forced to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex by a partner?	0	1		
23b. Have you ever used force to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with a partner?	0	1		
24a. Have you ever had oral, anal, or vaginal sex because of threats from a partner?	0	1		
24b. Have you ever used threats to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with a partner?	0	1		
25a. Has your property or pet ever been threatened with harm by a partner?	0	1		
25b. Have you ever threatened to harm a partner's property or pet?	0	1		
26. All together, in the past 12 months about how many times were you abused or victimized in an incident that involved any of the above mentioned items?	_____			
27. All together, in the past 12 months about how many times were you the aggressor in an incident that involved any of the above?	_____			
28. At what age did you first experience one of these acts listed above? Please do not consider any abuse you might have experienced as a child with a non-romantic partner.	_____			
29. At what age did you first commit one of these acts listed above?	_____			

PART I. I would like you to continue thinking about all of the intimate, romantic, or sexual relationships you have had in your lifetime, including when you were a teenager. Please tell me all the types of injuries you have had from fights with any partner. **COMPLETE PART I AND THEN SAY:** Please continue thinking about all partner relationships you have had in your lifetime and tell me which types of injuries you have caused to any of your partners. **COMPLETE PART II.**

PART I: READ LIST OF INJURIES THEY HAD.				PART II: READ LIST OF INJURIES THEY MAY HAVE CAUSED.				
No	Yes	DK	Refused		No	Yes	DK	Refused
0	1	88	99	30. Black eye	0	1	88	99
0	1	88	99	31. Bloody lip or welts on face	0	1	88	99
0	1	88	99	32. Bruising or welts on neck	0	1	88	99
0	1	88	99	33. Small scratches, scrapes, or cuts	0	1	88	99
0	1	88	99	34. Deep cut or burn	0	1	88	99
0	1	88	99	35 Severe bruising	0	1	88	99
0	1	88	99	36. Knocked unconscious or passed out	0	1	88	99
0	1	88	99	37. Chipped or knocked out teeth	0	1	88	99

54. Does your former partner have a particular religious affiliation?	0 No 1 Yes ASK QUESTION 54a
54a. What affiliation is that?	
55. What were the living arrangements with your former partner?	(READ ALL CHOICES; CIRCLE ONLY ONE) 0 Living Together 1 Living Separately 2 Occasional Night Stay 3 Other (Specify) _____
56. Were you drinking alcohol prior to this Most recent incident?	0 No (GO TO QUESTION 58) 1 Yes
57. How many drinks did you have prior to the most recent incident with your _____ partner?	(PROBE FOR RESPONDENT'S BEST ESTIMATE) _____
58. Did you drink alcohol <u>after</u> the most recent incident with your _____ partner?	0 No (GO TO QUESTION 60) 1 Yes
59. How many drinks did you have <u>after</u> the most recent incident with your _____ partner?	PROBE FOR RESPONDENT'S BEST ESTIMATE _____
60. Did you take any illegal drugs prior to the most recent incident with your _____ partner?	0 No (GO TO QUESTION 62) 1 Yes
61. Which of the following illegal drugs did you take before the most recent incident with your _____ partner?	READ ALL CHOICES: CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY 1 Marijuana 2 Crack 3 Powder Cocaine 4 Heroin 5 Amphetamines 6 Crystal Meth/Methamphetamines 7 Other _____
62. Did you take any illegal drugs <u>after</u> the most recent incident with your _____ partner?	0 No (GO TO QUESTION 64) 1 Yes
63. Which of the following illegal drugs did you take after getting in the most recent incident with your _____ partner?	READ ALL CHOICES: CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY 1 Marijuana 2 Crack 3 Powder Cocaine 4 Heroin 5 Amphetamines 6 Crystal Meth/Methamphetamines 7 Other _____
READ AS WRITTEN: Please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each statement as it relates to the most recent Incident between you and your _____ partner.	CIRCLE ONLY ONE RESPONSE: CIRCLE NO OPINION ONLY WHEN RESPONDENT INSISTS. CIRCLE NA WHEN RESPONDENT OR PARTNER DID NOT USE ALCOHOL OR DRUGS. THESE ARE FOR VALIDATION OF ABOVE.

64. A. I feel that my use of alcohol contributed to The incident we had.	SA A NO-OP D SD NA
B. I feel that my partner's use of alcohol contributed to the incident we had.	SA A NO-OP D SD NA
C. I feel that my use of illegal drugs contributed to the incident we had.	SA A NO-OP D SD NA
D. I feel that my partner's use of illegal drugs contributed to the incident we had.	SA A NO-OP D SD NA
65. Did you hit, punch, slap, push, or kick your partner during this most recent incident?	0 No (GO TO QUESTION 68) 1 Yes
66. Did you feel you had the right to strike/kick your partner?	0 No 1 Yes
67. What was your reason for striking/kicking your partner during the most recent incident?	OPEN-ENDED QUESTION. PLEASE PROBE FOR DETAIL
68. Did your partner hit, punch, slap, push, or kick you during this most recent incident?	0 No GO TO QUESTION 70 1 Yes
69. Do you think your partner had a right to Strike/kick you?	0 No 1 Yes
70. Can you tell me briefly about the most recent Incident between you and your _____ Partner?	(OPEN-ENDED QUESTION. PLEASE PROBE FOR DETAILS SUCH AS WHAT STARTED THE ARGUMENT, WHO INITATED THE FIGHT, WERE THE POLICE CALLED, WHAT WAS THEIR RESPONSE, AND ANY INJURIES EXPERIENCED.)
SECTION D: THESE QUESTIONS ARE FOR ALL RESPONDENTS. READ AS WRITTEN. Now, I'm going to ask you some questions about your childhood and about your family background.	
71. Do you have a particular religious affiliation?	0 No 1 Yes ASK QUESTION 71a
71a. What affiliation is that?	_____

72. Before you were 18 years old, did you	<p>READ ALL STATEMENTS; CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.</p> <p>1 Run away from home 2 Hit your mother or father 3 Often lie to your parents 4 Pick fights 5 Join a street gang 6 Hit a school teacher 7 Frequently get drunk 8 Set fires 9 Get arrested 10 Fight with a police officer 11 Skip more than the last 5 days of school in any year but your last 12 Get expelled from school for bad behavior 13 Carry a weapon, such as a gun or knife</p>
73. Since age 18, have you been in more than one fight with anyone? Do not include fights with a partner or as required by your job.	<p>0 No 1 Yes</p>
74. Are you on parole or probation now for a Violent offense?	<p>0 No 1 Yes</p>
75. Have you been arrested in the past 12 months for offenses relating to violent interactions with anyone? 75 a. How many times?	<p>0 No GO TO QUESTION 76 1 Yes GO TO QUESTION 75a</p>
76a. In the past 3 days, how much alcohol did you consume? 76b. In the past 30 days, how much alcohol did you consume?	<p>PROBE FOR RESPONDENT'S BEST ESTIMATE</p> <hr/> <hr/>
77. How frequently, on average, did your father/ Step-father (or male guardian) drink any alcoholic beverages: wine, beer or liquor?	<p>(READ ALL CHOICES: CIRCLE ONLY ONE)</p> <p>1 Three or more times a day 2 1-2 times a day 3 3-4 times a week 4 1-2 times a week 5 1-2 times a month 6 Once a year 7 Never</p>
78. How frequently, on average, did your mother/ Step-mother (or female guardian) drink any alcoholic beverages: wine, beer, or liquor?	<p>(READ ALL CHOICES: CIRCLE ONLY ONE)</p> <p>1 Three or more times a day 2 1-2 times a day 3 3-4 times a week 4 1-2 times a week 5 1-2 times a month 6 Once a year 7 Never</p>
79. Were you physically abused before age 18?	<p>0 No 1 Yes</p>
80. Were you sexually abused before age 18?	<p>0 No 1 Yes</p>
81. Have you been physically or sexually abused as an adult?	<p>0 No 1 Yes</p>
82. To your knowledge, did your father/step-father (or male guardian) use any type of illegal drug?	<p>0 No 1 Yes</p>

83. To your knowledge, did your mother/step mother (or female guardian) use any type of illegal drug?	0 No 1 Yes																														
<p>SECTION E. READ AS WRITTEN: For the following set of statements, please answer whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. When we use the term parents we mean either biological parents, adoptive parents, step-parents, or your primary guardian growing up.</p>																															
<p>85. A. I have been beaten so badly that it left marks on my body.</p> <p>B. My parents have beaten me so badly that I was ashamed to be seen by others.</p> <p>C. Sometimes my parents beat me so badly that I needed to see a doctor.</p> <p>D. There were times when my father beat my mother.</p> <p>E. There were times when my mother beat my father.</p> <p>F. There were times when my parents beat my brothers or sisters so badly that it left marks on their body.</p>	<p>(CIRCLE ONLY ONE CHOICE PER STATEMENT. USE 'NOOP' ONLY WHEN RESPONDENT INSISTS.). PLACE PLACARD IN FRONT OF RESPONDENTS.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>SA</td> <td>A</td> <td>NO-OP</td> <td>D</td> <td>SD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SA</td> <td>A</td> <td>NO-OP</td> <td>D</td> <td>SD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SA</td> <td>A</td> <td>NO-OP</td> <td>D</td> <td>SD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SA</td> <td>A</td> <td>NO-OP</td> <td>D</td> <td>SD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SA</td> <td>A</td> <td>NO-OP</td> <td>D</td> <td>SD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SA</td> <td>A</td> <td>NO-OP</td> <td>D</td> <td>SD</td> </tr> </table>	SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD	SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD	SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD	SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD	SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD	SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD
SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD																											
SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD																											
SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD																											
SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD																											
SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD																											
SA	A	NO-OP	D	SD																											

This is the conclusion of the interview. Thank you very much for agreeing to participate.

APPENDIX B

The Domestic Violence survey was conducted using two different ADAM surveys, due to the fact that the ADAM survey was revised in 2000. The following procedure was used to recode the variables so the 1999 and 2000 data would match.

Variable Name	1999		2000		Recoded	
	Value	Label	Value	Label	Value	Label
AGEALC	77 M	NA/Skip	5555	Yes, but unspecified	5555	Yes, but unspecified
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
ALC12MT	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	77 M	NA/Skip	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
	99 M	Data not obtained	7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
EVERMARJ	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
AGEMARJ	77 M	NA/Skip	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
MARJ12MT	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	77 M	NA/Skip	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
	99 M	Data not obtained	7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
EVERCRK	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
AGECRK	77 M	NA/Skip	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing

Variable Name	1999		2000		Recoded	
	Value	Label	Value	Label	Value	Label
CRK12MT	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	77 M	NA/Skip	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
	99 M	Data not obtained	7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
EVERCOC	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
AGECOC	77 M	NA/Skip	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
COC12MT	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	77 M	NA/Skip	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
	99 M	Data not obtained	7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
EVERHER	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
AGEHER	77 M	NA/Skip	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
HER12MT	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	77 M	NA/Skip	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
	99 M	Data not obtained	7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
EVERMETH	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing

Variable Name	1999		2000		Recoded	
	Value	Label	Value	Label	Value	Label
AGEMETH	77 M	NA/Skip	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
METH12MT	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	77 M	NA/Skip	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
	99 M	Data not obtained	7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
USE30MA			0	No	0	No
			1	Yes	1	Yes
			6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
USEMOMA	77 M	NA/Skip	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
MJ72HR	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	77 M	NA/Skip	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
	99 M	Data not obtained	7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
USE30CC			0	No	0	No
			1	Yes	1	Yes
			6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
USEMOCC	77 M	NA/Skip	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
CRK72HR	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	77 M	NA/Skip	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
	99 M	Data not obtained	7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
		9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing	

Variable Name	1999		2000		Recorded	
	Value	Label	Value	Label	Value	Label
USE30PC			0	No	0	No
			1	Yes	1	Yes
			6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
USEMOPC	77 M	NA/Skip	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
COC72HR	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	77 M	NA/Skip	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
	99 M	Data not obtained	7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
USE30HE			0	No	0	No
			1	Yes	1	Yes
			6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
USEMOHE	77 M	NA/Skip	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
HER72HR	0	No	0	No	0	No
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes
	77 M	NA/Skip	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
	99 M	Data not obtained	7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
USE30ME			0	No	0	No
			1	Yes	1	Yes
			6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing
USEMOME	77 M	NA/Skip	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing

Variable Name	1999		2000		Recorded		
	Value	Label	Value	Label	Value	Label	
CRY72HR	0	No	0	No	0	No	
	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes	
	77 M	NA/Skip	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only	
	99 M	Data not obtained	7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable	
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal	
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing	
DRNK30DY			0	No	0	No	
			1	Yes	1	Yes	
			6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only	
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal	
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing	
DAYDRNK	77 M	NA/Skip	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	5555 M	Yes, but unspecified	
	99 M	Data not obtained	6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only	
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable	
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal	
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing	
URINE	0	No/Refused	0	Respondent Refused	0	Respondent Refused	
	1	Yes/ Provided	1	Specimen Provided	1	Specimen Provided	
	2	Tried/Could not provide	2	Respondent attempted no specimen provided	2	Respondent attempted no specimen provided	
	99 M	Data not obtained	3	Respondent not available	3	Respondent not available	
			4	Other	4	Other	
			6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only	
			7777 M	Not Applicable	7777 M	Not Applicable	
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing	
	ANYDRG			0	Negative for all drugs	0	Negative for all drugs
				1	Positive MJ50 Only	1	Positive MJ50 Only
			2		2		
			3		3		
			8	No Test	8	No Test	
			6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only	
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal	
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing	
DRUGS			0	No Positive Tests	0	No Positive Tests	
			1	Positive, 1 Drug Only	1	Positive, 1 Drug Only	
			2	Positive, Multiple	2	Positive, Multiple	
			8	No Test	8	No Test	
			6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only	
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal	
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing	
	AGE	99 M	Data not obtained	8888	Refusal	8888	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing	

Variable Name	1999		2000		Recoded	
	Value	Label	Value	Label	Value	Label
RESIDENC	0	Public Housing	1	House, Mobile Home, Apartment	1	House, Mobile Home, Apartment
	1	Private Apartment	2	Residential hotel, Rooming house,	2	Residential hotels, Rooming house,
	2	House		Dorm, Group Home,		Dorm, Group Home,
	3	Shelter		Student Housing,		Student Housing,
	4	Jail/Prison		Military Base		Military Base
	5	Half-way House	3	Hospitals, Treatment Facility, Extended Care Facility	3	Hospitals, Treatment Facility, Extended Care Facility
	6	Drug/Alc Treatment Facility	4	Jail, Prison, Correctional	4	Jail, Prison, Correctional
	7	Street		Boot Camp		Boot Camp
	8	Other	5	Shelter	5	Shelter
	99 M	Data not obtained	6	No Fixed Residence, Homeless	6	No Fixed Residence, Homeless
			7	Other	7	Other
			6666 M	Facesheet Only	6666 M	Facesheet Only
			8888 M	Refusal	8888 M	Refusal
			9999 M	Missing	9999 M	Missing