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The intergenerational transmission of violence hypothesis is a widely researched mechanism of risk pertaining to children who have grown up witnessing intimate partner violence (IPV) between parents who then later may enter abusive dating relationships. Latinos are growing segments of the population with unique cultural factors influencing the occurrence of IPV. The author used an existing longitudinal data from the Women and Family Project (McCloskey, Figueredo & Koss, 1995) to examine the roles of the mother’s abuse history (physical and psychological) and the mother-daughter relationship on the daughter’s risk for dating violence among a sample of 50 Latina mother-daughter pairs. Results indicated the mothers’ experience with psychological abuse as a significant individual predictor for daughters’ risk of dating violence. The Latina daughters’ odds of reporting dating violence were three times higher if they also witnessed psychological maltreatment during childhood. Mothers’ reported psychological abuse, and daughters’ reported quality of the mother-daughter relationship and their dating violence beliefs accounted for over a quarter of the variance for the daughters’ risk of dating violence. This finding demonstrated connections between the mothers’ psychological maltreatment, the mother-daughter relationship, and the daughters’ dating violence beliefs of dating violence among the daughters. The results of this study are discussed in terms of the role of learned behaviors and beliefs, as well as the influence of maternal psychological abuse on the mother-daughter relationship and the mother’s psychological health.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

According to the 2010 Census, Latinos represent 16% of the U.S. population and grew by 43% over the course of a decade (Ennis, Rios-Vargas, & Albert, 2011), which greatly increases the national significance of any health or social needs of this group. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2013) has identified intimate partner violence (IPV) as a “serious, preventable public health problem that affects millions of Americans,” including Latinos. The prevalence and incidence of exposure to IPV among Latinos is high. Some estimate a nearly one-quarter lifetime prevalence rate of exposure to IPV (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Ingram (2007) found in a population-based survey with Latinos that half of the sample reported being exposed to some kind of IPV (i.e., physical, sexual, and psychological violence). Hazen and Soriano (2007) found that Latina women across nationalities in their sample experienced high lifetime rates of violence (33.9% of physical violence, 20.9% of sexual coercion, and 82.5% reporting psychological aggression). It is vital to continue researching the impact of IPV within the Latino population to identify risk and protective factors to reduce the occurrence of IPV among this fast-growing subgroup.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention define IPV according to the five types of IPV identified by Saltzman, Fanslow, McMahon, and Shelley (2002), which involve physical violence, sexual violence, threats of physical or sexual violence, and psychological/emotional violence perpetrated by a current/former significant other, lover, or spouse. IPV can vary according to frequency and severity by occurring in one instance
to chronic, severe battering or maltreatment. However, the definition of psychological/emotional violence is prefaced by stating that it will be deemed so when “there has been prior physical or sexual violence or prior threat of physical or sexual violence” (CDC, 2013). This definition of psychological maltreatment/aggression is limiting because psychological maltreatment can occur without the threat of violence through insults, demeaning language, and manipulation. The literature tends to conceptualize IPV as more severe and being frequent acts of violence or suggested violence. However, scholars have attempted to note the specific type(s) of IPV they are examining and have expanded their exploration across different cultural groups, such as Latinos.

Although the literature on the prevalence and incidence of exposure to IPV varies depending on the nature of the sample, a review of the IPV studies with Latinos funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention suggested that after controlling for confounders (e.g., income, age, education, drinking, family history, urbanicity, and impulsivity) IPV occurs as frequently among Latinos as with non-Latinos (Klevens, 2007). Klevens (2007) inferred that rates of victimization may be the same for both Latinos and non-Latinos but the severity of the abuse and its consequences may be more serious for Latinos. For example, Krishnan, Hilbert, and VanLeeuwen (2001) found more than half of the Latina participants in their shelter study to be suicidal compared to 35% of the non-Latina respondents. This highlights the significant psychological influence abuse can have on Latina women.

There are a number of barriers Latinas face that may influence their experiences with IPV. Previous studies have found that Latino families who report incidences of IPV
tend to be more economically and educationally disadvantaged when compared to non-Latino White women (González-Guarda, Ortega, Vasquez, & DeSantis, 2010; Kaufman Kantor et al., 2004; Straus & Smith, 1990). Less education and income/wealth can pose as barriers toward reporting IPV and seeking help. Another barrier that affects Latinas is acculturation level. One study found that Latinas who were moderately or highly acculturated were more likely to report IPV compared with the least acculturated Latinas (Garcia, Hurwitz, & Kraus, 2005). A language preference to speak in Spanish, a noted marker of low acculturation, has been identified in the literature as a significant cultural barrier for Latinas towards seeking help (West, Kaufman Kantor, & Jasinski, 1998).

These findings highlight that recent Latina immigrants to the United States may be more vulnerable to staying in an abusive relationship, may continue to have contact with their abuser despite leaving the relationship, or may not receive access to needed resources (e.g., legal services, counseling, temporary housing).

In addition, Latina women have been found in some studies to be more likely than non-Latina White women to have more tolerant attitudes towards “wife abuse” (Torres, 1991) and to be in “male-dominated marriages” in which men have more control and power in the marriage (Jasinski, 1996). Although these cultural factors may increase the likelihood for tolerating IPV in a relationship, some research has found that there are within group differences among Latinos regarding their intolerance of abusive behavior by a spouse (Kaufman Kantor et al., 1994). A number of protective factors have also been identified in the literature in regards to IPV, which include women having a higher education level (Caetano, Nelson, & Cunradi, 2001), being of high-medium acculturation level (Caetano, Ramisetty-Mikler, & McGrath, 2004), and having social support
The role of acculturation continues to be both a risk and protective factor based on a recent review of the IPV literature with Latinos (Cummings, González-Guarda, & Sandoval, 2013). Researchers thus have called for a more social ecological understanding of Latino culture and its effects on IPV because of influential cultural factors, such as gender roles, family stressors, income, and household composition (Cummings, González-Guarda, & Sandoval, 2013; Perilla, Bakeman, & Norris, 1994).

One notable risk factor for IPV is family history and intergenerational transmission (McCloskey, 2013). Family environment might pose a risk for early onset of dating and potential dating violence (i.e., violence between courting adolescent and young couples) (Enhrensaft, Cohen, Brown, Smailes, Chen, & Johnson, 2003). More specifically, experiencing childhood victimization or witnessing IPV have been identified as significant risk factors within the family environment for future IPV. A potential mechanism of risk noted by researchers is the “cycle of violence” across generations within the family unit as implied with the intergenerational transmission of violence hypothesis (Egeland, 1993). Research that supports this hypothesis has found that women exposed to IPV as children are more vulnerable to experiencing relationship victimization as an adult beyond the influence of other forms of childhood abuse (Elliott & Mihalic, 1997; Enhrensaft et al., 2003).

Theoretical Framework. Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) has been widely applied to conceptualize the cycle of violence across generations (Olsen, Parra, & Bennet, 2010). The theory suggests that individuals are socialized within the family unit through modeling and observing behavior to learn acceptable interpersonal behaviors, relationship roles and expectations, and possible gender/dating scripts (Villavencio,
Another popular theory within the IPV literature is social-cognitive theory (Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1990), which proposes that abusive socializing experiences will lead to chronic aggressive behavior through social information processing patterns. Dodge and colleagues (1990) found that childhood physical abuse was a risk factor for later aggressive behaviors through deficient social processing, attention to cues, and behavioral strategies. These two theories share conceptual overlap (Olsen, Parra, & Bennet, 2010) in terms of “learned response options and later response constructions…and response decisions” (p. 416). Lichter and McCloskey (2004) found that social cognitive beliefs regarding relationship roles and attitudes towards dating violence mediated the likelihood for adolescents who witnessed IPV during childhood to experience dating violence. This study highlighted the significant role of relationship beliefs and attitudes towards mediating the risk of dating violence among adolescents.

It is estimated that about 30% of children who live in a two-parent home witness IPV in the U.S. (McDonald, Jouriles, Ramisetty-Mikler, Caetano, & Green, 2006). Most research on intergenerational transmission of family violence has dealt with select samples, such as with children or women recruited from institutional settings (e.g., domestic violence shelters or the child protection system) (Renner & Shook Slack, 2006). Few researchers have interviewed abused women and their children from community samples. Also, a small number of studies have examined the effects of intergenerational violence within ethnic or racial minority samples; therefore, there is a need in the literature to capture cultural influences on IPV (Klevens, 2007; Stith et al., 2000). Moreover, witnessing IPV during childhood is a noteworthy risk factor that should be explored further across cultural groups, such as with Latinos.
IPV not only affects the child in a household but also parenting behaviors and the parent-child relationship. Holden and Ritchie (1991) found that battered women reported experiencing more parental stress than those who were not abused. Also, research has demonstrated a connection between impaired psychological functioning and parenting attitudes and behavior (i.e., parental warmth, effectiveness, control) (Levendosky & Graham-Bermann, 2000). It can be assumed, then, that a mother who is experiencing IPV may experience stress or psychological distress that can affect her parenting, and in turn the mother-child relationship. Ehrensaft and colleagues (2003) found an increased risk for partner injury through IPV perpetration when a perpetrator had a history of physical injury by a caretaker and low mother-adolescent/child closeness. On the other hand, the occurrence of IPV in the household can strengthen the mother-child bond (Villavicencio, 2008). These findings highlight the importance of parenting behaviors and attitudes in the context of IPV on the future behavior of children and adolescents.

The research to date suggests that Latinos are significantly impacted by IPV, experience unique risk factors, and that the intergenerational transmission of violence can occur through witnessing IPV as a child. However, we have limited knowledge about the role of intergenerational IPV among Latina mothers and daughters, and the role of the mother-daughter relationship on the daughter’s risk for dating violence. It is vital to examine such experiences with Latina mothers and daughters to provide more accurate information for the development of culturally relevant prevention and intervention efforts. Research on Latina mothers and daughters is important due to the higher risk of victimization women encounter and the potential intervening capability of the mother-daughter relationship to reduce risk for Latina women. Resiliency factors can be explored
as well to understand what protective processes within Latino families may be moderating the risk for dating violence or later IPV.

This study made use of a longitudinal dataset collected in the Southwestern U.S. over a decade (1990-2000) (McCloskey & Lichter, 2003). The dataset is unique because there are few to none longitudinal datasets focusing on girls who grow up with IPV in the household. The study also utilized extensive measures to assess IPV and dating violence, most of which are still widely used today. The current study examined the possibility of intergenerational IPV among Latina daughters who witnessed IPV in their household during childhood and adolescence through secondary analysis. Also, the role of the mother-daughter relationship was explored in terms of possible learned behaviors and beliefs towards relationships and dating violence. In the “Women and Family Project” (McCloskey, Figueredo, & Koss, 1995) longitudinal dataset, approximately half of the Latina mothers reported being in an abusive relationship. The daughters’ level of risk for dating violence was examined as an outcome along with other cultural variables (e.g., education, language preference, and relationship beliefs) that can influence the extent of risk. Findings from this study can add to the dating violence and IPV literature pertaining to Latinos by identifying predictors of dating violence. This in turn can inform culturally-sensitive dating violence prevention and IPV intervention programs.
I will explore the IPV literature more in depth in regards to familial risk factors for dating violence and propose theories related to the mechanism of intergenerational violence. I will also discuss specific cultural variables that can influence the occurrence of IPV among Latino families and explore the role of the mother-daughter relationship in regards to risk of future dating violence. Then, I will proceed to detail the study’s rationale and hypotheses, as well as examine the influence of witnessing IPV and the mother-daughter relationship on Latina daughters’ risk for dating violence.

**Dating Violence as a Risk Factor for IPV**

Dating violence during the adolescent years may be a precursor to repeated violence in young adulthood (Gomez, 2010; Smith, White, & Holland, 2003) and escalated marital violence in adulthood (Jorgensen, 1986). Thus, dating violence is a potential point for the prevention of adult IPV. Teenage dating violence is defined as “the use or threat of physical force or restraint carried out with the intent of causing pain or injury to another” between dating partners (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989, p. 4). Dating violence occurs between teen and young adult dating partners, with IPV being an umbrella term used for adult intimate relationships.

One of the first studies to examine the prevalence of dating violence found that one out of five college students had experienced at least one incident of physical abuse in their romantic relationships (Makepeace, 1981). Estimates since that time found that
50% to 60% of adolescents or young adults are either victims or perpetrators of dating violence (Avery-Leaf, Cascardi, O’Leary, & Cano, 1997; O’Keefe, 1997). However, Lewis and Fremouw’s (2001) critical review of the literature suggested that there are mixed results among the studies attempting to capture dating violence prevalence rates. For example, depending on the definition of dating violence used, some studies have found prevalence rates to be from 9% (Roscoe & Callahan, 1985) to as high as 65% when verbal aggression is measured (Laner, 1983). Perhaps with the inclusion of verbal aggression or psychological maltreatment, a more comprehensive view of dating violence can be captured in the literature, such as what has been seen with adult IPV.

Despite the discrepancies in the literature regarding rates of violence, dating violence has been identified as a significant predictor of future IPV in adulthood. For example, Gomez (2010) examined a longitudinal national sample of over 4,000 youth and found that child abuse and adolescent dating violence victimization were highly predictive of young adult IPV. Thus, dating violence can be a precursor to continued IPV through adulthood. Dating violence rates among particular racial/ethnic groups should be examined further, such as with Latinos.

**Latino/as and Dating Violence**

Dating violence research with Latino adolescents is limited, especially in exploring risk for victimization (Rayburn et al., 2007). Within the literature, Latina girls have been found to be more likely to report dating violence victimization (Howard & Wang, 2003; Sanderson, Coker, Roberts, Tortolero, & Reininger, 2004). Another study found that one in 10 Latino youth reported dating violence experiences within the past
year (Howard, Beck, Hallmark Kerr, & Shattuck, 2005). Howard and colleagues (2005) identified risk factors for dating violence among Latino youth that included youth who reported carrying a gun, suicidal thoughts and being involved in physical fights. A specific protective factor that was noted in the study for Latina girls was if they reported a stronger sense of self, they were less likely to report dating violence. Perhaps a firm sense of identity and in one’s beliefs and values assist Latina girls in identifying unhealthy relationships and an abusive partner. Such learned beliefs and values can occur within the family unit through family role and/or gender socialization. Culture may influence gender socialization practices and interact with modeling by the parent (Stith et al., 2000). One study found that adolescent girls who had witnessed IPV among their parents were more accepting of dating violence, which also acted as a mediating effect towards experiences of dating violence (Forshee, Bauman, & Linder, 1999). Therefore, it is imperative to examine the role of gender socialization among Latinos and evaluate its influence on risk for dating violence or IPV.

**Influence of Gender Socialization among Latinas on Risk for IPV**

A significant amount of research has found that Latinos living in the United States and abroad have traditional views towards gender roles (Niemann, 2004; Perilla et al., 1994; Marín & Marín, 1991) and these views may in turn be related to risk for dating violence. Traditional views towards gender roles include unique cultural variables, such as familismo. Familismo emphasizes family relationships, endorsing gender-based division of responsibilities among family members (Flores, Eyre, & Millstein, 1998). As a result of familismo, Latino children may be socialized to adhere
to traditional gender role expectations, such as females being dependent and submissive, and males being more dominant and coercive (Raffaelli & Ontai, 2004). In addition, more traditional gender role beliefs may facilitate the acceptance of abuse by men. Truman, Tokar, and Fischer (1996) found that traditional beliefs pertaining to heterosexual relationships were connected to the acceptance of male violence against women. Therefore, gender role socialization can influence attitudes towards IPV.

There are gender-role expectations among Latinas that carry a positive value for family life—such as motherly self-sacrificing (i.e., marianismo)—although these same qualities may increase women’s risk for relationship violence (Perilla et al., 1994). Such traditional expectations may influence Latina girls to internalize notions of learned helplessness and even to remain submissive to an abuser. In their qualitative study with Mexican American male and female adolescents, Black and Weisz (2004) found that participants, regardless of gender, believed that males were in control and the “boss” in romantic relationships and that females were responsible for their problems including violence within the relationship (“girl’s fault if she is hit”). According to Perilla and colleagues (1994), these types of gendered stereotypes are heightened when taking into account acculturation issues (i.e., being a recent immigrant to the U.S., language barriers, and isolation from family).

Women may also feel compelled to remain in the abusive relationship (Torres, 1991) or minimize the abuse due to cultural beliefs centered on maintaining the family’s privacy and reputation. For example, findings from Ahrens, Ríos-Mandel, Isas, and Lopez’s (2010) qualitative study suggested that familismo influenced Latina participants’ reluctance to disclose “family secrets” and thus many remained silent to
protect “their reputation and that of their family” (p. 288). It can be assumed that cultural beliefs endorsing IPV as acceptable can also be transmitted across generations. A survey conducted with a Latino sample found that having beliefs tolerant of IPV were associated with higher rates of IPV (Kaufman Kantor et al., 1994), which prompts the question of how Latinas are learning such messages and how it influences their understanding of relationships. Although there is mounting documentation about the various risk factors for dating violence among Latinas, there is very little information about the mechanisms used to learn such messages and the influence of these messages on their understanding of romantic relationships.

**Theoretical Framework**

Learning the possible developmental pathways or mechanisms for how individuals become perpetrators or victims of violent relationships is vital to reduce risk, facilitate better outcomes, and develop effective treatments (Olsen, Parra, & Bennett, 2010). Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980) theorized that children who witness IPV or experience child abuse are more likely to become physically abusive in their romantic adult relationships. Others have conceptualized this “cycle of violence” as being a repetitive cycle of violence amongst partners who were children that witnessed parental IPV (O’Leary, 1988). This concept developed into the intergenerational transmission of violence (IVT) hypothesis. The most commonly used theoretical foundation for this phenomenon is the theory of social learning and how children learn interpersonal functioning by observing how their parents treat each other and how others treat them (Bandura, 1977). Therefore, children who grew up in violent homes and witnessed
parental IPV would be more likely than those who did not to imitate and enact the learned interpersonal functioning in their own relationships as adolescents and adults.

Researchers have found a significant association between witnessing IPV as a child and being abused in an intimate relationship as an adult (Ehrensafet, et al., 2003; Stith, Rosen, & Middleton, 2000). Stith and colleagues (2000) found that females were more likely to be victimized if having witnessed IPV growing up or growing up in general in a violent home more so than females who did not witness violence in the household. McCloskey (2013) explored the abuse experience across three generations of women and found that 40% of battered mothers in the sample reported that their own mothers had been abused, and daughters who were sexually abused had mothers with the same sexual abuse history. It is possible that a narrative of victimization can be formed across generations. Some researchers postulate that women may adopt a learned helplessness response to violence (Renner & Shook Slack, 2006) and develop negative beliefs towards themselves or their actions as a result of such “uncontrollable” events (McCloskey, 2013; Peterson, Maier, & Seligman, 1993). However, such learned helplessness and negative self-beliefs can be the product of domination, control, manipulation, and violence by a perpetrator.

This study employed a social-cognitive framework to conceptualize the experiences of the daughters’ risk for dating violence and it applied social learning theory to better understand the influence of modeling and learned behaviors (Bandura, 1977) within the mother-daughter relationship. The social-cognitive model has also been used to examine possible social cognitions developed from child abuse (Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1990). Dodge and colleagues (1990) found that children who experience physical
harm viewed the world “in deviant ways that later perpetuate the cycle of violence” through the likelihood that they will develop “biased and deficient patterns of processing information, including a failure to attend to relevant cues, a bias to attribute hostile intentions to others, and a lack of competent behavioral strategies to solve interpersonal problems” (p. 1679). Essentially, the authors proposed that children will attribute a hostile bias towards others despite no threat being present. These interpersonal attributions could lead to difficulties in future romantic relationships in terms of perceived conflict(s), conflict resolution, role management, and general communication. It can be assumed that cognitions of gender and relationship beliefs can also be formed through observing parents or modeling beliefs/attitudes from the family unit within the context of IPV.

Gender-typed beliefs have been found to be a risk factor for relationship violence (Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd, & Christopher, 1983; Lichter & McCloskey, 2004; O'Keefe, 1997). For example, Lichter and McCloskey (2004) applied the social-cognitive paradigm to examine gender role beliefs or attitudes that may develop from exposure to IPV. The authors found an association between beliefs and attitudes towards dating relationships/violence when a child witnesses IPV. Childhood is potentially a key developmental period for the daughters to learn from their parents how to understand themselves and the world around them, and how to navigate other interpersonal relationships (e.g., friends, family, romantic relationships). In particular, daughters may acquire particular beliefs based on their mothers’ experiences that may dictate the daughters’ understanding of what they deserve in a romantic relationship, how they should be treated, and what role they should play within their relationship. Authors have
called for a more comprehensive theoretical approach towards examining risk for IPV. To address the gaps in literature, Riggs and O’Leary (1989) developed a model of dating violence pertaining to two distinct categories of interest: contextual and situational variables. Contextual variables are defined as “distal” variables that predict later violence, such as violence in the family of origin. Situational factors predict whether dating violence may occur, such as relationship dissatisfaction or conflict. The current study examined contextual variables to predict dating violence among the Latina daughters, such as examining the influence of being exposed to IPV as a child and a teen’s dating beliefs towards dating violence, as well as gendered beliefs pertaining to family roles. All of which have been shown to be potential risk factors for dating violence.

**Latina Mother-Daughter Relationships**

It is important to examine potential parent-child relationship factors in understanding the transfer of risk for abuse and family violence or “cycle of violence” (McCloskey, 2013; McCloskey & Lichter, 2003). Parenting practices or the quality of the relationship between the parent and child may influence whether children find themselves in abusive relationships later similar to the abuse they have witnessed. One study found that negative mother-child interactions involving harshness and negativity at age 3 for the child were associated with female victimization by intimate partners at age 21 (Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, & Silva, 1998). The authors suggested that young people who experienced “warmth, trust and open communication in an earlier primary relationship” (Magdol et al., 1998, p. 386) are likely to enact these characteristics in their
adult relationships. Other research has also shown the significance of the mother-daughter relationship in transferring parenting styles across generations, such as the use of physical punishment (Elder, Capsi, & Downey, 1986; Thornberry, Freeman-Gallant, Lizotte, Krohn, & Smith, 2003).

The mother-daughter relationship may play a more significant role at times in influencing the daughter’s attitudes and behaviors than the father-daughter relationship. For example, post-divorce studies indicate that adolescents are exposed to sensitive maternal disclosures concerning their father compared to the reverse (Arditti, 1999). One study found that divorced mothers were motivated to “shape” their daughter’s view of her father by negative disclosure concerning the former husbands (Koerner, Jacobs, & Raymond, 2000). Focusing more attention on the mother-daughter relationship in the area of intergenerational IPV might highlight the importance of the mother’s role in shaping the daughter’s beliefs or attitudes towards relationship roles and abuse. In studies examining the importance of the Latina mother-daughter relationship in particular, it was noted that highly conflictive relationships within the pair can lead to an increase in internalizing and externalizing symptomatology for Mexican-American youth (Crean, 2008). These findings highlight the influence of a mother’s dynamic on her daughter’s symptomatology. It is vital to explore the mother-daughter relationship within the context of IPV in the household in order to understand the role of the dynamic.

Research focusing on the mother-daughter relationship among Latinas within the context of IPV is scarce except for one noted study. Findings from Villavicencio’s (2009) qualitative study conducted with Latina adolescents showed that “almost all” of
the participants explicitly reported supporting their mothers when witnessing parental IPV. The daughters defended their mothers openly and reported the conflict to have influenced their views against male-on-female violence. On the basis of the study’s findings, Villavicencio speculated that the closeness of the mother and daughter may serve as a protective process. Because of the daughter’s heightened awareness of her mother’s experience with abuse, the daughter may, in turn, endorse less tolerant views towards abuse.

Closeness in the mother-daughter relationship can be a source of support for adolescent girls, especially those in an abusive relationship. Villavicencio (2009) found that daughters who indicated a history of dating violence expressed more positive views regarding their future when motherly support was present. However, some daughters in the study expressed high conflict relationships with their mothers; these conflict relationships left daughters feeling emotionally neglected by their mothers and/or perceiving limited support needed to leave the abusive relationship. Yet, in some cases of conflicted mother-daughter relationships, the mother was viewed as “strong” in how she managed the abusive relationship. The author suggested that the Latina adolescents used their mother-father relationship as a model for their own relationships and relied on their family’s messages. This qualitative examination provided an in-depth view of the importance of the Latina mother-daughter relationship and its effect on the adolescent daughters’ relationship views and perceptions towards IPV.

The mother-daughter relationship can influence the daughter’s risk for future dating violence or IPV victimization through the quality of parenting practices, level of support given by the mother, the role of the mother in shaping beliefs or attitudes for the
daughter, and the level of closeness between the Latina mother and daughter. The
current study examined the role of the mother-daughter relationship among Latinas in
order to identify a potential point of prevention and intervention against continued
generational IPV.

**Study Rationale**

Intimate partner violence is a significant public health concern nationally. IPV is a
particular concern for Latinos because they are over-represented among poor and
working class communities, experience more severe forms of IPV, and have limited
access to effective IPV intervention efforts. To date, witnessing IPV during childhood has
been noted as a significant risk factor for adolescent dating violence, while in turn dating
violence has been identified as a risk factor towards later IPV as an adult. Gender-typed
beliefs and more accepting attitudes towards IPV have also been identified as risk factors,
which can be learned through parental role-modeling and communicated messages about
relationships and gender. Parental practices and parent-child closeness are additional
influences on possible future IPV victimization. However, there are significant
limitations in the literature pertaining to examining the intergenerational transmission of
violence among Latina daughters and mothers and examining the influence of the
mother-daughter relationship on future IPV. This study’s sample of Latina mother-
daughter pairs will shed light on their experiences with IPV, the role of the mother-
daughter relationship, and identify any specific cultural factors (i.e., IPV-related beliefs,
family role beliefs, education, and language) that can increase the daughters’ risk of
reporting dating violence.
Statement of Intent

Building on the research, the current study explored whether the intergenerational transmission of violence hypothesis applies to a sample of Latina mother-daughter pairs. The theories of social learning (i.e., modeled behaviors and attitudes) and learned social cognitions (i.e., beliefs) were applied in examining the mechanisms of intergenerational violence. In addition, the role of the mother-daughter relationship was examined as well to determine its influence on the daughter’s likelihood to experience dating violence. The project consisted of secondary analysis of the longitudinal “Women and Family Project.” This 10-year longitudinal dataset was collected over the course of three waves of data collection (i.e., Wave 1 in 1990, Wave 2 in 1996, and Wave 3 in 1998). The dataset includes Latina mothers and daughters, which includes daughters who have witnessed IPV in their household growing-up and those who have not. Specific research questions were as follows:

(a) Is there a relation between the mothers’ reported abuse history and the daughters’ experience with dating violence? I hypothesize that mothers who reported either physical or psychological abuse will also have daughters who report dating violence, which would provide support for the intergenerational transmission of violence hypothesis.

(b) Does the mother’s abuse history (at Wave 1 and 2) relate to the quality of the mother-daughter relationship during Wave 2? I hypothesize that daughters who had mothers with a history of abuse will report a lower quality of the mother-daughter relationship
(low on parental warmth). This occurrence may be due to the influence of the trauma on the mother’s parenting behaviors and self-esteem.

(c) Is there a relation between the quality of the mother-daughter relationship and the daughter’s experience of dating violence? I hypothesize that daughters who report a close and warm mother-daughter relationship will have a lower likelihood of experiencing dating violence because of the maternal support received.

(d) Do associations exist among the socio-cognitive variables (daughter’s gender-typed family role beliefs and dating violence beliefs), mother’s abuse history, and daughter’s reported dating violence? Based on the literature review, I hypothesize that daughters whose mothers report either psychological or physical abuse will endorse more favorable beliefs towards traditional gender-typed family roles and dating violence. In addition, the same tolerant and traditional beliefs will be associated with daughters who report dating violence due to the assumption that daughters will learn relationship beliefs and behaviors through social learning and social cognitive theories.

(e) Does the mother’s abuse history predict the daughter’s likelihood of experiencing dating violence as an adolescent at both Waves 2 and 3? On the basis of the empirical literature, I hypothesize those daughters who witnessed IPV as children will be more likely to report dating violence in their romantic relationships, according to the proposed theory of intergenerational transmission of violence.

(f) When accounting for mothers’ abuse history and the quality of the mother-daughter relationship, do socio-cognitive variables predict the daughters’ likelihood to report dating violence? Daughters who report receiving parental warmth from their mother
will endorse less tolerant IPV dating beliefs, and will have a lower likelihood for
dating violence. The mothers’ warmth and support could act as a protective factor by
nurturing the daughters’ self-esteem and informing them of unhealthy relationship
dynamics.
CHAPTER 3
PRESENT STUDY

Method

Secondary analysis of the “Women and Family Project” dataset (McCloskey, Figueredo & Koss, 1995; McCloskey & Lichter, 2003) was conducted. The Women and Family project was designed to investigate the unique risk of marital violence on children’s behaviors, attitudes, beliefs, psychological and physical health, interpersonal relationships, and academic functioning. The dataset is based on in-depth interviews over 10 years with mother-child pairs ($N = 363$) first recruited in 1990. The pairs were later re-interviewed in two subsequent waves, one from 1996 to 1997 ($N = 310$) and 1998 to 1999 ($N = 296$). Approximately 150 mother-daughter pairs were interviewed with 50 pairs identifying as Latina, mainly of Mexican origin. The Latina mothers were recruited through various research announcements and posters in Spanish and English throughout low-income areas in a Southwestern mid-size city. Families were originally recruited from battered women’s shelters, health clinics and community organizations; therefore, providing a convenience sample. The comparison group was recruited through the community as well with no mention of abuse on recruitment materials. All of the women met the criteria to participate in the study if they reported co-residing with a male partner the past year while also raising at least one school-age child in the household (6 to 12 years old).
Participants who had been in an abusive relationship for the past year comprised the group of interest. Women were originally grouped as either exposed to intimate partner violence the year preceding the interview or not exposed. Exposure to intimate partner violence was defined when a woman reported at least two forms of “minor” physical aggression (according to the Conflict Tactics Scale [Straus, 1979]) or one form of escalated physical aggression; for example, pushing and shoving (so called minor) or beating for a number of minutes (severe). This classification was labeled as a “group” variable, and analyses were performed with domestic violence exposure as the independent variable in subsequent analyses. For the purpose of this study, data from the three waves were examined through secondary analysis with the Latina mother-daughter pairs ($N = 50$ pairs), in which the mother reported having either experienced IPV ($n = 26$) or not ($n = 24$).

**Participants**

The current sample consists of 50 Latina mothers and their daughters ($N = 50$ dyads), in which 26 mothers reported being in an abusive relationship and 24 mothers noted no abuse in their current relationship. Three mothers (6%) were recruited from a shelter and the remaining mothers were from the community (94%). The following demographics were obtained from the first wave of data collection unless otherwise noted. The mother’s average age was 33 years old ($SD = 1.6$), and the daughters’ mean age was 8.5 years old ($SD = 1.8$) at Wave 1 (ranging from 6-12 years old), 14.6 years old ($SD = 1.8$) at Wave 2 (ranging from 11 to 18 years old), and 16.3 years ($SD = 1.8$) at Wave 3 (ranging from 13 to 20 years old) (see Table A1). All but one mother reported
being the biological parent of her daughter, and 28 of the mothers reported that their partners were the biological father (56%). Mothers in the sample had from 1 to 7 children ($m = 3.28, SD = 1.5$). Thirty-two women (64%) were married. The reported mean relationship length for the mothers was eight years ($SD = 5.42$) and ranging from 1-24 years. For 12 of the daughters (24%), the mother’s abuser was the step-father, and 10 (20%) reported an “other” relationship. At some point during data collection, the majority of the participants self-identified as Hispanic, Mexican, or Mexican-American (96%). The mothers tended to prefer speaking English ($n = 32, 64%$) to Spanish ($n = 7, 14$%), while 11 (22%) reported no preference between English or Spanish. The majority of the daughters’ preferred language was English ($n = 45, 90$%) with two preferring Spanish (4%) and one either (2%). The average years of formal education for the mothers was 12.6 years ($SD = 2.4$), which would be equivalent to a high school diploma or some college. Nearly three-quarters (72%) of the mothers were employed at least part time. Thirty percent ($n = 15$) of mothers reported their partners were unemployed, six (12%) had part-time employment, and 28 (56%) of the partners were full-time. A few participants had missing data. The mean monthly income from both the mother and partner was $1,187; however, that of the mother’s alone was $404 and the partner’s alone was $783.

At Wave 3, thirty-eight girls reported having dated and 11 never dated at this time point. One participant had missing data. In addition, 34 reported ever having a boyfriend with relationship length ranging from eight weeks to six years. All 50 of the daughters provided a name of a current “boyfriend.” All 50 daughters were considered for analysis because every daughter provided a name of a current dating partner and thus
indicating a degree of dating exposure. A total of 10 daughters (21.3%) reported being physically, psychologically and/or sexually abused by a dating partner for both Waves 2 and 3. For the purposes of this study, we used daughter age of 14 yrs old or older at Wave 3 as the inclusion criteria. Researchers have defined adolescence as beginning at age 14 (Ullman & Filipas, 2005) as a way to distinguish between dating violence and childhood abuse. Subsequently, three cases were eliminated from analyses because the daughters were 13 years old at Wave 3; thus, our final sample consisted of 47 girls.

Measures

Across the three waves of data collection, various psycho-social measures were administered to both mothers and daughters through in-person interviews. Refer to Table 2 to see all measures used and their internal consistency coefficients. In addition, refer to Appendix B, Forms 1-7 to see the measures in their full form. For the purposes of this study, mother’s reported abuse at Wave 1 was used along with demographic variables. From Wave 2, daughters’ responses concerning the mother-daughter relationship and their abuse histories were examined along with the mother’s experience of psychological abuse specifically. In the third wave of interviews, the daughter’s experience of dating violence was considered in addition to Wave 2 data, as well as the daughters’ completion of high school or attainment of a GED. An identified strength of this study was how data were gathered from two informants, from the perception of both the mother and daughter. In addition, the longitudinal data provide a rich source of information for analysis.
**Demographics.** General demographic information (e.g., age, parental status, relationship status, number of children, length of relationship, partner living in household, language preference, employment, and formal education) was obtained through questionnaire responses given at Wave 1 of data collection. Specific attention will be given to the mother and daughter’s education level and the mother’s language preference based on risk factors discussed in the aforementioned chapters. Additional demographic information was gathered from the daughters across waves that included education level, if they live with the mother, relationship status, length of relationship, age of partner, and attraction preference.

**Group Classification: Childhood Exposure to Intimate Partner Violence.** Latina mothers were classified as abused based on self-reports at the time of recruitment during Wave 1. Fifteen out of the 19 items from the Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS) (Straus, 1979) were used to assess the frequency and extent of the violence in the home. The CTS has been criticized for not capturing the full complexity of violence that women may experience (Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, & Daly, 1992), so investigators from the primary study conducted informal focus groups with battered women and shelter staff to improve the scale’s validity. Seven additional items were included pertaining to property destruction, forced sex, threat to harm children if the woman left, and if their partner had burned them. Items were originally answered on a 7-point Likert-type scale from 0 (never) to 6 (more than 20 times). However, through recommendation of the scale’s original creator, physical violence scores were dichotomized into abused (1) or non-abused (0) categories due to the usually skewed distributions of participants’ reported physical abuse (Straus, 1979). If participants answered “yes” to one of the CTS items of
moderate to severe violence, then they were classified as abused; thus, producing the “abused” grouping classification variable (Herrera & McCloskey, 2001). This revised 22 item scale had a Cronbach alpha of .95 (Lichter & McCloskey, 2004) in initial stages of data analyses that led to the grouping variable. The CTS contains items that also address psychological aggression, which has been noted to be a predecessor for physical violence (O’Leary, 1988; Straus, 1974).

Mother’s Experience of Psychological Abuse. Psychological abuse was measured with modified items from the Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI-F) [shortened version] (Tolman, 1989) at Wave 2 with the mothers. The PMWI-F consists of 14-items ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very frequently) and two scales: the Emotional Verbal Scale (e.g., “My partner called me names/swore at me/yelled and screamed at me”) and the Dominance-Isolation Scale (e.g., “My partner tried to make me feel crazy/monitored my time and made me account for my whereabouts/restricted my use of the telephone”). Cronbach alpha estimate (.93) for the total measure was high. A summed score for psychological abuse victimization was created to capture a greater range of variance within this continuous variable. Psychological abuse at Wave 3 of data collection was not considered due to the scope of the study aiming to assess the effects of witnessing IPV during the daughters’ early development (Waves 1 and 2).

Outcome Variable: Occurrence of Dating Violence for Daughters. At Waves 2 and 3, daughters were asked if they had been victimized by intimate partners. Dating history was assessed from the most recent boy dated for at least one month to the past year (12 months), which correspond to items described in surveys of teen dating
violence (e.g., Foshee, Linder, Bauman, Langwick, Arriaga, Heath, et al., 1996) that were adapted from items in the CTS (Straus, 1979). During initial data collection, dating was defined as “going out with or being with someone in a romantic way, whether you have dated only once or have had a long-term relationship,” not necessarily including sexual activity (Lichter & McCloskey, 2004).

Responses to the 12 items were dichotomized as no abuse (0) and abused (1) due to the skewed nature of abuse indicators as noted previously (Straus, 1979). Sample questions include: “Has any other guy you dated ever thrown an object at you in the past year?” Or “slapped/hit you with a fist/choked/beat you up in the past year?” For this study, a sexual abuse item (i.e., “Has anybody you have dated forced you to have sex in the past year?”) (Koss & Oros, 1982) was included with the physical abuse indicators because of the typical co-occurrence of both types of abuse as noted in the literature (Edwards, Holden, Felitti, & Anda, 2003). Due to some psychological abuse items being more severe compared to other items, endorsing any one of these four items (“Overly critical, ridiculed you, pressured you for sex, and angry if you wouldn’t have sex”) at a three or above response (Sometimes to Very Often) were included in the physical abuse items as well. Severe psychological abuse has been noted in the literature as a precursor to physical abuse (O’Leary, 1999). The daughters were categorized as having experienced dating violence if they endorsed at least one abuse item, similar to categorization strategies of past research with dating adolescents (Foshee et al., 1996). The internal consistency estimate was acceptable (.85).

**Mother-Daughter Relationship Quality.** During Waves 2 and 3, daughters were asked to respond to the “Mother-Child Relationship Questionnaire.” This questionnaire
was comprised of various measures assessing relationship dynamics as part of the interview protocol. Subscales of the questionnaire regarding parental warmth and rejection with the target child were used. The total scale consisted of 14 items rated from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always) with an acceptable internal consistency estimate of .87. The parental rejection (eight) items were developed by the original principal investigator (Stuewig & McCloskey, 2005) to measure humiliating and/or shaming tactics used by the mother with the daughters and demonstrated good internal consistency (Cronbach alpha = .82). Sample items are: “How often does your mother criticize the way you look physically?” and “How often does your mother say very personal things and embarrassing things about you in front of other people?”

Parental warmth items were adapted from Hazzard, Christensen, and Margolin (1983); these six items measure the sense of closeness the daughter may feel towards her mother. Sample items are: “How often does your mother tell you she likes what you did or thank you for doing things?” and “How often does your mother pay attention to what you say?” Responses were rated on the same 5-point scale and also initially showed acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach alpha = .82).

A paired samples t-test failed to reveal a statistically significant difference between the mean score of the daughter’s perceptions of the mother-daughter relationship at Wave 2 ($M = 54.33, SD = 8.80$) and the mean score at Wave 3 ($M = 55.09, SD = 8.39$), $t(43) = -.747, p = .459, \alpha = .05$. Because there was no significant difference between scores across time, the mother-daughter relationship measure from Wave 2 was used for further analysis. These data provide an interpretation of the mother-daughter relationship from the daughter’s point of view during a significant
development period for the daughters at Wave 2. This period of data collection captures the adolescence period of the daughters in which the mother-daughter relationship at this point can inform future behaviors.

**Beliefs towards Relationships and Abuse.** In Wave 3 for the daughters, the Dating Scripts Scale (DSS: described in Crawford, 2000) assessed attitudes and traditional gender role beliefs about dating violence. The DSS is comprised of 11 items rated 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 4 (*Strongly agree*) with a Cronbach alpha estimate of .71. The DSS assesses participants’ views on how girls and boys should act in their relationships. The measure captures beliefs towards acceptability of abuse in relationships. Sample items include: “guys should always pay on dates, hitting someone is just a sign that you love them, and girls should break up with a guy the first time he hits her.”

In addition, mothers and daughters were asked at Wave 3 their gender role beliefs towards husband and wife relationships with the Family Roles scale. The Family Roles scale was based on a 20 item instrument created from qualitative interviews and Suzuki’s (1991) scale measuring sex-role attitudes. The scale is an 8-item scale rated 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*). Items were reversed coded as needed. The mothers’ responses elicited an alpha coefficient of .37 and the daughters’ responses was a .73, respectively. Due to the low reliability in the mother’s responses, the mother’s Family Roles scale scores will not be examined.
Procedure

At each time point, data were collected through face-to-face interviews with standardized questionnaires and in-depth interviews with the mothers and daughters. Both were informed of the general aims of the study to assess children’s psychosocial adjustment and family environment, and after giving consent, mother and child were interviewed separately for about two hours and tape recorded. Trained female interviewers were utilized and the project attempted to match the interviewer’s ethnicity to that of the family. Interviews in Spanish were conducted if needed ($n = 7$) and administered by individuals who were native Spanish speakers. The translation of measures within the interview protocol was lead by a research associate who was a native Spanish speaker. Initial translations were carefully reviewed through discussion groups of bilingual research staff members. The Conflict Tactics Scale was the only measure that received back translation due to the length of the overall interview protocol and limited resources. However, the research team reviewed the interview material extensively to reach a consensus of meaning for the interview process. Interviewers were blind to family violence history until the end of the interview, except for early interviews that took place in the shelter. A full-time master’s level counselor was contracted with the project in order to aid families in the midst of crisis or assist in reporting or counseling families with current cases of child abuse. Because of the ethical and legal responsibilities for the investigators to report current abuse, there may have been underreporting of family violence or abuse among participants. To compensate participants for their time, gift certificates or cash were provided to youth ($20$) and parents ($30$).
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Data Analysis

Both parametric (for continuous variables) and non-parametric tests (for categorical variables) were used to examine group differences and relationships among variables. In addition, binary logistic regressions were used to examine the predictors of interest in order to assess daughters’ potential risk level for dating violence. To address each research question the following analyses were conducted: a) Group differences and associations were examined between the daughters’ reported dating violence and the mothers’ abuse history with the use of chi-square analyses and Spearman correlations; b) Spearman correlations were used to explore associations between the mother-daughter relationship and the mother’s abuse history; c) Additional Spearman correlations were used to consider possible associations between the mother-daughter relationship and the daughter’s report of dating violence; d) Again, Spearman correlations were employed to examine any potential relationships between socio-cognitive variables (e.g., daughter’s gender-typed family role beliefs and dating violence beliefs) with mothers’ abuse history and daughters’ reported dating violence e) A simultaneous logistic regression was used to examine whether the mother’s abuse history (physical and psychological abuse) predicts the daughter’s experience of dating violence; f) Another simultaneous logistic regression took into account the mother-daughter relationship and mother’s abuse history to examine whether socio-cognitive variables (e.g., daughter’s gender-typed family role
beliefs and dating violence beliefs) would predict the daughter’s likelihood to report dating violence

**Group Differences and Associations**

Based on the first research question, demographic variables were examined among mothers and daughters.

*Mothers.* To determine whether the mothers who experienced IPV \((n = 26)\) were different on demographic variables compared to those who did not report a history of IPV \((n = 24)\), a descriptive chi-square analysis was conducted. No significant differences were found between groups on the demographic variables. See Table A3 for further details.

*Daughters.* Descriptive information regarding data from the daughters across all three waves of data collection is presented in Table A4. During the first wave of data collection the Latina daughters were at an important developmental period for their potential exposure to IPV. All daughters were included in the analysis because each provided a name of a dating partner. From the total sample, ten daughters (21%) reported experiencing dating violence in their intimate relationships and 37 (79%) reported no dating violence over the course of Wave 2 and Wave 3 of data collection. Daughters’ age did not differ in regards to their experience of dating violence \((t(47) = - .86, p = .39)\).

Various demographic variables were identified as potential risk factors in the literature for the Latina daughters’ risk for dating violence, which included the mother’s education level and language preference, and the daughter’s completion of high school.
These variables were not significant according to various analyses (i.e., t-tests, Mann-Whitney tests, Kruskal-Wallis test, and chi-square analysis) and did not serve as risk factors for this sample. No significant differences or associations on demographic variables were found between the mother’s who reported IPV and those who did not. In addition, no significant differences or associations were found for the daughters for each wave of data collection.

Abuse Variables. For research question (a), the relationship between the mother’s abuse history and the daughter’s report of dating violence was explored. First of all, group differences were examined in regards to the mothers’ experiences with abuse and the daughters’ report of dating violence. There was no significant difference between the mothers’ initial report of IPV (Wave 1) and daughters’ experience of dating violence (at both Waves 2 and 3), \( X^2(1) = 1.45, p = .70 \). However, there was a significant positive relationship between the daughters’ report of dating violence and the mother’s report of psychological abuse at Wave 2, \( r_s = .37, p = .02 \). See Table 5 for a correlation matrix with the variables of interest. Mothers’ experiences of psychological abuse were related to higher instances of dating violence for the daughters, which partially supports the given hypothesis in terms of a possible generational transmission of IPV if the mother experienced psychological abuse.

Mother-daughter relationship. To address research question (b), relationships between the perceived quality of the mother-daughter relationship and mothers’ abuse history were examined. There was no significant association between the mothers’ initial report of physical abuse and the daughters’ reported quality of the mother-daughter relationship (during the second wave of data collection), \( r_s = .08, p = .61 \). Moreover, a
A significant negative correlation was found between the daughter’s perception of the mother-daughter relationship and the mothers’ experience with psychological abuse ($r = -0.44, p = .004$). The negative correlation suggests that daughters who perceived the mother-daughter relationship as “warmer” had mothers who endorsed experiencing less or no psychological abuse during the period where the daughters were about 14-15 years old, which partially aligns with the proposed hypothesis. Daughters tend to perceive a lower quality mother-daughter relationship when the mother has experienced a form of abuse, in this case—psychological abuse.

For research question (c), additional group differences and associations were examined between the mother-daughter relationship and the daughter’s reported dating violence. Daughters who reported no dating violence ($Mdn = 26.31$) had significantly more positive perceptions of the mother-daughter relationship than those daughters who were experiencing dating violence ($Mdn = 15.45$), $U = 99.5, p = .03$. This finding is consistent with a Spearman correlation that found a significant negative relationship between the daughters’ reported experience of dating violence and their perceptions of the mother-daughter relationship, $r = -0.33, p = .02$. The analyses support the hypothesis that daughters’ who report a warmer mother-daughter relationship will likely to report no dating violence.

To assess research question (d), associations between socio-cognitive variables (daughter’s gender-typed family role beliefs and dating violence beliefs) and mothers’ abuse history as well daughters’ reported dating violence. There was no significant relationship between daughters’ dating violence beliefs and mothers’ initial report of IPV. However, there was a significant positive association between daughters’ beliefs
towards dating violence and mothers’ experience of psychological abuse, $r_s = .30, p = .05$. Mothers experiencing psychological abuse tended to have daughters endorse more favorable beliefs towards dating violence (i.e., “Guys only hit their girlfriends when they’ve done something to deserve it”). Also, there was a significant positive relationship between the daughters’ reported beliefs towards dating violence and their beliefs towards more traditional gender roles in the family, $r_s = .62, p < .001$. This finding highlights the association between more traditional beliefs towards roles in the family unit and favorable beliefs towards dating violence. However, there was not a significant relationship between the daughters’ reported experience of dating violence and their beliefs towards family roles, $r_s = .06, p = .70$. Therefore, the findings partially supported the occurrence of transmitted beliefs towards dating violence to daughters when mothers’ reported psychological abuse.

It appears that early exposure to IPV alone is not a determinant for later dating violence. However, if mothers are subjected to psychological maltreatment during their daughters’ adolescence, being exposed to both may erode the mother-daughter relationship. The daughters may also internalize beliefs towards dating and family roles that place them in jeopardy of dating violence.

**Regression Findings**

Simultaneous logistic regression analysis was selected to test the intergenerational transmission of violence hypothesis through learned mechanisms of modeled behavior and socialized beliefs/attitudes, which applies features of the social learning model and social-cognitive model. Regression analyses can assist in predicting future behavior and
likelihood of risk for the Latina daughters. Simultaneous logistic regression was selected over linear or multiple regression because the outcome variable – dating violence victimization of adolescent daughters – was a categorical value with two levels (0, 1).

No demographic variables were adjusted for the regression models due to non-significant findings in the descriptive analyses. Based on the previous bivariate analyses, it appears that witnessing psychological maltreatment may have more of an influence on the daughters’ risk for dating violence than witnessing IPV, as well as influencing their beliefs towards family roles and dating relationships. The mother-daughter relationship may also moderate the daughters’ level of risk when accounting for witnessing psychological maltreatment. Therefore, the proceeding regressions will not take into account the mothers’ initial report of physical abuse from Wave 1. See Table 6 for the logistic regression analyses.

A logistic regression was conducted to examine research question (e) to determine if the mothers’ psychological abuse history predicts the daughters’ report of dating violence. The overall model was significant ($\chi^2 (1) = 5.74, p = .02$) accounting for 21% of the variance for the likelihood of predicting daughters’ reported dating violence, with 86% of the participants classified correctly. The mothers’ reported psychological abuse presented as a significant predictor ($p = .02$) in the model, which indicates that mothers’ who report psychological abuse will increase the odds of their daughters’ reporting dating violence by three times. This provides partial support for the transmission of intergenerational IPV in terms of witnessing psychological maltreatment growing up.

To test research question (f), mothers’ report of psychological abuse, the mother-daughter relationship, daughters’ dating violence beliefs and the daughters’ gender-typed
family roles beliefs were entered simultaneously into the model in order to predict the daughters’ likelihood of experiencing dating violence. The overall model was non-significant, \( \chi^2 (4) = 7.89, p = .096 \), as shown in Table A6. The mothers’ psychological abuse demonstrated to be the only significant individual predictor; however, due to the overall model being non-significant, the individual predictor could not be interpreted.

A second logistic regression was conducted with the same variables in consideration except for the daughters’ beliefs towards family roles. This was done to reduce possible multicollinearity with daughters’ beliefs towards dating violence because both measures assess degrees of traditional gender role beliefs. This second simultaneous logistic regression demonstrated a significant overall model \( \chi^2 (3) = 7.85, p = .05 \) accounting for 27% of the variance for the likelihood of predicting daughters’ reported dating violence, with 83% of the participants classified correctly. Once again, the mothers’ reported psychological abuse presented as a significant predictor \( (p = .04) \) in the model, which indicates that mothers’ who report psychological abuse will increase the odds of their daughters’ reporting dating violence by three times. The overall model highlights the importance of the perceived quality of the mother-daughter relationship as a predictor, in addition to noting pathways of possible transmission of modeled and learned behaviors, beliefs and/or attitudes towards IPV. The intergenerational transmission of violence hypothesis appears to be partially supported by the fact that daughters who witnessed the psychological maltreatment of their mothers were more likely to report dating violence than those who were non-witnesses.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This study utilized secondary analysis of the 10-year longitudinal “Women and Family Project” to examine the intergenerational transmission of violence hypothesis among Latina mothers and daughters with over half of the mothers reporting IPV at the initial stage of data collection. Theories of social learning (i.e., modeled behaviors and attitudes) and learned social cognitions (i.e., beliefs) were applied in examining the mechanisms of intergenerational violence. Risk factors for dating violence among the Latina daughters were examined, including witnessing IPV in the household during childhood, their perceived quality of the mother-daughter relationship, socio-cognitive factors (i.e., gender-typed family role beliefs and beliefs towards dating violence), and specific cultural demographic variables.

Analyses demonstrated associations between the daughters’ endorsement of dating violence when their mothers reported psychological abuse, the daughters had more tolerant beliefs towards dating violence, and the daughters perceived their mothers to be more rejecting of them. Regression analyses supported the aforementioned findings with a significant model that captured over a quarter of the variance to explain the daughters’ reports of dating violence. The intergenerational transmission of violence hypothesis is partially supported with mothers’ report of psychological abuse being a significant predictor for daughters’ experience of dating violence. This chapter will discuss the findings more in depth and offer possible explanations through support from the
Risk Factors for Daughters’ Dating Violence

Demographic variables were not significantly associated with the daughters’ report of dating violence. This may be due to the small sample size in the current study, few instances of missing data, and the fact that mother’s language preference was used as a proxy to assess acculturation level. However, a few notable variables grouped together were found to predict daughters’ report of dating violence. A regression model that accounted for the mother’s psychological abuse, the daughters’ perceptions of the mother-daughter relationship, and the daughters’ dating violence beliefs predicted 27% of the variance for the daughters’ likelihood to experience dating violence. This reinforces the importance of the combination of variables that entail the mothers’ experience with abuse and the daughters’ perceptions towards their mothers. The only significant individual predictor was the mother’s psychological abuse experience, which indicated daughters were three times more likely to report dating violence when witnessing psychological maltreatment in childhood. This affirms the key developmental period of late childhood/early adolescence for the daughters.

Intergenerational Transmission of IPV

The intergenerational transmission of violence hypothesis was partially supported by those daughters who witnessed during childhood their mothers’ experience psychological maltreatment, which increased the daughters’ risk of dating violence by
three times. However, mothers’ report of physical violence during the initial stage of data collection did not predict daughters’ likelihood of experiencing dating violence. This indicates that witnessing the psychological maltreatment of their mothers tended to make the daughters more vulnerable towards dating violence than witnessing their mothers be physically abused. This finding supports the inconsistent evidence in the literature that exposure to IPV translates directly into dating violence (McCloskey, 2011). Perhaps more attention is needed by scholars to explore in depth the influence of witnessing ongoing psychological abuse in the household.

The mothers’ endorsement of psychological abuse at Wave 2, during the late childhood and early adolescence of the daughters, acted as a significant predictor for the daughters’ report of dating violence. Witnessing psychological maltreatment may be more influential for children due to the ongoing, controlling and manipulative nature of this type of abuse. Other studies have found the significant impact that psychological abuse can have on women’s mental health alongside physical and sexual abuse (Street & Arias, 2001). Psychological maltreatment may be more harmful for daughters to observe in the household because of the degree of control, manipulation, and degradation that the mother may experience from her partner or spouse. Johnson (2006) described various forms of IPV, including intimate terrorism, which is a form of IPV marked by more frequent and severe aggression in addition to a broader pattern of control. Some of the mothers’ experiences in this sample may be described as intimate terrorism, which is often a gendered form of abuse affecting women. By observing their mothers undergo such treatment, social learning theory can explain how the daughters may learn certain beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors that could be favorable towards IPV. Hilton (1992)
interviewed battered mothers and found that a number of them were concerned about the potential long-term risks to their children who had witnessed the abuse, demonstrating an awareness of potential intergenerational patterns.

It is unclear whether witnessing their mothers’ experience of psychological abuse or if the influence of the psychological abuse on the mothers played a role in the daughters’ risk for dating violence. However, the significance of psychological abuse repeatedly presenting itself as an important variable within this small sample, which indicates the meaningfulness to explore this occurrence further. Moreover, it may be important to explore the mothers’ relationship with their daughters as an intervening factor. A number of longitudinal studies have noted that children’s functioning over time is closely related to their mothers’ parenting and mental health (DeBoard-Lucas & Grych, 2011). The effect of psychological abuse on the mother may influence her parenting behaviors- then, influencing the child and the mother-child relationship.

**Mother-Daughter Relationship**

The daughters’ perceptions of their mother--whether they perceived them as warm or rejecting--played a vital role in the daughters’ later potential risk for dating violence. A significant relation was found between the daughters’ perception of their mother and her later report of dating violence. Specifically, daughters who perceived a more negative relationship with their mothers (rejecting nature) were more likely to experience dating violence. Research has noted the damaging influence family violence can have on the mother-daughter relationship (Magdol et al., 1998). This occurrence may be explained by another significant finding that showed mothers who reported less or no psychological
abuse at Wave 2 were more likely to have daughters who had a “warmer” perception of their relationship.

The mothers’ parenting ability may also have been influenced by the psychological abuse. Psychological abuse has been noted in the literature to have psychological consequences such as lowered self-esteem (Aguilar & Nightingale, 1994), depression (Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994), and post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms (Street & Arias, 2001). Scholars have suggested that psychological abuse is a stronger predictor of mental health issues than physical abuse (Hazen, Connelly, Soriano, & Landsverk, 2008) and studies are adding to the body of literature highlighting the detrimental effects of psychological maltreatment on Latinas (Hazen et al., 2008). These findings suggest that psychological distress from this type of abuse may have disrupted the mother-daughter relationship resulting in daughters’ endorsement of more negative perceptions towards their mothers. Stuewig and McCloskey (2005) found that abused women who are mothers may be “rejecting” of their adolescent children using “tactics of humiliation and excessive criticism” more often than non-abused women. On the other hand, other studies have shown that abused mothers in particular are able to maintain “good parenting” skills (Levendosky, Huth-Bocks, Shapiro, & Semel, 2003; Sullivan, Juras, Bybee, Nguyen, & Allen, 2000).

The findings suggest the overarching influence abuse can have on the family system as a whole that can affect generation to generation. Semaan, Jasinski, and Bubriski-McKenzie (2013) discussed the dichotomized view towards abused mothers in the family violence literature--mothers are viewed as either the good mother or the bad mother. However, the authors highlighted the complex nature of mothering, the meaning
it offers towards identity and power, and how the mothers in their study viewed motherhood as “a source of affirmation and strength that helped them to survive and to care for their children” (p. 79). Other scholars have cautioned about defining motherhood in the context of IPV because it places responsibility and blame on mothers (Roberts, 1999), who “are doomed to fail” (Mullender et al., 2002). Although by continuing to explore the mother-daughter relationship, it can offer a richer narrative to any intergenerational connections in terms of patterns or intervening factors. The importance of the mother-daughter relationship can provide insight on a potential protective factor that can lower the likelihood of daughters experiencing dating violence. In particular, maternal warmth can potentially act as a protective factor that counters the effects of witnessing IPV on children (Skopp, McDonald, Jouriles, & Rosenfield, 2007).

These findings are not unique to Latina women but the current study’s focus on Latina mothers and daughters can allow for cultural interpretations to better understand the findings. For this sample of Latina mothers and daughters, psychological abuse may have a more significant influence on the mother-daughter relationship due to the cultural values in the Latino community that promote close familial relationships (familismo). The mothers’ experience with psychological abuse may disrupt the mother-daughter relationship, which could contradict expected cultural values and norms. The daughter’s self-esteem and beliefs towards healthy relationships may be influenced by the sense of rejection from their mother.
Daughters’ Dating Violence Beliefs

The role of the daughter’s dating violence beliefs in the regression model may offer a cognitive rationale between why a daughter may internalize the understanding that they “deserve” to be in an abusive relationship after having witnessed their mothers experience psychological maltreatment growing up. It is possible that the perceived rejection from their mothers may influence a daughter to feel unworthy of warmth, love and/or a healthy relationship. In addition, parents who excuse or justify abuse may be implicitly endorsing violence as acceptable in relationships, while those who discuss the physical and emotional pain as a consequence to abuse could imply that it is “wrong” (DeBoard-Lucas & Grych, 2011). However, if the mother-daughter relationship is ruptured, it would most likely decrease the mother’s opportunities to condemn abuse and make known its consequences to the daughter.

Limitations

Although the current study is one of the few studies to employ a longitudinal design to examine dating violence among Latina adolescents, there are a number of noteworthy limitations. First, the small sample size of Latina mothers and daughters may have limited the analyses to find additional significant results. There were measurement concerns as well. The use of the Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS) (Straus, 1979) has been criticized in the literature due to its assessment of a limited scope of behaviors, not taking into account the sequence of behaviors of each partner, and the measure’s limited examination of attempts to control and dominate a partner (DeBoard-Lucas & Grych, 2011). However, the inclusion of the psychological abuse measure in this study attempted
to assess a wider range of controlling and verbally abusive behaviors. The procedure of dichotomizing abuse scores has also been criticized in the literature due to the loss of information and less sensitive measurement to assess a construct such as IPV that is not a truly categorical variable (DeBoard-Lucas & Grych, 2011). This study used categorical scores for IPV and dating violence from the CTS; however, the study’s measure for psychological abuse offered an additional type of abuse on a continuous scale. The simple categorization of physically aggressive and threatening acts may be less sensitive than psychological abuse inventories, which may be a result of the enduring psychological harm that could remain after a psychological manipulative or physically aggressive act. Moreover, the Latina mothers may have underreported occurrences of physical abuse during the initial stage of data collection, which could have influenced the non-significant findings involving that variable.

Scholars have called for more specificity in assessing the types of childhood abuse exposure to develop a deeper understanding of the influence of abuse on the child’s adjustment. This study assumes that the child was exposed to violence based on the Latina mothers’ self-reports and all the daughters living in the household at that time. Kitzmann and her colleagues (2003) identified no significant difference in effect sizes when a child’s exposure was assessed versus assumed. However, assessing the different types of exposure, such as the use of a taxonomy of exposure as suggested by Holden (2003), can offer greater details of the child’s experience (DeBoard-Lucas & Grych, 2011). Also, additional confounds could have been controlled, as recommended by Kitzmann, Gaylord, Hold, and Kenny (2003), such as general stress, parent substance use, and abuse towards the child.
Implications

Previous literature has observed the importance of targeting treatment for children exposed to abuse to also include the mother, which has been noted as being more effective than only addressing the child (Graham-Bermann, Lynch, Banyard, DeVoe, & Halabu, 2007). This study highlights the benefit of including general parenting skills-building but also aiding mothers to talk to their children about relationship abuse. Due to the possible psychological consequences that witnessing IPV during childhood may have on the Latina daughters, it is imperative that community efforts attempt to promote resiliency and ensure the safety of members of the Latino community. One study found that among Mexican-American women in college who had witnessed IPV growing up, outcomes such as lowered self-esteem, increased depression, and greater trauma symptoms may be attributed to IPV exposure while controlling for childhood abuse experiences (Davies, DiLillo, & Martínez, 2004). Outreach programming or direct services geared towards reducing relationship abuse in the Latino community should tailor their efforts to address their specific cultural values/beliefs and to also aim to strengthen familial bonds, such as the mother-daughter relationship.

Future Directions

The current study contributes to the literature by showing that witnessing IPV (physical violence) as a child has less of an effect on future dating violence than does witnessing the psychological maltreatment of your mother during late childhood or early adolescence, which is an especially sensitive developmental period. Scholars have advocated for research to follow adolescent Latina daughters into later adulthood, which
may offer more information regarding the “cycle of violence” in their intimate relationships (McCloskey, 2011). Additional sources of risk should be taken into account for Latina daughters as well, such as neighborhood climate, parental substance use and criminal history, as well as any psychopathology. Continuing to examine and control for these contextual variables and risk factors will offer clarity in terms of whether exposure to relationship abuse accounts for dating violence (McCloskey, 2011). A more ecological model can attempt to capture multiple contexts for relationship abuse within the Latino community. This study did attempt to examine the impact of the mother-daughter relationship but the addition of parental variables, psychological constructs, and adjustment variables for children can be included in future analyses. Scholars have suggested going beyond social learning theory and the use of a cognitive-contextual framework to understand IPV (DeBoard-Lucas & Grych, 2011). This study’s utilization of longitudinal data took into account two time points in which the Latina daughters were exposed to maternal abuse, both physical and psychological abuse. This complies with the advocacy of some scholars to consider the limitation of cross-sectional research (DeBoard-Lucas & Grych, 2011) and the call for more longitudinal studies (Kitzman et al., 2003).

Aiding Latina mothers to recognize unhealthy and abusive relationship dynamics through community psychoeducation/outreach programming may assist the mother to recognize what needs to be addressed in their relationship, what resources to utilize (e.g., counseling, parent education classes, or substance abuse treatment), and possibly offer assistance in ending or leaving the abusive relationship. Additional programming targeted
towards strengthening family communication and relationships can be emphasized as well, with particular consideration for mothers and daughters.

**Conclusion**

In summary, this study provides support for the intergenerational transmission of violence hypothesis among Latina daughters who witness their mothers experience psychological maltreatment. Also, perceived rejection by their mother and more tolerant beliefs towards dating violence were associated with daughters’ reported dating violence. Theories of social learning of behaviors and learned social cognitions were applied to the results and implications were discussed in regards of how to reduce IPV with in the Latino community within the context of the study’s findings.
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Table 1. Daughter Age Distribution across Waves of Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (Years)</th>
<th>Wave 1 N (%)</th>
<th>Wave 2 N (%)</th>
<th>Wave 3 N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9(18%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5(10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7(14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7(14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10(20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6(12%)</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
<td>10(20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6(12%)</td>
<td>3(6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7(14%)</td>
<td>10(20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9(18%)</td>
<td>5(10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10(20%)</td>
<td>7(14%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5(10%)</td>
<td>10(20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2(4%)</td>
<td>8(16%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>5(10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1(2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Measures Used for Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Name of Measure</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>Internal Reliability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mothers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 1</td>
<td>Demographics questionnaire</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modified CTS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Grouping classification)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2</td>
<td>Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daughters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2</td>
<td>Dating Violence Measure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother-Daughter Relationship Questionnaire</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3</td>
<td>Dating Violence Measure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dating Script Scale (DSS)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Roles Scale (FRS)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Comparison of Latina mothers Who Experienced IPV versus Those Who Did Not \((N = 50)\) at Wave 1 of Data Collection (1990-1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experienced IPV ((n = 26))</th>
<th>Did Not Experience IPV ((n = 24))</th>
<th>Significance (X^2) or (V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s age</td>
<td>30.65 yrs old (1.62)</td>
<td>30.48 yrs old (1.6)</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom biological (%) Parent to child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s number of children</td>
<td>3.92 (1.44)</td>
<td>3.54 (1.98)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother married to partner (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of relationship With partner</td>
<td>8.83 years (1.6)</td>
<td>12.66 years (1.1)</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s partner is Biological parent (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner currently Live at home (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s language Preference (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English more than Spanish</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both equally</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish more than English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Spanish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother employed (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No High School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 (cont.)
Table 3 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experienced IPV ($n = 26$)</th>
<th>Did Not Experience IPV ($n = 24$)</th>
<th>Significance $X^2$ or $V$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daughters’ age</td>
<td>9 years old (1.80)</td>
<td>14.29 years old (1.78)</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter’s Grade</td>
<td>$9^{th}$ grade (1.96)</td>
<td>$9^{th}$ grade (1.83)</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Some variables contain missing data due to respondents leaving the item blank.

$p < .05^*$  $p < .001^{**}$
Table 4. Demographic Information of Daughters \((N = 50)\) by Periods of Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education level (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 8th grade</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12th grade</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12th grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with mother (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating History (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never dated</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever had boyfriend</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of current Relationship (in weeks)</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of current boyfriend</td>
<td>17.4 yrs</td>
<td>19.3 yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracted to: (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Some variables contain missing data due to respondents leaving the item blank.*
Table 5. Correlation Matrix Examining Associations between Abuse, Relationship, and Socio-cognitive Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mother’s Physical Abuse</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mother’s Psychological Abuse</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Daughter’s DV</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. M-D Relationship</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Daughter’s DV Beliefs</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Daughter’s Family Roles Beliefs</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(M-D = Mother-Daughter; DV = Dating Violence)

*p < .05

**p < .01
Table 6. Logistic Regressions Predicting Dating Violence among Latina Daughters (N = 47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% C.I.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression 1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom psych abuse</td>
<td>1.13*</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>[1.18, 8.12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom psych abuse</td>
<td>1.12 *</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>[.98, 9.48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-D relationship</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>[.86, 1.03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-DV beliefs</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>[.05, 8.70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-FR beliefs</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>[.11, 6.18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression 3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom psych abuse</td>
<td>1.14*</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>[1.02, 9.53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-D relationship</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>[.86, 1.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-DV beliefs</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>[.06, 4.91]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R1 = Nagelkerke: $R^2 = .21, \chi^2 (1) = 5.74$; R2 = Nagelkerke: $R^2 = .28, \chi^2 (4) = 7.89$; R3 = Nagelkerke: $R^2 = .27, \chi^2 (3) = 7.85$. B = regression coefficient; SE B = E of the regression coefficient; Exp(B) = standardized regression coefficient; C.I. = confidence interval.

*p < .05
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APPENDIX A

MOTHER-PARTNER ISSUES (CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE ITEMS)

Please tell me how often you have experienced the following with ________ at any point in the relationship (ever) [0 = Never, 6 = more than 20 times].

Threatened to hit or throw something at you?

Thrown, smashed, hit or kicked something in front of you?

Thrown something at you?

Pushed, grabbed, or shoved you?

Slapped you?

Beat you up?

Kicked, bit, or hit you with a fist?

Tried to hit you with something?

Choked you?

Threatened you with a knife or gun?

Used a knife or gun against you

Threatened you with physical violence

Hit you with a fist?

Beat you for a number of minutes?

Forced you or tired to force you into having sex?

Forced anal or oral sex on you?

Threatened to harm or kill the children if you left?

Threatened to kill you if you left?

Burned you?
Harmed a pet?

Destroyed your personal possessions (such as ripping your clothes)?

Invaded your privacy (i.e., opening your mail)?
APPENDIX B

TEENAGE DATING HISTORY - DAUGHTERS

Has the guy you most recently dated (for 1 month or longer) ever [1= Yes, 0= No]:

*Physical abuse items*

- Thrown/smashed something in front of you?
- Hit/kicked something in front of you?
- Thrown something at you?
- Pushed, grabbed, or shoved you?
- Slapped you?
- Hit you with a fist?
- Hit or try to hit you with something?
- Beat you up?
- Threatened you with a knife or gun?
- Did he ever choke you?
- Did he ever do anything to you that resulted in your being physically injured?
- Has any other guy you dated ever done anything to scare you or hurt you physically?

*Sexual abuse item*

- Forced you or tried to force you into having sex by threatening you, holding you down or hurting you in some way?
Severe psychological abuse items

I’d like to ask you about things that any boy you’ve dated in the last year might have done. [1= Never, 2= Rarely (once or twice), 3= Sometimes, 4= Often, 5= Very often]

How often has any guy you dated:

Been overly critical of you?

Ridiculed or called you names in front of other people?

Pressured you for sex?

Became angry if you would not go along with his requests for sex?
APPENDIX C

PSYCHOLOGICAL MALADJUSTMENT WOMEN’S INVENTORY-MOTHERS

This questionnaire asks about actions you may have experienced in your relationship with your partner. Answer each item as carefully as you can. [1= Never, 2= Rarely, 3= Occasionally, 4= Frequently, 5= Very frequently]

In the past six months:

My partner called me names.

My partner swore at me.

My partner yelled and screamed at me.

My partner treated me like an inferior.

My partner monitored my time and made me account for my whereabouts.

My partner used our money or made important financial decisions without talking to me about it.

My partner was jealous or suspicious of my friends.

My partner accused me of having an affair with another man.

My partner interfered in my relationships with other family members.

My partner tried to keep me from doing things to help myself.

My partner restricted my use of the telephone.

My partner told me my feelings were irrational or crazy.

My partner blamed me for his problems.

My partner tried to make me feel crazy.
APPENDIX D

MOTHER-CHILD (DAUGHTER) RELATIONSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

We’re going to ask questions about your mother. I’m going to read some sentences that might describe how your mother makes you feel. [1= Never, 2 = Rarely, 3= Sometimes, 4= Often, 5= Always]

How often does your mother say nice things about you to other people, like “____ is being nice and did a nice job?”

How often does your mother say very personal things and embarrassing things about you in front of other people?

How often does your mother criticize the way you look physically?

How often does your mother complain that it costs too much to take care of you?

How often does your mother tell you she likes what you did or thank you for doing things?

How often does your mother encourage you in what you like to do?

How often does your mother act like she is ashamed of you?

How often does your mother care if she has hurt your feelings?

How often does your mother yell at you when you’ve made a mistake?

When you are upset about something, how often do you talk with your mother about things that bother you or about your problems?

How often does your mother make you look stupid in front of other people?

How often does your mother pay attention to what you say?

How often does your mother put down or make fun of things you’re interested in?

How often does your mother tell you you’re doing things wrong?
I’m now going to ask you some questions about how much you agree with statements about women and men, and particularly about the relationship between husbands and wives. We’re interested in what you BELIEVE should happen within marriages, more than what you think USUALLY happens. I’d like you to scale your beliefs from 1 to 5 [1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree].

How much do you agree with the statement:

The most important person in a woman’s life should be her husband or partner.

Husbands and wives should share household chores equally.

Husbands should make more money than their wives.

Married women should stay at home and not work when they have young children.

When both parents work, husbands and wives should equally share in taking care of babies and children.

Husbands should be the primary breadwinner for the family.

Husbands should share their personal feelings and thoughts with their wives.

Wives should keep their weight down for their husbands.
I’m now going to ask you about how you think women and men or girls and boys, should act in their relationships. I’m going to say some sentences and then you’ll tell me if you agree or disagree with the statement. [1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Agree, 4= Strongly agree]

Guys should always pay on dates.

A girl has to let her boyfriend have the upper hand if she wants to stay in the relationship.

In general, girls should let their boyfriends win arguments.

If a girl really loves a guy, she should stay with him even if he makes her feel bad.

Guys only hit their girlfriends when they’ve done something to deserve it.

Girls should keep their schedules open for their boyfriends.

Guys should share their private thought with their girlfriends.

There is no good excuse for a guy to hit a girl.

Hitting someone is just a sign that you love them.

It’s flattering for a girl to have a boyfriend who is jealous, because it shows how much he values her.

Girls should break up with a guy the first time he hits her.