Understanding Perceptions of Severity and Reporting of Child-to-parent Family Violence

A thesis

submitted in fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Science in Psychology

at

The University of Waikato

by

BRIDGET ANNE O'KEEFFE

THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

2024

Abstract

It is widely understood that family violence (FV) is underreported, and research — predominantly on intimate partner violence (IPV) — suggests that the perceived severity of FV is one of the many factors important in decisions about whether to report to police. Previous research has identified several factors that affect perceptions of IPV severity (e.g., gender, type of harm, and history of violence), and the types of appraisals that contribute to perceived severity (e.g., victim fear and hurt, the harmfulness, aggressiveness, ordinariness and justifiability of aggressor behaviour; and victim responsibility for aggressor behaviour). But less is known about factors that contribute to perceptions of severity and reporting decisions for other types of FV, including child-to-parent violence (CPV), where children are the aggressors against their parents.

Therefore, the overarching aim of this thesis was to gain a better understanding of whether perceived severity is associated with the likelihood of reporting CPV, and to identify factors that may affect the perceived severity of CPV. We set out to achieve this aim with two survey studies. In the first study, we examined whether participants' perceptions of CPV severity were related to the likelihood they would report CPV to the police, and analysed the effect of aggressor gender and developmental stage, and parent gender on perceptions of severity. The results indicated that perceived severity was moderately associated with participants' likelihood of reporting CPV, and that parent gender — rather than aggressor gender or developmental stage — affected those perceptions of CPV severity.

In the second study we set out to identify the appraisals that may contribute to perceptions severity and investigate the effect of context about previous use of CPV on perceived severity. We found that perceptions of severity appeared to consist of judgements about the extent to which the victim was impacted by the aggressor's harmful behaviour, with the items for victim fear and hurt, the harmfulness and aggressiveness of aggressor

behaviour, and severity forming a coherent index for perceived severity. We also found that overall, context about previous use of CPV did not affect the perceived severity of CPV. Taken together, the findings presented in this thesis have contributed to the growing body of research on CPV, as well as furthering our understanding of factors related to perceived severity and reporting decisions for FV in general. The results could be used to inform efforts to increase FV reporting to police and improve the support offered to families experiencing CPV.

Keywords. Severity, family violence, child-to-parent violence, reporting.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my supervisor Dr Apriel Jolliffe Simpson for all her encouragement, support, and enthusiasm over the course of my masters research, Apriel and the members of the Crime Lab have made this challenging year such a fun and exciting experience. I would also like to thank my family for their never ending love, warmth, and care as well as their unwavering belief in my success. Finally, thank you to my partner Amber who kept me sane, cared for me, and made me laugh while I wrote this thesis, whom I love very much.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Child-to-parent violence (CPV) is a type of family violence (FV) where children use aggressive behaviours towards their parents. Like other forms of FV, CPV is under-reported (Cuervo, 2023; Gracia et al., 2009; Holt, 2013; Hong et al., 2012; Ibabe, 2019; Khan et al., 2023; Lyons et al., 2015; Miles & Condry, 2016; Williams et al., 2017). Improved understanding of why people choose not to report different forms of FV to police may inform efforts to encourage reporting and improve the support offered to families experiencing CPV. Research has begun to identify factors relevant to the decision to report FV, including the perceived severity of behaviours. Such research suggests that people's perceptions of severity are influenced by characteristics including the gender of the aggressor and victim (Fanslow et al., 2010; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Harris, 1991; Ibabe et al., 2009; Khan & Rogers, 2015; Parker et al., 2022; Rico et al., 2017; Sikström & Dahl, 2023; Wilson & Smirles, 2022), aggressor developmental stage (Calvete et al., 2020; Holt & Lewis, 2021; Hong et al., 2012; Ulman & Straus, 2003), the type of harm (e.g., verbal, physical, or psychological harm; threats and intimidation; Fanslow et al., 2010; Wilson & Smirles, 2022), and the history of harmful behaviour (Barrett et al., 2020; Contreras et al., 2019, 2020; Lehmann et al., 2012; Marshall, 1992; Taylor et al., 2021; Yamawaki et al., 2009).

Despite the growing body of research about FV reporting decisions, to our knowledge none has explored what factors affect people's decisions to report CPV. Therefore, in this thesis we[1] investigated whether the perceived severity of CPV was associated with reporting decisions, and whether perceived severity was affected by factors such as the child

[1] This thesis is my own work, I use "we" and "our" throughout to acknowledge the collaborative nature of research and the guidance of my supervisor.

aggressors' gender and developmental stage, parent gender, and context about previous use of CPV. We presented these results both overall and for different types of harm (i.e., physical, verbal, and psychological harm, as well as threats and intimidation). To supplement this knowledge, we also examined what appraisals may contribute to the concept of perceived severity. Here we present a brief review of the understandings of FV in New Zealand, risk and prevalence of CPV, FV reporting, and perceptions of violence severity in relation to FV and CPV.

Family Violence (FV) in Aotearoa New Zealand

FV is defined in Aotearoa New Zealand as the use of any physically, sexually, or psychologically abusive act—including controlling behaviour—against a person with whom the aggressor is—or has been—in a family relationship. A family relationship as defined by the Family Violence Act (2018, §9) includes spouses/partners, family members, close personal relationships, as well as people who ordinarily share a household such a flat mate. It is important to note that FV in New Zealand is sometimes referred to as whānau violence, and while the two are often used interchangeably, whānau violence is understood from a te ao Māori perspective as a breach of tikanga brought about by violence towards ones whakapapa (Kruger, 2004). The Family Violence Act (2018) also acknowledges that FV includes coercive control – a pattern of abusive behaviour made up by several acts over time. The act specifies that patterns of abusive behaviour constitute FV even if individual acts appear to be minor or trivial; this is an important specification because it acknowledges the cumulative that harm FV can cause (Bath, 2020; & Anda, 2010; Higgins, 2005; Minto et al., 2022).

In the latest New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey (NZCVS), it was reported that 74,000 adults experienced a criminal offence by a family member in the past year, and approximately two-thirds of these incidents went unreported to the police (Ministry of Justice, 2022). Despite low reporting rates, the New Zealand Police respond to a FV episode

approximately every four minutes (New Zealand Police, 2021), with many reported episodes including behaviours that meet the legal definition of FV but are not considered criminal offences (e.g., verbal abuse; Jolliffe Simpson et al., 2021). New Zealand has the highest estimated lifetime prevalence rate of FV of any nation in the OECD (OECD, 2013), and when considering that estimated criminal offences against family members represent just a subset of behaviours constituting FV, the scale of New Zealand's FV problem starts to become clear.

While statistics cannot capture the extent of FV occurring in New Zealand, they do elucidate the groups of people who are most affected by FV victimisation. The most recent NZCVS (Ministry of Justice, 2023) found that the rate of offences against family members among Māori (5.12%) was significantly higher than the national average (2.04%); the same could be seen for LGBT+ people (6.28%), disabled adults (4.20%), single parents (8.66%), people under financial pressure (4.63%), and people experiencing moderate (5.53%) or high (12.31%) levels of psychological distress. The NZCVS also showed that women were more likely than men to be the victim of an offence by a family member (Ministry of Justice, 2023). However, NZCVS statistics are not broken down according to the relationship between the aggressor and victim, which prevents us estimating the prevalence of certain types of FV such as child abuse and maltreatment, sibling abuse, and CPV.

Child-to-parent Violence (CPV)

CPV is often overlooked in discussions of FV, in part because it is difficult to define. In this thesis, we defined CPV in accordance with Coogan (2011), as any abusive behaviour, regardless of type, used by a child under 18 where the target of abuse was their parent. It has been argued that CPV committed by people aged under the age of 13 is a different phenomenon to CPV committed by people aged between 13 and 17 (i.e., adolescent-to-parent violence), with this distinction helping to conceptualise risk factors associated with CPV as it

acknowledges the effect of differing developmental stages on the behaviour of children and adolescents (Coogan, 2011). There has also been debate about whether abuse from children towards mothers is distinctly different from abuse towards fathers (Edenborough et al., 2008; Hunter et al., 2010; Peck et al., 2023; Ulman & Straus, 2003) due to the gendered differences between mothers' and fathers' relationships with their children. The use of multiple names to refer to the same—or similar—concepts has resulted in disjointed silos of research and may have contributed to the lack of attention in the CPV area (Coogan, 2011).

Risk Factors for CPV

The small body of existing research about CPV has identified several risk factors for CPV victimisation and perpetration (Coogan, 2011; Loinaz et al., 2020; Lyons et al., 2015; Rico et al., 2017). Risk factors include the characteristics of people and families, as well as social and cultural factors. As with other types of FV, victims who experience CPV are more likely to be women than men. It has been suggested that this gender difference may be observed due to the reporting behaviours of men and women; research has found that women were more willing to disclose FV victimisation than men (Baumer & Lauritsen, 2010; Boxall et al., 2018; Burke et al., 1988; Emery, 2010; Khan et al., 2023; Voce & Boxall, 2018; Walsh & Krienert, 2009). On the other hand, women may be at greater risk of CPV victimisation because they are more likely to be primary caregivers of their children. Mothers' increased contact with children provides more opportunity for conflict to arise between mother and child (Lyons et al., 2015). This explanation is supported by research on IPV establishing that episodes of violence can be borne from ordinary interactions, with increased risk resulting from increased contact between victim and aggressor (Boxall et al., 2018).

Other factors that have been associated with increased risk of CPV victimisation include family structure and FV victimisation. CPV is far more common in single-parent families than two-parent families, possibly due to the increased stressors and reduced parental

supervision often associated with single parenthood (Ibabe et al., 2009; Walsh & Krienert, 2007, 2009). There is a wealth of evidence showing that parents who experience CPV are often victimised by their partners, too; this is especially true for mothers (Coogan, 2011; Cottrell & Monk, 2004; Gallagher, 2004; Ibabe et al., 2013). Gallagher (2004) found that two thirds of single mothers who had experienced CPV had also been a victim of IPV, and 60% of children who used CPV came from families where IPV had occurred between their parents. Similarly, Ibabe and colleagues (2013) observed that boys were more likely to use physical harm against their mother if their father had previously used physical harm against her.

Conversely, FV perpetration also puts individuals at a greater risk of experiencing CPV victimisation, and bidirectionality of violence in the home has been found in many studies examining risk for CPV (Contreras & Cano, 2016; Cottrell & Monk, 2004; Cuervo, 2023; Ibabe, 2019, 2019; Ibabe et al., 2009, 2013; Ibabe & Jaureguizar, 2010; Loinaz et al., 2020; Lyons et al., 2015; Navas-Martínez & Cano-Lozano, 2022). In a study of juvenile violent offenders, Contreras and Cano-Lozano (2016) found that young people who used CPV reported greater levels of FV exposure and victimisation in their home than young people who did not use CPV. These findings suggest that parents who use violence against their children are at greater risk of having their child use CPV against them.

Prevalence of CPV

The research discussed above provides insight into the characteristics of people and families who are more likely to experience CPV. But due to the relative obscurity of CPV in FV research, it is difficult to estimate the scale of the problem. International estimates of the prevalence of CPV vary greatly from 5% to 55% and are likely impacted by high levels of underreporting (Coogan, 2014; Edenborough et al., 2008; Ibabe, 2019; Ibabe et al., 2013; Williams et al., 2017). As in many countries, in New Zealand there is little to no available

research or official data describing the prevalence of CPV; the problem is under-researched and almost entirely absent from policy, policing, and public health discussions (Condry & Miles, 2014; Crichton-Hill et al., 2006; Miles & Condry, 2016; Williams et al., 2017). A evaluation of New Zealand FV research (Lievore & Mayhew, 2007) examined IPV, child maltreatment, elder abuse and neglect, and sibling abuse, but not CPV. As stated in the review *"Our search did not locate any New Zealand studies addressing violence towards parents by children or adolescents, and this topic is not covered."*(Lievore & Mayhew, 2007, p. 17). The absence of CPV from New Zealand-based FV research indicates a need to fill significant gaps in our knowledge, and answer questions such as "Why might people choose not to report CPV?"

Reporting CPV

In New Zealand, it is estimated that a mere third of FV-related offences are reported to police (Ministry of Justice, 2022); however, it is currently unclear how reporting rates for FV in New Zealand differ between types of FV. It is widely known that FV is underreported for many reasons (Baumer & Lauritsen, 2010; Emery, 2010; Gracia et al., 2009; Hunter et al., 2010; Khan et al., 2023; Spencer et al., 2017; Williams et al., 2017). The latest New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey (Ministry of Justice, 2023) reports that offences being seen as a private family matter was the most common reason why victims chose not to report FV (34.3%). In addition, victims also selected avoiding further shame, embarrassment, humiliation as the second most common reason for not reporting (26.0%), followed by "police could not have done anything" (15.5%), "police would not have bothered or been interested" (11.0%), and "did not have enough evidence to report it" (10.3%; Ministry of Justice, 2023). Taken together, it is clear that victims have many reasons for choosing not to report FV to police.

Local and international research suggests that when deciding whether to report CPV, the reasons people have for not reporting FV in general are compounded by the complex nature of parent-child relationships (Arias-Rivera et al., 2022; Coogan, 2011, 2014; Gallagher, 2004; Hunter et al., 2010; Khan et al., 2023; Miles & Condry, 2016; Voce & Boxall, 2018; Williams et al., 2017). For example, not reporting FV to avoid shame and humiliation is especially relevant for CPV victims (Arias-Rivera et al., 2022; Coogan, 2014; Fanslow et al., 2010; Khan et al., 2023; Sheehan, 1997; Voce & Boxall, 2018; Williams et al., 2017). Parents may choose not to report CPV due to fear of being blamed for their child's violent behaviour, or being shamed or judged by family, friends, and support agencies (Arias-Rivera et al., 2022; Coogan, 2014; Hunter et al., 2010; Williams et al., 2017). This fear of shame and judgement can be caused by past experiences of negative responses to prior attempts at help-seeking; a study of New Zealand mothers and grandmothers experiencing CPV (Williams et al., 2017) found that victims seeking help from professional support agencies were often told they needed parenting support to stop being abused by their children. Negative responses to parents reporting CPV is commonly identified and largely attributed to the structure of FV support agencies and the conceptualisation of FV that underpins their practice (Arias-Rivera et al., 2022; Condry & Miles, 2014; Coogan, 2014; Holt, 2013, 2016; Hunter et al., 2010; Miles & Condry, 2016; Tew & Nixon, 2010; Williams et al., 2017). FV support agencies predominantly operate on the assumption that children who are involved in FV are the primary victims (Gallagher, 2004), and are ill equipped to respond to FV that violates this assumption.

Research has also examined the reporting behaviours of third parties. Gracia and colleagues (2009) found the most common response for people who witnessed or knew about an episode of IPV was not to report it. When given a hypothetical IPV scenario, people tended to respond with mediating behaviours rather than reporting, with reporting to police

being seen as a last resort response for extreme cases. The researchers attributed participants' hesitancy to intervene to the common perception of conflict between partners being a "private matter" (Gracia et al., 2009). Indeed, the idea that violence between family members is private and a "family matter" is present in much of the research about FV and reporting behaviours and likely contributes greatly to underreporting and the hidden nature of FV (Fanslow et al., 2010; Gracia et al., 2009; Leon et al., 2022; Ministry of Justice, 2022, 2023).

Finally, studies on the reporting behaviours of people who witness or experience FV have found gendered differences between the reporting behaviours of men and women (Condry & Miles, 2014; Emery, 2010; Gracia et al., 2009; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Harris, 1991; Holt, 2016; Khan et al., 2023; Parker et al., 2022). One such study by Emery and colleagues (2010) found small but significant gendered differences in reporting behaviours whereby underreporting of violence women used against men was greater than underreporting of violence men used against women. Emery and colleagues (2010) hypothesised that this difference may exist because men perceive violence that is used by women as less severe than violence used by men, due the fact that women tend to have a lesser physical capacity to cause serious injury (Emery, 2010; Harris, 1991; Parker et al., 2022). Indeed, the rate of injury caused by physical harm by women is lower than the rate for violence used by men (Hamby & Jackson, 2010).

Factors Affecting the Perceived Severity of CPV

A salient factor in decisions to report CPV is severity; a common reason for not reporting is that the violence is just not "bad enough". In the context of FV, severity usually refers to the level of physical harm FV causes, with most measures of FV severity focusing on physical injury to the victim, victim fear, and the frequency of violence (Barrett et al., 2020; Marshall, 1992; Taylor et al., 2021). Previous research into perceptions of FV severity has shown that some types of FV (e.g., physical harm, IPV, child maltreatment) are seen as

more severe than others due to factors including gender (Fanslow et al., 2010; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Harris, 1991; Ibabe et al., 2009; Khan & Rogers, 2015; Parker et al., 2022; Rico et al., 2017; Sikström & Dahl, 2023; Wilson & Smirles, 2022), developmental stage (Calvete et al., 2020; Holt & Lewis, 2021; Hong et al., 2012; Ulman & Straus, 2003) the type of harm used (e.g. physical harm, verbal abuse, threats and intimidation, psychological abuse; Fanslow et al., 2010; Wilson & Smirles, 2022), and context about the aggressor's previous use of violent behaviour (Barrett et al., 2020; Contreras et al., 2019, 2020; Lehmann et al., 2012; Marshall, 1992; Taylor et al., 2021; Yamawaki et al., 2009).

Gender

It has been widely observed that violence used by men against women is perceived to be more severe than if the aggressor and victim were any other combination of genders (Emery, 2010; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Parker et al., 2022; Wilson & Smirles, 2022), and observed gender differences in perceptions of violence severity are not exclusive to IPV. Across all types of relationships, violence used by men against women is viewed as less permissible, and violent retaliation by women against men is seen as more justified than if used by men (Harris, 1991). Hamby and colleagues (2010) investigated the cause of this gendered difference in perceived severity by asking participants to rate the level of fear caused by physical characteristics such as size and strength, personality traits, and relationship dynamics. Participants rated physical differences as the most important cause of fear, more than relationship or personality dynamics. Hamby and colleagues (2010) concluded that rather than gender stereotypes, gendered differences in perception of violence severity are the result of the established physical differences in size and strength between men and women.

However, Hamby and colleagues' (2010) explanation for gendered differences in perceived severity does not explain differences in the perceived severity of non-physical

harm. Moreover, other research on the topic has found that size had no significant impact on perceptions of IPV severity (Parker et al., 2022; Skinner, 2003). In contrast to the findings of Hamby and colleagues (2010), when examining gendered perceptions of physical and psychological IPV, Ploeg (2023) found no difference between participants' perceptions of the severity of IPV used by men and IPV used by women. Interestingly, Ploeg (2023) also found no differences between the perceived severity of IPV within heterosexual relationships and same-sex relationships.

Developmental Stage

Like gender, the developmental stage of the aggressor (e.g., whether they are a child or teenager) may affect how people interpret the severity of violent behaviour (Calvete et al., 2020; Holt & Lewis, 2021; Hong et al., 2012; Ulman & Straus, 2003). Research on CPV and aggressor age is limited and conflicting, likely due to differences in definitions and samples (i.e., clinical vs non-clinical; Coogan, 2011; Cuervo, 2023; Lyons et al., 2015; Moulds et al., 2016; Walsh & Krienert, 2007, 2009). Some studies have found that CPV offending peaks in middle adolescence and decreases as children age (Calvete et al., 2020; Moulds et al., 2019; Simmons et al., 2018; Ulman & Straus, 2003), whereas others have found CPV offending to manifest at an early age, increasing in frequency and severity as children grow older (Cuervo, 2023; Rico et al., 2017; Walsh & Krienert, 2007, 2009). While conflicting, findings about the developmental stage of CPV aggressors largely map onto the trajectory of young offenders observed in Moffit's (1993) taxonomy, whereby studies using non-clinical samples reflect the adolescent limited trajectory and clinical samples reflect the life-course persistent trajectory.

Despite conflicting findings about the age of CPV aggressors, researchers have reached consensus on the idea that CPV is used by children of all ages, but often only starts to be seen as problematic when the behaviour persists into adolescence (Coogan, 2011, 2014; Holt & Lewis, 2021; Simmons et al., 2019). Research on how the developmental stage of

aggressor impacts perceptions of severity of CPV is almost non-existent; however, as children develop their size and strength both increase, as do their capacity for inflicting physical harm. Hence, violence used by teenagers may be perceived as more severe than violence used by smaller, younger children (Calvete et al., 2020; Hong et al., 2012; Ulman & Straus, 2003). Indeed, a study of juvenile domestic assault found that assaults by aggressors under 18 were far less likely to result in injury than when the aggressors was over 18 (Snyder & McCurleye, 2008).

Context and Ordinariness

In general, human behaviour that is more common is viewed as more normal, and therefore, more acceptable (Bettio et al., 2020; Simmons et al., 2019). It follows that common forms of harm would be perceived as less severe — and be less often reported to police — compared with rare behaviours. The nature of the relationship between parents and children means that a degree of conflict or misbehaviour from children is a normative aspect of that relationship (Arias-Rivera et al., 2022; Condry & Miles, 2014; Gallagher, 2004; Holmbeck & Hill, 1991; Lyons et al., 2015; Simmons et al., 2019). As a result, it is challenging to distinguish between children's normal—but challenging or frustrating—behaviour towards their parents, and behaviour that is abnormal and harmful (Simmons et al., 2019).

Research on other types of FV has similarly identified that understanding what is "normal" in society is important when deciding what constitutes harmful behaviour and how severe those behaviours are (Bettio et al., 2020; Simmons et al., 2019). For example, Bettio and colleagues (2020) found that more prevalent behaviour was perceived as less severe, and posited that behaviours such as pushing and shoving were viewed as less severe because their ordinariness made them normative in comparison to less prevalent behaviours such as harming someone with a knife. Previous experience of FV may also cause people to view FV as less severe. For example, Khan and colleagues (2015) found that people who experienced

sibling violence themselves perceived sibling violence as less severe than violence in other types of relationships because of their own experiences. It is possible that CPV is normalised for the same reasons; like conflict between brothers and sisters is expected, we also expect conflict between parents and children (Arias-Rivera et al., 2022; Condry & Miles, 2014; Gallagher, 2004; Holmbeck & Hill, 1991; Lyons et al., 2015; Simmons et al., 2019). But in contrast, other research on the effect of contextual factors on perceptions of IPV severity has found that violence is viewed as more severe by third parties when it occurs more frequently in relationships (Barrett et al., 2020; Contreras et al., 2019, 2020; Lehmann et al., 2012; Marshall, 1992; Taylor et al., 2021; Yamawaki et al., 2009).

Appraisals that Contribute to Perceptions of Severity

Efforts to understand the prevalence of FV often also measure the severity of the harm that victims experience. But perceptions of severity are subjective; thus, measuring severity can prove difficult without understanding the types of appraisals that people take into account when judging the severity of an episode. To inform the task of measuring FV severity, research – primarily on IPV – has examined the types of appraisals that contribute to perceived severity (e.g., victim fear, extent of injury to the victim, harmfulness of the aggressor's behaviour, justification of the aggressor's behaviour, victim responsibility for the aggressor's behaviour; Basow et al., 2007; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Yamawaki et al., 2009). Parker and colleagues (2022) found that the judgements that made up perceptions of severity fit into two components. The first component — which they referred to as perceived level of injury — included the judgements of how likely victims' injuries would require medical attention, how necessary was it to report to authorities, and the level of perceived violence (Parker et al., 2022). The second component consisted of judgments about responsibility for violence – the level of blame attributed to the victim, the level of blame attributed to the aggressor, and the justification of

the aggressor's violent behaviour (Parker et al., 2022). In sum, these findings suggest appraisals about victim fear and hurt, the harmfulness, aggressiveness, ordinariness and justifiability of aggressor behaviour; and victim responsibility for aggressor behaviour may all contribute to perceived severity (Basow et al., 2007; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Yamawaki et al., 2009).

Study 1

This thesis includes two studies, with the overarching research aim of better understanding whether perceived severity is associated with the likelihood of reporting CPV, and to identify factors that may affect the perceived severity of CPV. In study 1 we sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is the perceived severity of behaviours that constitute CPV related to how likely people are to report those behaviours to police?
2. Does child developmental stage, gender and parent gender affect the perceived severity and likelihood of reporting behaviours that constitute CPV?

Study 1 involved a survey of 403 first year psychology students. Participants were presented with a list of 26 behaviours in a random order—including either physical, verbal, and psychological harm, or threats and intimidation —and asked to rate the severity and likelihood they would report each behaviour to police on a scale of 1-5. In this study, we used survey conditions to examine whether aggressor developmental stage and gender, and parent gender affected participants' ratings of severity and likelihood of reporting.

Based on previous research, we hypothesised that the likelihood of reporting CPV behaviours to the police would be positively associated with the perceived severity of those behaviours (Emery, 2010; Gracia et al., 2009; Hine et al., 2022; Ministry of Justice, 2022, 2023; Spencer et al., 2017). We also expected that CPV behaviours used by teenaged aggressors would be perceived as more severe than if they were used by children, and CPV

behaviours from boys would be perceived as more severe than the same behaviours from girls. Finally, we hypothesised that CPV behaviours directed towards mothers would be seen as more severe than if they were directed towards fathers (Basow et al., 2007; Condry & Ross, 1985; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Harris, 1991; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Parker et al., 2022; Wilson & Smirles, 2022; Yamawaki et al., 2009).

Study 1 Method

Design

We used a between subjects survey design for this pre-registered study (see Appendix A). The survey asked participants to rate the severity of, and likelihood they would report, a set of 26 behaviours that constitute CPV (see Appendix B). We also collected demographic information about participants and asked if they had ever witnessed, perpetrated, or been a victim of any of the CPV behaviours presented in the survey. All participants saw the same list of behaviours, but the gender of the aggressor and parent (i.e., boy versus girl, and mother versus father), and the developmental stage of the aggressor (i.e., teenager or child) changed depending on the condition participants were assigned to. We chose to use the words "child" and "teenager" to denote the different developmental stages instead of specific age ranges (e.g., 6 -12 years, 13-18 years) because the words "child" and "teenager" communicate the aggressor's physical and mental developmental stage with adequate consistency while minimising participants' cognitive load.

Initially, participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: male child and mother, female child and mother, male teenager and mother, and female teenager and mother. Once we reached a sample size of 30 in each of the initial conditions – ensuring we reached a minimum sample size required for analysis – we then added a further four conditions: male child and father, female child and father, male teenager and father, and

female teenager and father. Subsequently, participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions.

Participants

We recruited 403 first year psychology students through the University of Waikato's Introduction to Psychological Research Programme (IPRP). IPRP introduces first year psychology students to psychological research and allows them earn course credit by participating in studies conducted at the university. Participants received 2 course credits for participating in the study. Participant consent was sought before beginning the survey, and upon completing the survey participants were again asked if they consented to their survey responses being included this research. Participants who consented before beginning the survey but did not consent for their responses included in analyses still received their 2 course credits. This two-step consent process ensured that participants agreed to be included in this research of their own volition rather than out of need for course credit. No other incentive was given for participation. After completing the survey, participants saw a debriefing letter explaining the purpose of the study (see Appendix B).

Sample Characteristics

Table 1 shows most participants were female, a fifth were male, and a small proportion were gender diverse or did not specify their gender. Just over half of participants were aged 17-20, 21–30-year-olds made up roughly a quarter of the sample, and just over a fifth of participants were aged 31-60. Ethnicity was multiply coded as participants were able to select more than one ethnic group. Most participants identified as New Zealand European with a quarter identifying as Māori, just over a fifth of participant were Asian and just under a fifth were Pacifica, participants who identified as European, Latin American, Middle Eastern, or South African each made up less than a tenth of the sample.

The question about participants parents or caregivers was also multiply coded; participants could select all parents or caregivers who raised them. Most participants were raised by their mother and/or their father with a small proportion being raised by step-parents, grandparents, adoptive parents, and/or other family/caregivers and just under half had said they had used CPV behaviours towards a parent/caregiver. Most participants had siblings and almost half of those who had witnessed a sibling using behaviour that constituted CPV. Roughly a sixth of the sample were parents themselves and of them almost half indicated that their child had used CPV behaviours against them. Of the eight possible conditions roughly one sixth of participant were assigned to each of the male child and mother, female child and mother, male teenager and mother, and female teenager and mother conditions and approximately one tenth of the sample assigned to each of the remaining conditions – male child and father, female child and father, male teenager and father, and female teenager and father.

Table 1

Description of Sample in Study 1

Variable	*n (%)*
Gender	
Male	81 (20.1)
Female	313 (77.7)
Another gender	7 (1.7)
Not specified	2 (0.5)
Age	
17-20	237 (58.8)
21-30	106 (26.3)
31-40	33 (8.2)
41-50	21 (5.2)
51-60	5 (1.2)
Ethnicity [a]	
New Zealand European	278 (69.0)
Māori	103 (25.6)
Indian	17 (4.2)
Chinese	15 (3.7)
Other Asian	19 (4.7)
Samoan	14 (3.5)
Cook Island Māori	7 (1.7)
Other Pacifica	13 (3.2)
European	21 (5.2)
Latin American	4 (1.0)
Middle Eastern	2 (0.5)
South African	13 (3.2)
Parents or caregivers [a]	
Mother	386 (95.8)
Father	355 (88.1)
Stepmother	26 (6.5)
Stepfather	29 (7.2)
Grandparents	63 (15.6)
Adoptive parents	8 (2.0)
Other family/caregiver	11 (2.7)
Has siblings	364 (90.3)
Is a parent	64 (15.9)
Perpetrated CPV	171 (42.4)
Witnessed CPV	181 (44.9) [b]
Victim of CPV	28 (6.9) [c]
Condition	
Male child and mother	67 (16.6)
Female child and mother	64 (15.9)

Male teenager and mother	64 (15.9)
Female teenager and mother	64 (15.9)
Male child and father	33 (8.9)
Female child and father	38 (9.4)
Male teenager and father	38 (9.4)
Female teenager and father	35 (8.7)

Note. CPV = Child-to-parent Violence.
[a] Percentages exceed 100% because participants could select more than one response to these questions
[b] 44.9% of overall sample has witnessed CPV but this represents 49.7% of people at risk of witnessing CPV as only participants who said yes to having siblings were asked if they had ever seen a sibling use CPV against a parent.
[c] 6.9% of overall sample had been a victim of CPV but this represent 43.8% of people at risk of CPV experiencing victimisation as only participants who said yes to being a parent were asked if they had been a victim of CPV.

Procedure

The survey included 26 behaviours that constitute CPV. Table 2 shows these behaviours were selected from pre-existing IPV and CPV screening tools: the Checklist of Coercive and Controlling Behaviours (CCB; Lehmann et al., 2012), the Child-to-parent Violence Questionnaire - Parents Version (CPV-Q-P; Contreras et al., 2020), and the Child-to-parent Aggression Questionnaire (CPAQ; Calvete et al., 2013). The 26 behaviours included 5 examples of physical harm, 4 of verbal abuse, 9 of psychological abuse, and 8 of threats and intimidation. We chose not include any forms of sexual violence from IPV screening tools because none of the CPV screening tools reviewed covered sexual violence. To avoid unnecessary repetition, we combined items from different screening tools that referred to the same behaviour. We also altered the wording of items sourced from the CCB, which was created for IPV, to better fit the context of CPV (Lehmann et al., 2012). The order that the CPV behaviours were presented to participants was randomised to avoid anchoring effects.

Table 2

Study 1 Survey Items and Sources

Survey item	Type of harm	Source
He/she threw something at his/her mother/father	Physical	CCB
He/she pushed or grabbed his/her mother/father	Physical	CCB
He/she choked his/her mother/father	Physical	CCB
He/she hit, kicked, or punched his/her mother/father	Physical	CCB
He/she hit, or tried to hit, his/her mother/father with an object	Physical	CCB
He/she swore at his/her mother/father	Verbal	CCB
He/she moved towards his/her mother/father when he/she was angry	Threats and intimidation	CCB
He/she smashed or broke something	Threats and intimidation	CCB
He/she threw or kicked something	Threats and intimidation	CCB
He/she threatened to harm his/her mother/father	Threats and intimidation	Adapted from CCB
He/she threatened to kill his/her mother/father	Threats and intimidation	Adapted from CCB
He/she threatened his/her mother/father with a weapon	Threats and intimidation	Adapted from CCB
He/she falsely accused his/her mother/father of mistreatment	Psychological	Adapted from CCB
He/she blamed his/her misbehaviour on his/her mother/father	Psychological	Adapted from CCB
He/she made offensive, degrading, and humiliating comments towards his/her mother/father	Verbal	Adapted from CCB and CPV-Q-P
He/she told his/her mother/father “I hate you!”	Verbal	Adapted from CPV-Q-P

He/she told his/her mother/father “I wish you were dead!”	Verbal	Adapted from CPV-Q-P
He/she threatened to harm his/herself	Threats and intimidation	Adapted from CPV-Q-P
He/she threatened to commit suicide	Threats and intimidation	Adapted from CPV-Q-P
He/she stole money from his/her mother/father	Psychological	CPV-Q-P
He/she told his/her mother/father that at home his/her mother/father must do what he/she wants	Psychological	CPV-Q-P
He/she demanded his/her mother/father stop what he/she was doing to pay attention to them	Psychological	CPV-Q-P
He/she demanded his/her mother/father buy something knowing his/her mother/father could not afford it	Psychological	CPV-Q-P
He/she refused to comply with a request was important to his/her mother/father	Psychological	CPAQ
He/she blackmailed his/her mother/father to get what he/she wanted	Psychological	CPAQ
He/she did something to purposely annoy his/her mother/father	Psychological	CPAQ

Note. CCB = Checklist of Coercive and Controlling Behaviours (Lehmann et al., 2012), CPV-Q-P = Child-to-parent Violence Questionnaire Parent’s Version (Contreras et al., 2020), CPAQ = Child-to-parent Aggression Questionnaire (Calvete et al., 2013).

Checklist of Coercive and Controlling Behaviours (CCB)

The CCB, created by Lehmann and colleagues (2012), is an empirically validated domestic violence assessment instrument. Consisting of 84 items divided among 10 subscales, the CCB is used to assess levels of violence and coercive control in relationships between intimate partners (Lehmann et al., 2012). The 10 subscales of the CCB assess different aspects of violent intimate partner relationships including, physical abuse, sexual abuse, male privilege, isolation, minimising and denying, blaming, intimidation, threats, emotional abuse, and economic abuse. The items and subscales of the CCB were based on theories of IPV as well as clinical observations, and were validated using a sample of 2,135 women who were taking refuge from IPV at a women's shelter (Lehmann et al., 2012).

Child-to-parent Violence Questionnaire Parent's Version (CPV-Q-P)

The CPV-Q-P is a 14-item scale used to measure the extent of parent's CPV victimisation. Created by Contreras and colleagues (2020) to accompany the Child-to-parent Violence Questionnaire Adolescent's Version (CPV-Q-A)–designed to measure children's appraisals of the extent of their CPV use–the CPV-Q-P asks parents, in the past year, how often their child used 14 behaviours that constitute CPV against them. Parents respond using a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., 0 = Never, 1 = Rarely, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Many times, 4 = Very often) to indicate the frequency with which their child used each behaviour. The questionnaire covers a range of violent behaviours including physical, financial, and psychological violence, as well as control over parents. The CPV-Q-P was validated using a sample of 1,012 Spanish parents with children between the ages of 12 and 17 years (Contreras et al., 2020).

Child-to-parent Aggression Questionnaire (CPAQ)

The CPAQ was developed by Calvete and colleagues (2013) to evaluate both physical and psychological aggression from adolescents towards parents. The questionnaire uses a 4-

point Likert scale on which adolescents indicate how many times they've use aggressive behaviour towards their parent in the past year (i.e., 0 = Never, 1 = once or twice, 2 = between 3 and 4 times, 3 = 6 or more times). Adolescents are asked about 3 physically aggressive behaviours and 7 psychologically aggressive behaviours; they respond to those 10 behaviours once in relation to use against their mother and once more against their father. The CPAQ was validated using a sample of 2719 adolescents aged 13-18, randomly selected from 38 Spanish schools (Calvete et al., 2013).

Analytic Plan

All analyses were completed in R. First, we calculated descriptive statistics for the sample. Then, to answer our first research question, we used a Pearson correlation between participants' average severity ratings and average likelihood of reporting ratings.

To answer our second research question, we conducted two two-way ANOVA to investigate the effect of children's gender and developmental stage on participants' ratings of severity and likelihood that they would report CPV behaviours to the police, with an additional block for parent gender in each model. Before conducting these ANOVA, we tested the assumption of equality of variances with Levene's tests, which produced non-significant results for both severity and likelihood of reporting, meaning the assumption of equality of variance was not violated. To test the assumption of normality, we first produced histograms and density plots of the average ratings of severity and likelihood of reporting to visually examine the distribution of the data, which appeared mostly normally distributed with some left skew. We then conducted a Shapiro-Wilks test on the average ratings of severity and likelihood of reporting and found the data were not normally distributed; however, it is generally agreed that ANOVA are robust to non-normal data with large enough samples (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012). Furthermore, when we used the non-parametric equivalent to ANOVA, we found the same pattern of significance. Finally, we carried out

exploratory t-tests and one-way ANOVA to identify whether ratings of severity and likelihood of reporting CPV behaviours differed according to demographic characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, and whether participants had any previous experience of CPV.

Study 1 Results

Our first research question was: Is the perceived severity of behaviours that constitute CPV related to how likely people are to report those behaviours to police? We found that increases in severity were associated with moderate increases in the likelihood of reporting, $r(401) = .48$, $p < .001$ (Cohen, 2013). The size of the correlation between severity and likelihood of reporting remained relatively stable in the moderate range across the different types of harm included in the survey; physical $r(401) = .44$, $p < .001$, verbal $r(401) = .41$, $p < .001$, and psychological harm $r(401) = .50$, $p < .001$), and threats and intimidation $r(401) = .40$, $p < .001$.

Next we answered our second research question: Does child developmental stage, gender and parent gender affect the perceived severity and likelihood of reporting behaviours that constitute CPV? The results from ANOVA indicated that participants rated behaviours used against mothers ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 0.61$) as more severe than if the same behaviours were used against fathers ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 0.60$), $F(1, 399) = 13.18$, $p < .001$. Neither child gender nor developmental stage affected participants' ratings of severity.

Turning now to the likelihood of reporting CPV behaviours, ANOVA results showed participants indicated a greater likelihood of reporting CPV behaviours used by teenagers ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 0.67$) than children ($M = 2.57$, $SD = 0.70$), $F(1, 399) = 6.12$, $p = .014$. Additionally, participants indicated that they were more likely to report CPV behaviours used against mothers ($M = 2.70$, $SD = 0.69$) than if those behaviours were used against fathers ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 0.67$), $F(1, 399) = 4.12$ $p = .043$. There was no significant effect of child gender on likelihood of reporting.

We also examined whether the relationship between child developmental stage and gender, and parent gender — and the perceived severity and likelihood of reporting behaviours that constitute CPV — differed across the types of harmful behaviours included in the survey (i.e., physical harm, verbal abuse, threats and intimidation, and psychological abuse). Overall we found the pattern of results to be relatively stable across the different types of harm. Physical harm against mothers was perceived as more severe ($M = 4.55$ $SD = 0.63$) than physical harm against fathers ($M = 4.32$ $SD = 0.69$), $F(1, 399) = 11.81$, $p < .001$, and physical harm used by teenagers ($M = 4.56$ $SD = 0.55$) was perceived as more severe than physical harm used by children ($M = 4.38$ $SD = 0.74$), $F(1, 399) = 8.32$, $p = .004$. When mothers were the target of psychological harm, these behaviours were rated as more severe ($M = 3.26$ $SD = 0.80$) than when fathers were targeted ($M = 2.97$ $SD = 0.70$), $F(1, 399) = 11.81$, $p < .001$; psychologically harmful behaviours were also rated as more severe when used by teenaged aggressors ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 0.75$) than when used by child aggressors ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.80$), $F(1, 399) = 8.32$, $p = .004$. Verbally harmful behaviours used against mothers were rated as more severe ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.85$) than when used against fathers ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 0.85$), $F(1, 399) = 12.04$, $p < .001$. Threats and intimidation were rated as more severe when used by teenaged aggressors ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.52$) than when used by child aggressors ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 0.67$), $F(1, 399) = 3.91$, $p = .050$.

As for likelihood of reporting across the different types of harm, participants were more likely to report physically harmful behaviours used against mothers ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.88$) than against fathers ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 0.94$), $F(1, 399) = 12.82$, $p < .001$; and more likely to report physically harmful behaviours used by teenaged aggressors ($M = 3.78$, $SD = 0.88$) than by child aggressors ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 0.93$), $F(1, 399) = 8.48$, $p = .004$. Threats and intimidation from teenaged aggressors ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.74$) were more likely to be reported than threats and intimidation from child aggressors ($M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.78$), $F(1, 399) = 8.10$, p

= .005. Parent gender, and aggressor gender and developmental stage had no effect on ratings of verbally or psychologically harmful behaviours.

We conducted exploratory analyses to examine whether participants' perceptions of severity and reporting differed across demographic characteristics, parental figures, or previous experience of CPV. We found that participants aged 17 – 20 years (M = 2.74, SD = 0.66) were more likely to report CPV than those in the 21-30 age group (M = 2.54, SD = 0.67) or 31+ (M = 2.50, SD = 0.79), $F(3, 392) = 3.27$, $p = .021$; but there was no difference in severity ratings across age groups. We did not find any significant difference in participants' ratings of severity or likelihood of reporting CPV across participant genders. Participants who identified as New Zealand European rated CPV behaviours as less severe (M = 3.66, SD = 0.57) than those who did not identify as New Zealand European (M = 3.96, SD = 0.68), $F(1, 394) = 22.09$, $p < .001$; New Zealand European participants were also less likely to report CPV behaviours (M = 2.55, SD = 0.61) than those who did not identify as New Zealand European (M = 2.87, SD = 0.80), $F(1, 394) = 19.90$, $p < .001$. There were no significant differences in perceived severity or likelihood of reporting between participants of non-New Zealand European ethnicities and any other non-New Zealand European ethnicity.

Finally, we also conducted exploratory analyses to investigate the effect of previous experience of CPV on participants' ratings of severity and likelihood of reporting CPV. We found that participants who had used CPV behaviours against their parents rated CPV behaviours less severe (M = 3.60, SD = 0.62) than those who had not used CPV (M = 3.87, SD = 0.59), $F(1, 394) = 21.20$, $p < .001$; participants who had used CPV were less likely to report CPV behaviours (M = 2.42, SD = 0.66) than those who had not (M = 2.82, SD = 0.66), $F(1, 394) = 36.68$, $p < .001$. Additionally, participants who had witnessed a sibling use CPV rated CPV behaviours as less severe (M = 3.62, SD = 0.60) than those who had not witnessed CPV (M = 3.88, SD = 0.62), $F(2, 393) = 8.34$, $p < .001$; they were also less likely to report

CPV behaviours (M = 2.44, SD = 0.63) than participants who had not witnessed CPV (M = 2.85, SD = 0.65), $F(2, 393) = 17.32$, $p < .001$. Lastly, participants who had been a victim of CPV rated CPV behaviours as less severe (M = 3.56, SD = 0.58) than those who had not been a victim of CPV (M = 3.98, SD = 0.56), $F(2, 393) = 4.02$, $p = .018$; but there was no difference in likelihood of reporting between participants who had been a victim of CPV and those who had not.

Study 2

In study 1[2] we investigated the relationship between perceived severity and likelihood of reporting behaviours that constitute CPV by asking participants to rate the severity of those behaviours. We found that parent gender affected participants perceptions of CPV severity, and for some types of harm, so too did the aggressor's developmental stage. However, the behaviours included in study 1 were presented without context, whereas real episodes of CPV are far more complex. It is well established that context affects the perceived severity of violence; hence, the individual acts of violence within an episode of CPV are only part of the many factors considered when judging the severity of CPV (Basow et al., 2007; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Follingstad & DeHart, 2000). Furthermore, in study 1 we were unable to delineate what appraisals about the behaviours that constitute CPV affect the perceived severity of those behaviours. The impact that violence has on the victim (e.g., injury, fear) has been found to affect the perceived severity of violence, as well as factors related to the aggressor, including how aggressive and how ordinary their behaviour was, and how justified they were in using that behaviour (Basow et al., 2007; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Yamawaki et al., 2009). Therefore, in study 2 we aimed to both

[2] The results of Study 1 and Study 2 will be discussed together in the discussion section of this thesis.

identify the appraisals that may contribute to perceptions severity, and investigate the effect of context on perceived severity. The research questions were:

1. What types of appraisals contribute to the perceived severity of behaviours that constitute CPV?
2. Does the level of contextual information about previous CPV affect the perceived severity of behaviours that constitute CPV?

To answer these questions we used a survey of 387 first year psychology students. Participants were presented with 4 vignettes in a random order—each including either physical, verbal, and psychological harm, and threats and intimidation—and asked to rate the severity of each behaviour on a scale of 1-5. To begin to understand what types of appraisals contribute to the perceived severity of behaviours that constitute CPV, in addition to rating overall severity, we asked participants to rate several appraisals that may be related to the construct of severity (i.e., victim fear and hurt, the harmfulness, aggressiveness, ordinariness and justifiability of aggressor behaviour; and victim responsibility for aggressor behaviour). In this study, we used experimental conditions to examine whether the level of contextual information about previous CPV affected participants' ratings of severity.

We hypothesised that severity is a single construct, with appraisals of victim fear and hurt, the harmfulness, aggressiveness, ordinariness, and justifiability of aggressor behaviour; and victim responsibility for aggressor behaviour all contributing to perceived severity (Basow et al., 2007; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Yamawaki et al., 2009). Furthermore, based on previous research showing the effect of frequency on perceptions of violence (Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Follingstad et al., 2004; Follingstad & DeHart, 2000; Sorenson & Taylor, 2005; Yamawaki et al., 2009) we hypothesised that increased history of the aggressor using CPV towards their parent would be

associated with greater participant ratings of severity overall and for all the types of harm presented in the four vignettes.

Study 2 Method

Design

We used a between subjects survey design for this pre-registered study (see Appendix C). The survey presented participants with four vignettes of CPV about a mother and son called Julie and Oscar. Each vignette included a different type of harm: physical harm, verbal abuse, psychological abuse, or threats and intimidation. After reading each vignette, participants were asked to rate the severity of Oscar's behaviour and seven (see Appendix D) aspects thought to contribute to perceived severity, and indicate the extent to which they thought Oscar's behaviour should be addressed by his family and/or police. All participants saw the same four vignettes but information about the extent of Oscar's history of violent behaviour towards his mother changed depending on experimental condition. We randomly assigned participants to one of four conditions: no context about history of violent behaviour towards Julie, no history of use of violent behaviour towards Julie, history of occasional use of violent behaviour towards Julie, history of regular use of violent behaviour towards Julie.

Participants

We recruited 387 first year psychology students through the University of Waikato's Introduction to Psychological Research Programme (IPRP). IPRP introduces first year psychology students to psychological research and allows them earn course credit by participating in studies conducted at the university. Participants received 2 course credits for participating in the study. We sought participants' consent before beginning the survey and upon completing the survey, we again asked participants if they consented to their survey responses being used in analysis. Participants who consented to take part in the survey but did not consent for their responses to be used in analysis still received their 2 course credits. No

other incentive was given for participation. After completing the survey, participants saw a debriefing letter that explained the purpose of the study (see Appendix D).

Sample Characteristics

Table 3 shows most participants in study 2 were female, roughly a fifth were male, and a small proportion were gender diverse. Just under a third of participants in the sample were aged 17-20, one quarter were age 21-30, with those aged 31-60 making up the remainder of the sample. As in study 1, ethnicity was multiply coded and participants were able to select more than one ethnic group. The largest proportion of the sample identified as New Zealand European, approximately one tenth identified as Māori and roughly the same proportion identified as Asian, small proportions of the sample also identified as European, South African, and Latin American.

As in study 1, the question about participants parents or caregivers was multiply coded; allowing participants to select all parents or caregivers they were raised by. Most participants were raised by their mother and/or father, just over a tenth of the sample were raised by a step-parent, and one sixth were raised by grandparents, with small proportions of the sample being raised by adoptive parents and other family/caregivers. Most participants had at least one sibling, and of those who did, roughly two-fifths had witnessed a sibling use CPV. Just under a sixth of participants were parents, and of those, a fifth had been a victim of CPV. Almost a third of participants indicated that they had used CPV against a parent. Random assignment resulted in the number of participants in each of the four conditions being approximately equal.

Table 3

Description of Sample in Study 2

Variable	*n (%)*
Gender	
Male	67 (17.3)
Female	308 (79.6)
Another gender	12 (3.1)
Age	
17-20	232 (59.9)
21-30	99 (25.6)
31-40	29 (7.5)
41-50	21 (5.4)
51-60	6 (1.6)
Ethnicity [a]	
New Zealand European	274 (70.8)
Māori	97 (15.1)
Indian	18 (4.6)
Chinese	16 (4.1)
Other Asian	18 (4.7)
Cook Island Māori	4 (1.0)
Other Pacifica	18 (4.7)
European	16 (4.1)
Latin American	3 (0.8)
South African	10 (2.6)
Parents or caregivers [a]	
Mother	371 (95.9)
Father	340 (87.9)
Stepmother	26 (6.7)
Stepfather	26 (6.7)
Grandparents	63 (16.3)
Adoptive parents	9 (2.3)
Other family/caregiver	11 (2.8)
Has siblings	359 (92.8)
Is a parent	60 (15.5)
Perpetrated CPV	108 (27.9)
Witnessed CPV [b]	147 (38.0)
Victim of CPV [c]	13 (3.4)
Condition	
No indication of previous use of CPV	97 (25.1)
Never used CPV	96 (24.8)
Occasionally used CPV	98 (25.3)
Regularly used CPV	96 (24.8)

Note. CPV = Child-to-parent Violence.

[a] Percentages exceed 100% as participants could select more than one response to these questions
[b] 38.0% of overall sample has witnessed CPV but this represents 40.9% of people who said yes to having siblings.
[c] 3.4% of the overall sample had been a victim of CPV, but this represents 21.7% of people who said yes to being a parent.

Procedure

The survey included four vignettes of CPV. The vignettes described a fictional CPV episode between Oscar and his mother Julie, and consisted of a normal child-to-parent interaction that then became violent, as research indicates this is often how episodes of FV begin (Boxall et al., 2018). To avoid any unintended effects of further context on participants' ratings, all four vignettes began with the same interaction between Oscar and Julie, with the only difference being the type of harm Oscar used against Julie (e.g. physical harm, verbal abuse, psychological abuse, or threats and intimidation). Participants rated the overall severity of Oscar's behaviour as well as seven appraisals that may contribute to perceptions of severity. We chose these appraisals (i.e., victim fear and hurt, the harmfulness, aggressiveness, ordinariness and justifiability of aggressor behaviour; and victim responsibility for aggressor behaviour; Basow et al., 2007; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Yamawaki et al., 2009) because previous FV research indicated that these factors are considered in people's perceptions of the severity of FV (Basow et al., 2007; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Yamawaki et al., 2009).

Analytic Plan

All analyses were completed in R. First, we used descriptive statistics to describe the sample. Then, to answer the first research question, we first used Pearson correlations to examine the relationship between the appraisals that may contribute to perceptions of severity with each other and with the overall severity item. Because we hypothesised there was one

underlying factor (i.e., the construct of severity), we then used factor analysis to answer the research question[3]. A Kaiser-Meyer Olkin test and Bartlett's test of sphericity indicated that the data were suitable for factor analysis (Kaiser, 1974). After selecting the model that best fit the data, we described the factor loadings and identified a factor describing perceived severity to use as an index when answering the second research question. To answer the second research question, we used two one-way ANOVAs to investigate the effect of context about the aggressor's history of using CPV towards their mother on perceived severity.

Before conducting the ANOVAs, we tested the assumption of equality of variances with Levene's tests, which produced a non-significant for the severity index, meaning the assumption of equality of variance was not violated. To test the assumption of normality, we first produced histograms and density plots of the average severity index rating to visually examine the distribution of the data, which appeared mostly normally distributed with some left skew. We then conducted a Shapiro-Wilks test on the average severity index rating and found the data were not normally distributed; however, it is generally agreed that ANOVA are robust to non-normal data with large enough samples (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012).

We also carried out exploratory analyses to identify whether ratings of perceived severity differed according to demographic characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, and whether participants had any previous experience of CPV.

Study 2 Results

Our first research question was: What types of appraisals contribute to the perceived severity of behaviours that constitute CPV? To answer this question, we first examined the relationship between the appraisal items included in the survey. Table 4 shows severity had a

[3] We also investigated using mediation or moderation analyses but multicollinearity meant these analyses were not suitable.

moderate to strong positive correlation with victim fear, the harmfulness and aggressiveness of aggressor behaviour, and a small positive correlation with victim responsibility for aggressor behaviour. The aggressiveness of aggressor behaviour was moderately positively correlated with victim fear and the harmfulness of aggressor behaviour. This pattern of correlations was similar across the four types of harm included in the study (physical harm, verbal abuse, psychological abuse, and threats and intimidation; see Appendix E).

Table 4

Correlations Between Participants' Ratings of Appraisals that May Contribute to Perceptions of Severity

Item	Severity	Fear	Hurt	Harm	Aggressive	Ordinary	Justified	Responsible
Severity	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fear	**0.59**	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hurt	0.48	0.48	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
Harm	**0.70**	0.55	0.55	1.00	-	-	-	-
Aggressive	**0.71**	**0.57**	0.44	**0.68**	1.00	-	-	-
Ordinary	0.35	0.25	0.15	0.33	0.32	1.00	-	-
Justified	0.14	**0.05**	0.05	0.17	0.15	0.33	1.00	-
Responsible	**0.03**	**0.02**	**-0.06**	**0.03**	**0.02**	0.16	0.34	1.00

Note. Pearson correlation coefficient was used, p-values significant at .05 denoted in bold

Table 5 shows model fit indices for factor analyses with one to four factors, which indicated a two-factor solution best fit the data. Examination of eigen values using Kaiser's criterion (Kaiser, 1960) and a scree plot (see Appendix F) indicated two factors for extraction, and the results of absolute and comparative fit indices also supported the two-factor model (Brown, 2006).

Table 5

Model Fit Indices for Factor Analysis of Appraisals that May Contribute to Perceptions of Severity

Model	RMSR	TLI	RMSEA	BIC
One-factor	.11	-	-	-
Two-factor	.03	.96	.07	9.77
Three-factor	.02	.99	.03	-37.52
Four-factor	.01	.99	.03	-10.82

Note. RMSR = Root mean square residual TLI = Tucker Lewis index RMSEA = Root mean square error of approximation BIC = Bayesian information criterion. Models used minimum residual extraction and promax rotation.

Table 6 shows the items that loaded on factor 1 — which we named *Severity* — included severity, victim fear and hurt, and the harmfulness and aggressiveness of aggressor behaviour. The remaining items loaded on factor 2, which we named *Abnormality*. Together these two factors accounted for 100% of variance. Cronbach's alpha indicated high internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) among factor 1 items ($\alpha = .86$) indicating that together the variables included in factor 1 are a reliable measure of the construct of severity and the factor is suitable for use in further analyses; much lower internal consistency was found among factor 2 items ($\alpha = .51$). Because factor 1 *Severity* had high internal consistency, we summed each participants' ratings for the items that loaded on the factor and used this new variable as an index for perceived severity when answering the second research question.

Table 6

Factor Loadings for Two-Factor Model of Appraisals that May Contribute to Perceptions of Severity

Item	Factor 1 *Severity*	Factor 2 *Abnormality*
Severity	**.84**	.03
Fear	**.72**	- .07

Hurt	**.64**	- .12
Harm	**.83**	.04
Aggressive	**.80**	.03
Ordinary	.28	**.38**
Justified	- .03	**.76**
Responsible	- .10	**.47**
Eigenvalues	3.53	1.46
% of variance	76.00	24.00

Note. Bold font indicates factor loadings.

Next we answered our second research question: Does the level of contextual information about previous CPV affect the perceived severity of behaviours that constitute CPV? To answer this question, we performed ANOVA with the perceived severity index and found that participants perceived violence from children who used CPV occasionally (M = 4.10, SD = 0.51) as more severe than violence from children who regularly used CPV (M = 3.93, SD = 0.48) and violence from children who have never used CPV (M = 4.00, SD = 0.53), $F(3, 383) = 2.89$, $p = .03$. Additionally, we examined the effect of context about previous CPV use on the perceived severity of different types of harm (i.e., physical harm, verbal abuse, psychological abuse, and threats and intimidation). We found that participants rated psychological harm as more severe when there was context about the child occasionally using CPV (M = 3.66, SD = 0.78) than when there was context about the child regularly using CPV (M = 3.29, SD = 0.78) or the child never using CPV (M = 3.42, SD = 0.82), $F(3, 383)$ = 4.23, $p = .005$. There was no effect of context on the perceived severity of physical or verbal harm, or threats and intimidation.

We also conducted exploratory analyses with the perceived severity index to determine whether perceptions of severity differed across demographic characteristics. We found that New Zealand European participants viewed CPV as less severe (M = 3.92, SD = 0.50) than participants who did not identify as New Zealand European (M = 4.17, SD = 0.45),

$F(1, 385) = 21.08$, $p < .001$. There was no significant difference in perception of severity across age categories or genders. We then examined whether participants' ratings of severity differed by whether people had experienced CPV in some form. We found that participants who had witnessed CPV rated it as less severe ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 0.51$) than those who had not ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.48$), $F(2, 384) = 7.80$, $p < .001$. Participants who had used CPV also rated it as less severe ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 0.48$) than people who had not ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 0.50$), $F(1, 385) = 9.52$, $p = .002$. Finally, we found no significant differences in perceptions of severity between participants who had been a victim of CPV and those who had not.

Discussion

The overarching aims of this thesis were to gain a better understanding of whether perceived severity is associated with the likelihood of reporting CPV, and to identify factors that may affect the perceived severity of CPV. We conducted a pair of studies that each addressed different aspects of those aims. Taken together, the findings advanced our understanding of the impact of severity on reporting decisions as well contributing to knowledge about factors that affect perceptions of severity for FV, and specifically CPV.

Study 1

In answering the first question of Study 1: Is the perceived severity of behaviours that constitute CPV related to how likely people are to report those behaviours to police? We found that participants' ratings of the severity and the likelihood they would report CPV behaviours were, as hypothesised, positively correlated. However, the relationship between perceived severity and likelihood of reporting was only of moderate strength, suggesting that other factors alongside severity are considered when people decide whether to report CPV to police. This finding does not come as a surprise, because victimisation surveys and qualitative research with FV victims consistently find victims' reporting decisions are influenced by numerous factors other than the severity of violence (Ministry of Justice, 2022,

2023). These factors include, but are not limited to, fear of further violence as a result of reporting, unhelpful and shaming responses from support services and police, feeling personally responsible for victimisation, wanting to protect other family members from harm and disruption due to reporting, as well as wanting to protect the aggressor from legal consequences (Baumer & Lauritsen, 2010; Khan et al., 2023; Miles & Condry, 2016; Ministry of Justice, 2022, 2023); with the last reason being especially relevant when the victim's own child is the person using violence, as is the case with CPV.

Turning to the second question of Study 1: Does child developmental stage, gender and parent gender affect the perceived severity and likelihood of reporting behaviours that constitute CPV? We found no significant difference in the perceived severity of CPV used by teenaged and child aggressors; however, CPV used by teenaged aggressors was more likely to be *reported* to police than CPV by child aggressors. This finding supports the previous explanation that reporting decisions are based on more than just perceived severity, because if severity were the sole explanation for reporting, the likelihood of people reporting CPV to police would be the same for both teenaged and child aggressors. A common theme in research defining CPV is that violent behaviours used by children often only begin to be seen as problematic when those behaviours persist into adolescence (Coogan, 2011, 2014; Holt & Lewis, 2021; Simmons et al., 2019), suggesting that the level of responsibility attributed to children is based on their developmental stage (Miles & Condry, 2016).

It is widely understood that the part of the brain responsible for planning, judgement, and decision making – the prefrontal cortex – only starts to develop in adolescence (Blakemore et al., 2010; Jadhav & Boutrel, 2019); hence, although their prefrontal cortex is still not fully formed, a teenager's capacity to understand the consequences of their actions is greater than a child's (Decety, 2022; Jadhav & Boutrel, 2019; Killen & Smetana, 2022). Furthermore, adolescence is a time associated with advances in moral development

(Kohlberg, 1984) and as children reach adolescence they become better at perspective taking and begin to understand how their actions impact others (Decety, 2022; Jadhav & Boutrel, 2019; Kohlberg, 1984; Senland, 2022). In relation to CPV, this means teenaged aggressors are more likely than child aggressors to be aware of the harm they inflict on victims, and are consequently viewed as more responsible for their actions and more deserving of repercussions such as being reported to the police.

Despite the non-significant effect of aggressor developmental stage on perceptions of severity overall, when we broke down perceived severity by type of harm (i.e., physical harm, verbal abuse, threats and intimidation, and psychological abuse) we found that aggressor developmental stage did affect the perceived severity of both physical harm and threats and intimidation. The onset of puberty in adolescence brings about rapid physical changes (Blakemore et al., 2010) – often accompanied by increased size and strength – as well as an increased capacity to inflict physical harm. Therefore, it was not surprising to observe that physical harm and threats and intimidation (which imply future physical harm) from teenaged aggressors were perceived as more severe than if the same behaviours were used by child aggressors. Indeed, previous research has indicated that violence is perceived as more severe when the aggressor is larger and stronger than their victim (Hamby & Jackson, 2010).

Across all types of harm, we found that participants perceived CPV used against mothers as more severe and more likely to be reported than CPV against fathers; a finding consistent with much of the research on gender and perceptions of violence (Basow et al., 2007; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Harris, 1991; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Wilson & Smirles, 2022; Yamawaki et al., 2009). Previous research has put forth several potential explanations for why violence towards women is perceived as more severe and less acceptable than violence towards men, including differences in rates of

serious injury between men and women, differences in size and strength, and gender norms. Compared with men, women experience much higher rates of serious physical injury due to IPV (Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Sikström & Dahl, 2023), which could explain why violence against women is often perceived as more severe and frightening than when victims are men.

A study from Hamby and Jackson (2010) found that when presented with vignettes describing IPV episodes, participants' ratings of severity and fear were affected by differences in physical size and ability to inflict physical harm between men and women. Conversely, Parker and colleagues (2022) found that variations in aggressor physical size had no effect on perceptions of victim injury for IPV; rather, it was participants' beliefs in traditional gender norms – women are soft and vulnerable, men are resilient and aggressive – and not their perception of injury that influenced their attributions of blame for IPV (Parker et al., 2022). In our study, we could not conclude whether gendered differences in size and strength or pervasive gender norms resulted in all types of CPV against mothers being perceived as more severe than CPV towards fathers. Participants may have considered aggressor and parent physical size and strength when appraising the severity of physical harm and threats and intimidation, but it is less likely that participants considered differences in size and strength when rating non-physical forms of harm such as verbal abuse and psychological abuse. In the case of non-physical harm, gender norms may have had a greater impact on participant perceptions than physical differences. Societally, women — especially mothers — are conceptualised as gentle and often ascribed caring roles, with the embedded assumption that they should be protected from harm as a result (Basow et al., 2007; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Wilson & Smirles, 2022; Yamawaki et al., 2009).

In regard to aggressor gender, it is commonly reported in IPV research that violence committed by men is perceived as more severe than violence committed by women (Basow et al., 2007; Condry & Ross, 1985; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Hamby & Jackson, 2010;

Harris, 1991; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Wilson & Smirles, 2022; Yamawaki et al., 2009). This is at odds with the finding in this study that aggressor gender did not affect participants' perceptions of CPV severity or likelihood of reporting. One explanation for this finding may be that gendered differences in physical size and strength are not pronounced enough in childhood and adolescence to have the same impact on perceptions of violence severity as occurs between adult men and women.

Study 2

Recall the first question we set out to answer in study 2: What types of appraisals contribute to the perceived severity of behaviours that constitute CPV? Based on previous research (Basow et al., 2007; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Parker et al., 2022; Yamawaki et al., 2009), we suspected that the construct of perceived severity was affected by appraisals of victim fear and hurt, the harmfulness, aggressiveness, and ordinariness of aggressor behaviour, the justifiability of aggressors employing such behaviour, and level of responsibility attributed to victims for the behaviour directed towards them (Basow et al., 2007; Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Follingstad & DeHart, 2000; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Parker et al., 2022; Sorenson & Taylor, 2005; Wilson & Smirles, 2022; Yamawaki et al., 2009). Contrary to our hypothesis that the items would load on a single factor for perceived severity, the factor analysis of participant ratings of these items supported a two-factor solution. This finding indicated that participants' judgements about the CPV episodes could be described with two sets of appraisals; the first (factor 1) capturing the extent of negative impacts of violence (i.e., *Severity*), and the second (factor 2) capturing the rationalisation and moral weight assigned to the use of violence (i.e., *Abnormality*).

The first factor *Severity* contained the items for severity, victim fear and hurt, and aggressor harmfulness and aggressiveness, and explained most of the variance in participant

responses. In addition, factor 1 showed excellent internal consistency, indicating the items were indeed measuring aspects of a single construct. These results fit with previous research on factors that affect perceptions of severity; studies from Wilson & Smirles (2010) and Hamby & Jackson (2022) also created severity indices from appraisals of IPV consisting of similar items (e.g., violence severity, victims level of fear, hurtfulness of aggressors actions, seriousness of aggressors actions). Furthermore, both of the aforementioned studies found that their respective indices possessed a similarly high level of internal consistency to our own (Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Wilson & Smirles, 2022).

Factor two *Abnormality* included the remaining three appraisals — ordinariness and justifiability of aggressor behaviour, and victim responsibility — and was less internally consistent than the first factor. This result was comparable to findings from Parker and colleagues (2022), finding that victim blame, perpetrator blame, and justification of perpetrators behaviour together made up a component of perceptions of IPV severity. The small correlations between items in *Abnormality* and overall severity further supports the idea that abnormal behaviour may be viewed as more severe (Bettio et al., 2020; Simmons et al., 2019) and suggests that because conflict between child and parent is "normal" and "expected", it is viewed as less severe than other types of FV like IPV (Bettio et al., 2020; Holmbeck & Hill, 1991; Simmons et al., 2019).

Finally, we used factor 1 *Severity* as a perceived severity index to answer the second question of study 2: Does the level of contextual information about previous CPV affect the perceived severity of behaviours that constitute CPV? Overall, the level of context about previous use of CPV did not have a significant effect on perceptions of CPV severity; however, when we examined the effect on perceived severity by type of harm, we found that previous use of CPV affected participants' perceptions of the severity of psychological harm. Psychological harm was viewed as most severe when accompanied by context about

occasional previous use of CPV. This finding at first appeared counterintuitive because – in line with previous research on the effect of frequency of violence on perceived severity (Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Follingstad & DeHart, 2000; Sorenson & Taylor, 2005; Yamawaki et al., 2009) – we hypothesised that CPV would be perceived as increasingly severe in the context of increased history of CPV.

But on the other hand, research also supports the idea that violence is perceived as less severe by people who have become accustomed to it (Bettio et al., 2020; Khan & Rogers, 2015; Mrug et al., 2016; Simmons et al., 2019), as evidenced by our own exploratory finding that participants who had experienced CPV as a witness, perpetrator, and/or victim perceived CPV as less severe than participants who had not (see below). It is possible that the unpredictable nature of occasional use of CPV could cause more stress and psychological harm — and be viewed as more harmful by others — than regular or no use of CPV because of uncertainty about whether interacting with the aggressor will result in CPV. Research on the effect variable reinforcement and punishment has shown that inconsistency in the application and timing of negative stimuli can cause fear, anxiety, and psychological distress (Blackman, 2017; Deur & Parke, 1970; Hundt et al., 2013), which could explain the above finding from this study.

In addition to answering the main research questions of studies 1 and 2, we conducted exploratory analyses to investigate whether perceptions of CPV severity (studies 1 and 2) and likelihood of reporting (study 1) differed according to participants' previous experiences of CPV. Interestingly, we found perceptions of CPV severity did differ between participants who had experienced CPV – either as a witness, perpetrator, or victim – and those who had not. Participants in study 1 who had either witnessed, perpetrated, or had been a victim of any of the CPV behaviours included in the survey consistently rated CPV as less severe than participants without that experience and reported lower likelihoods of reporting CPV

behaviours to the police. We observed a similar pattern in study 2; ratings of severity from participants who had witnessed and/or perpetrated CPV were lower than ratings from participants who had not witnessed and/or perpetrated CPV. However, contrary to study 1, we did not observe a difference in severity ratings between study 2 participants who had been victims of CPV and those who had not. Finding that CPV was perceived as less severe by those who had experienced it was not surprising; it shows a habituation response whereby behavioural responses to a stimulus gradually reduce with repeated exposure (Rankin et al., 2009).

Implications

The findings from this research further our understanding of the relationship between perceived severity and likelihood of reporting, and factors that affect perceptions of severity, both for CPV, and in general. The above studies have contributed to the wider body of research on FV, where CPV research has been greatly lacking (Condry & Miles, 2014; Coogan, 2011; Holt, 2016; Holt & Lewis, 2021). Indeed, research on perceptions of severity of FV has primarily focused on IPV (Badenes-Sastre et al., 2024; Basow et al., 2007; Gracia et al., 2009; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Hine et al., 2022; Miller, 2011; Sikström & Dahl, 2023; Wilson & Smirles, 2022; Yamawaki et al., 2009). This research has provided foundational knowledge about factors that affect perceptions (Dennison & Thompson, 2011; Hamby & Jackson, 2010; Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Lindhorst & Tajima, 2008; Parker et al., 2022; Sikström & Dahl, 2023; Sorenson & Taylor, 2005; Wang, 2019); however, such results may not uniformly generalise to CPV due to the nature of parent-child relationships (Condry & Miles, 2014; Coogan, 2011; Holt, 2016; Holt & Lewis, 2021; Rutter, 2023). This research has also expanded our understanding of how people qualify and quantify harmful behaviour when it comes to violence used by children and teenagers.

Expanding understandings of perceptions of severity through the lens of CPV is important in a practical sense; these findings may be useful for informing efforts to encourage reporting. In addition to severity affecting victims' reporting decisions (Ministry of Justice, 2022, 2023; Spencer et al., 2017), previous research has indicated that, how violence is experienced by — and communicated to — third-parties may affect their judgements of severity and blame, in turn impacting decisions about who should report violence, and when (Sikström & Dahl, 2023). Our understanding of how third parties perceive severity, as well as how contextual factors affect their perceptions of severity and decisions about whether to report, can be used to inform and tailor efforts to increase reporting for CPV and FV more generally.

Limitations and Future Directions

It is important to note the limitations of this study. Firstly, both samples were drawn from a pool of university students — most of whom were young people — and perceptions of violence severity and reporting are known to differ with age (Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Hindin, 2003; Speizer, 2010; Waltermaurer et al., 2013; Wang, 2019). Furthermore, university students represent a group of people with a higher level of education than the general population, and increased education is associated with less accepting attitudes towards violence (Harris & Knight-Bohnhoff, 1996; Hindin, 2003; Speizer, 2010; Waltermaurer et al., 2013; Wang, 2019). As such, it is important to note that the people in our sample are likely to believe violence is less acceptable than the general public, and to generalise the results of this study to the wider population would be to underestimate the societal level of tolerance for violence. While there has been research on the effect of age, education, and other factors on perceptions of IPV, future research should investigate how such characteristics affect perceptions of CPV, and examine whether patterns differ between

IPV and CPV to determine the extent to which existing findings about perceptions of IPV can generalise to other types of FV.

In study 1 we found that parent gender affected perceptions of CPV severity; however; due to sample size constraints, in study 2 we could only examine the effect of context of previous use of CPV on perceptions of severity between a mother and teenaged son, and we could not examine parent-child relationships of other gender combinations. This interesting finding requires further examination, because investigating the combination of context and parent gender — and how these factors may effect perceptions of severity — would provide a more well-rounded understanding of how people perceive actual episodes of CPV, which are complex and context dependent.

Another potential limitation of both studies was our decision not to employ manipulation checks. While the pattern of significant results indicate that the parent gender, aggressor gender, aggressor developmental stage (study 1), and level of context (study 2) conditions influenced participants' responses, including a manipulation check could have helped us better understand the extent of manipulation achieved by the survey conditions (Hauser et al., 2018). A manipulation check may have also indicated where we could improve the wording of conditions to increase the effect of our manipulations in subsequent studies.

Furthermore, study 2's reliance on vignettes may pose a limitation, because it remains unclear whether people comparably process cues about gender, developmental stage, context, and type of harm when reading descriptions versus witnessing CPV. This potential limitation could be explored in future research using different experimental methods (e.g., audio descriptions, video re-enactments, and virtual reality) and comparing participant distress and response patterns to identify whether different experimental approaches produce similar results with respect to factors that affect perceptions of severity (Palomba et al., 2000; Woodward & Beck, 2017). The responses we gathered using vignettes were a first step in

understanding perceptions of CPV severity, but to gain a more complete idea of what affects people's perceptions of CPV, it would be helpful to understand the impact of differing methods of communication.

It is also important to consider that it is common for families who experience FV to have different types of FV occur alongside each other; a family may be dealing with CPV as well and IPV and sibling violence. Multiple types of FV co-occurring could impact the perceived severity of an aggressor's harmful behaviour because it would further complicate the context in which it occurs. For example, a person may be an aggressor in one scenario, but a victim in the next (Contreras & Cano, 2016; Cottrell & Monk, 2004; Cuervo, 2023; Ibabe, 2019, 2019; Ibabe et al., 2009, 2013; Ibabe & Jaureguizar, 2010). Hence, future research should investigate how context affects perceptions of FV severity for different types of FV in isolation and in combination, as well as for people in different roles. Research of this nature would allow us to compare perceptions of severity in the contexts of families experiencing a single type of FV, and families where multiple types of FV are co-occurring.

Conclusion

In this thesis, we aimed to better understand whether perceived severity is associated with the likelihood of reporting CPV, and to identify factors that may affect the perceived severity of CPV. We found that perceived severity was moderately associated with likelihood of reporting CPV, but there are likely many other factors that affect people's reporting decisions. We also found that parents gender had a significant impact on the perceived severity of CPV behaviour – violence towards mothers was seen as more severe than violence towards fathers – but aggressor gender did not. As for aggressor developmental stage, it only had a significant impact on the perception of severity and likelihood of reporting when we broke ratings down by the type of violent behaviour (e.g., physical violence, verbal abuse, psychological abuse, and threats and intimidation). The concept of perceived severity was

described with a factor containing severity, victim fear and hurt, and the harmfulness and aggressiveness of aggressor behaviour. Finally, context about previous use of violence did not affect perceptions of severity for vignettes of CPV episodes. These studies were important first steps in understanding perceptions of CPV severity, and examined how perceived severity relates to reporting decisions for CPV. The knowledge produced in these studies may help to inform efforts to understand and encourage the reporting of CPV and FV in general.

References

Arias-Rivera, S., Lorence, B., & Hidalgo, V. (2022). parenting skills, family functioning and social support in situations of child-to-parent violence: A scoping review of the literature. *Journal of Family Violence*, *37*(7), 1147–1160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-021-00316-y

Badenes-Sastre, M., Spencer, C. M., Alonso-Ferres, M., Lorente, M., & Expósito, F. (2024). How severity of intimate partner violence is perceived and related to attitudinal variables? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 101925. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2024.101925

Barrett, B. J., Peirone, A., & Cheung, C. H. (2020). Help seeking experiences of survivors of intimate partner violence in Canada: The role of gender, violence severity, and social belonging. *Journal of Family Violence*, *35*(1), 15–28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-019-00086-8

Basow, S. A., Cahill, K. F., Phelan, J. E., Longshore, K., & McGillicuddy-DeLisi, A. (2007). Perceptions of relational and physical aggression among college students: Effects of gender of perpetrator, target, and perceiver. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*(1), 85–95. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00333.x

Bath, H. (2020). The accumulating evidence for cumulative harm. *Developing Practice: The Child, Youth and Family Work Journal*, *38*, 6–14. https://doi.org/10.3316/ielapa.964135647953247

Baumer, E. P., & Lauritsen, J. L. (2010). Reporting crime to the police, 1973–2005: A multivariate analysis of long-term trends in the National Crime Survey and National Crime Victimization Survey. *Criminology*, *48*(1), 131–185. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2010.00182.x

Bettio, F., Ticci, E., & Betti, G. (2020). A fuzzy index and severity scale to measure violence against women. *Social Indicators Research*, *148*(1), 225–249. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-019-02197-7

Blackman, D. (2017). *Operant Conditioning: An experimental analysis of behaviour* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315083735

Blakemore, S., Burnett, S., & Dahl, R. E. (2010). The role of puberty in the developing adolescent brain. *Human Brain Mapping*, *31*(6), 926–933. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.21052

Boxall, H., Boyd, C., Dowling, C., & Morgan, A. (2018). Understanding domestic violence incidents using crime script analysis. *Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, *558*, 1–21.

Brown, T. A. (2006). Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research. In *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. Guilford Press.

Burke, P. J., Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1988). Gender identity, self-esteem, and physical and sexual abuse in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *51*(3), 272–285. https://doi.org/10.2307/2786925

Calvete, E., Gamez-Guadix, M., Orue, I., Gonzalez-Diez, Z., Lopez de Arroyabe, E., Sampedro, R., Pereira, R., Zubizarreta, A., & Borrajo, E. (2013). Brief report: The Adolescent Child-to-Parent Aggression Questionnaire: An examination of aggressions against parents in Spanish adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, *36*(6), 1077–1081. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2013.08.017

Calvete, E., Orue, I., Fernández-González, L., Chang, R., & Little, T. D. (2020). Longitudinal trajectories of child-to-parent violence through adolescence. *Journal of Family Violence*, *35*(2), 107–116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-019-00106-7

Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Elsevier Science.

Condry, J. C., & Ross, D. F. (1985). Sex and aggression: The influence of gender label on the perception of aggression in children. *Child Development*, *56*(1), 225–233. https://doi.org/10.2307/1130189

Condry, & Miles, C. (2014). Adolescent to parent violence: Framing and mapping a hidden problem. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, *14*(3), 257–275. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895813500155

Contreras, L., Bustos-Navarrete, C., & Cano-Lozano, M. C. (2019). Child-to-parent Violence Questionnaire (CPV-Q): Validation among Spanish adolescents. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, *19*(1), 67–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2018.09.001

Contreras, L., & Cano, M. del C. (2016). Child-to-parent violence: The role of exposure to violence and its relationship to social-cognitive processing. *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, *8*(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpal.2016.03.003

Contreras, L., León, S. P., & Cano-Lozano, M. C. (2020). assessing child-to-parent violence with the Child-to-Parent Violence Questionnaire, Parents' Version (CPV-Q-P): Factor structure, prevalence, and reasons. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 604956. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.604956

Coogan, D. (2011). Child-to-parent violence: Challenging perspectives on family violence. *Child Care in Practice*, *17*(4), 347–358. https://doi.org/10.1080/13575279.2011.596815

Coogan, D. (2014). Responding to child-to-parent violence: innovative practices in child and adolescent mental health. *Health & Social Work*, *39*(2), e1–e9. https://doi.org/10.1093/hsw/hlu011

Cottrell, B., & Monk, P. (2004). Adolescent-to-parent abuse: A qualitative overview of common themes. *Journal of Family Issues*, *25*(8), 1072–1095. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X03261330

Crichton-Hill, Y., Evans, N., & Meadows, L. (2006). Adolescent violence towards parents. *Te Awatea Review (Online)*, *4*(2), 21–22.

Cuervo, K. (2023). A deeper understanding of child to parent violence (CPV): Personal traits, family context, and parenting. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *67*(10–11), 1079–1105. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X211065588

Decety, L. H. H., Jean. (2022). A cognitive neuroscience perspective on moral development. In *Handbook of Moral Development* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Dennison, S. M., & Thompson, C. M. (2011). Intimate Partner Violence: The Effect of Gender and Contextual Factors on Community Perceptions of Harm, and Suggested Victim and Criminal Justice Responses. *Violence and Victims*, *26*(3), 347–363. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.26.3.347

Deur, J. L., & Parke, R. D. (1970). Effects of inconsistent punishment on aggression in children. *Developmental Psychology*, *2*(3), 403–411. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0029170

Edenborough, M., Jackson, D., Mannix, J., & Wilkes, L. M. (2008). Living in the red zone: The experience of child-to-mother violence. *Child & Family Social Work*, *13*(4), 464–473. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2008.00576.x

Emery, C. R. (2010). Examining an extension of Johnson's Hypothesis: Is male perpetrated intimate partner violence more underreported than female violence?: Item non-response in the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods. *Journal of Family Violence*, *25*(2), 173–181. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-009-9281-0

Fanslow, J., Robinson, E., Crengle, S., & Perese, L. (2010). Juxtaposing beliefs and reality: Prevalence rates of intimate partner violence and attitudes to violence and gender roles reported by New Zealand women. *Violence Against Women*, *16*(7), 812–831. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210373710

Felitti, V. J., & Anda, R. F. (2010). The relationship of adverse childhood experiences to adult medical disease, psychiatric disorders and sexual behavior: Implications for healthcare. In R. A. Lanius, E. Vermetten, & C. Pain (Eds.), *The Impact of Early Life Trauma on Health and Disease* (pp. 77–87). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511777042.010

Follingstad, D. R., & DeHart, D. D. (2000). Defining psychological abuse of husbands toward wives: Contexts, behaviors, and typologies. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *15*(9), 891–920. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626000015009001

Follingstad, D. R., Helff, C. M., Binford, R. V., Runge, M. M., & White, J. D. (2004). Lay persons' versus psychologists' judgments of psychologically aggressive actions by a husband and wife. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *19*(8), 916–942. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260504266229

Gallagher, E. (2004). Parents victimised by their children. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, *25*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1467-8438.2004.tb00573.x

Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: A guide for non-statisticians. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, *10*(2), 486–489. https://doi.org/10.5812/ijem.3505

Gracia, E., García, F., & Lila, M. (2009). Public responses to intimate partner violence against women: The influence of perceived severity and personal responsibility. *The*

Spanish Journal of Psychology, *12*(2), 648–656. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1138741600002018

Hamby, S., & Jackson, A. (2010). Size does matter: The effects of gender on perceptions of dating violence. *Sex Roles*, *63*(5–6), 324–331. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9816-0

Harris, M. B. (1991). Effects of sex of aggressor, sex of target, and relationship on evaluations of physical aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *6*(2), 174–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/088626091006002003

Harris, M. B., & Knight-Bohnhoff, K. (1996). Gender and aggression I: Perceptions of aggression. *Sex Roles*, *35*(1–2), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01548172

Hauser, D. J., Ellsworth, P. C., & Gonzalez, R. (2018). Are manipulation checks necessary? *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*, 998. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00998

Higgins, D. (2005). Differentiating between child maltreatment experiences. *Family Matters (Melbourne, Vic.)*, *69*, 50-.

Hindin, M. J. (2003). Understanding women's attitudes towards wife beating in Zimbabwe. (Research). *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, *81*(7), 501–509.

Hine, B., Noku, L., Bates, E. A., & Jayes, K. (2022). But, who is the victim here? Exploring judgments toward hypothetical bidirectional domestic violence scenarios. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *37*(7–8), NP5495–NP5516. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520917508

Holmbeck, G. N., & Hill, J. P. (1991). Conflictive engagement, positive affect, and menarche in families with seventh-grade girls. *Child Development*, *62*(5), 1030. https://doi.org/10.2307/1131150

Holt, A. (2013). *Adolescent-to-parent abuse: Current understandings in research, policy and practice* (1st ed.). Bristol University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1t6p748

Holt, A. (2016). Adolescent-to-parent abuse as a form of "domestic violence": A conceptual review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *17*(5), 490–499. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838015584372

Holt, A., & Lewis, S. (2021). Constituting child-to-parent violence: Lessons from England and Wales. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *61*(3), 792–811. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azaa088

Hong, J., Kral, M., Espelage, D., & Allen-Meares, P. (2012). The social ecology of adolescent-initiated parent abuse: A review of the literature. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, *43*(3), 431–454. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-011-0273-y

Hundt, N. E., Brown, L. H., Kimbrel, N. A., Walsh, M. A., Nelson-Gray, R., & Kwapil, T. R. (2013). Reinforcement sensitivity theory predicts positive and negative affect in daily life. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*(3), 350–354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.09.021

Hunter, C., Nixon, J., & Parr, S. (2010). Mother abuse: A matter of youth justice, child welfare or domestic violence? *Journal of Law and Society*, *37*(2), 264–284. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6478.2010.00504.x

Ibabe, I. (2019). Adolescent-to-parent violence and family environment: The perceptions of same reality? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(12), 2215. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16122215

Ibabe, I., & Jaureguizar, J. (2010). Child-to-parent violence: Profile of abusive adolescents and their families. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*(4), 616–624. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.04.034

Ibabe, I., Jaureguizar, J., & Bentler, P. M. (2013). Risk factors for child-to-parent violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, *28*(5), 523–535. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-013-9512-2

Ibabe, I., Jaurequizar, J., & Díaz, Ó. (2009). Adolescent violence against parents. Is it a consequence of gender inequality? *European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, *1*(1). https://journals.copmadrid.org/ejpalc/art/908a6f6a6c131a850ecb0e3f11b08189

Jadhav, K. S., & Boutrel, B. (2019). Prefrontal cortex development and emergence of self-regulatory competence: The two cardinal features of adolescence disrupted in context of alcohol abuse. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *50*(3), 2274–2281. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejn.14316

Jolliffe Simpson, A. D., Joshi, C., & Polaschek, D. L. L. (2021). Predictive validity of the DYRA and SAFVR: New Zealand Police's family violence risk assessment instruments. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 48(10), 1487–1508. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854821997525

Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *20*(1), 141–151. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446002000116

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, *39*(1), 31–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575

Khan, R., & Rogers, P. (2015). The normalization of sibling violence: Does gender and personal experience of violence influence perceptions of physical assault against siblings? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *30*(3), 437–458. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514535095

Khan, Sobia Bashir, & Faisal Shehzad. (2023). Domestic violence: The psychological and legal factors that affect reporting, prosecution, and sentencing. *Sjesr*, *6*(1), 139–146. https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol6-iss1-2023(139-146)

Killen, M., & Smetana, J. G. (Eds.). (2022). *Handbook of moral development* (Third edition). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages. In *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages* (1st ed.). Harper & Row.

Kruger, T. (2004). Transforming whānau violence: A conceptual framework: An updated version of the report from the former Second Māori Taskforce on Whānau Violence. In *Transforming whānau violence: A conceptual framework: An updated version of the report from the former Second Māori Taskforce on Whānau Violence* (Second edition.). [Te Puni Kōkiri].

Lehmann, P., Simmons, C. A., & Pillai, V. K. (2012). The validation of the Checklist of Controlling Behaviors (CCB). *Violence Against Women*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801212456522

Leon, C. M., Aizpurua, E., & Rollero, C. (2022). None of my business? An experiment analyzing willingness to formally report incidents of intimate partner violence against women. *Violence against Women*, *28*(9), 2163–2185. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012211025990

Lievore, D., & Mayhew, P. (2007). *The scale and nature of family violence in New Zealand: A review and evaluation of knowledge*. Ministry of Social Development.

Lindhorst, T., & Tajima, E. (2008). Reconceptualizing and operationalizing context in survey research on intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *23*(3), 362–388. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260507312293

Loinaz, I., Barboni, L., & Sousa, A. M. de. (2020). Gender differences in child to parent violence risk factors. *Annals of Psychology*, *36*(3). https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.428531

Lyons, J., Bell, T., Fréchette, S., & Romano, E. (2015). Child-to-parent violence: Frequency and family correlates. *Journal of Family Violence*, *30*(6), 729–742. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-015-9716-8

Marshall, L. L. (1992). Development of the severity of violence against women scales. *Journal of Family Violence*, *7*(2), 103–122.

Miles, C., & Condry, R. (2016). Adolescent to parent violence: The police response to parents reporting violence from their children. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy*, *26*(7), 804–823.

Miller, L. M. (2011). Physical abuse in a college setting: A study of perceptions and participation in abusive dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, *26*(1), 71–80. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-010-9344-2

Ministry of Justice. (2022). *New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey. Key findings—Cycle 4 report. Descriptive statistics*.

Ministry of Justice. (2023). *New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey. Key findings—Cycle 5 report. Descriptive statistics*.

Minto, K., Masser, B., & Louis, W. (2022). Lay understandings of the structure of intimate partner violence in relationships: An analysis of behavioral clustering patterns. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *37*(13/14), NP10810–NP10831. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520986276

Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, *100*(4), 674–701. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.4.674

Moulds, L., Day, A., Mayshak, R., Mildred, H., & Miller, P. (2019). Adolescent violence towards parents: Prevalence and characteristics using Australian police data. *The*

Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, *52*(2), 231–249. https://doi.org/10.3316/agispt.20190723014267

Moulds, L., Day, A., Mildred, H., Miller, P., & Casey, S. (2016). Adolescent violence towards parents: The known and unknowns. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, *37*(4), 547–557. https://doi.org/10.1002/anzf.1189

Mrug, S., Madan, A., & Windle, M. (2016). Emotional desensitization to violence contributes to adolescents' violent behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *44*(1), 75–86. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-015-9986-x

Navas-Martínez, M. J., & Cano-Lozano, M. C. (2022). Profile of the victimized aggressor in child-to-parent violence: Differences according to the type of victimization. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, *22*(2), 100302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2022.100302

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory. In *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

OECD. (2013). *SF3.4: Family violence*. OECD Social Policy Division Directorate of Employment, Labour and Social Affairs. http://www.oecd.org/social/family/database.htm

Palomba, D., Sarlo, M., Angrilli, A., Mini, A., & Stegagno, L. (2000). Cardiac responses associated with affective processing of unpleasant film stimuli. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *36*(1), 45–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8760(99)00099-9

Parker, M. M., Mattson, R. E., Alexander, E. F., & McKinnon, A. M. (2022). does perceived injury explain the effects of gender on attributions of blame for intimate partner violence? A factorial vignette analysis. *Journal of Family Violence*, *37*(2), 301–311. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-020-00229-2

Peck, A., Hutchinson, M., & Provost, S. (2023). Young person–to–mother violence: An integrative review of evidence from Australia and New Zealand. *Australian Social Work*, *76*(2), 245–258. https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2021.1887307

Ploeg, O. H. (2023). *Gendered perceptions of psychological and physical intimate partner violence severity in a New Zealand sample* [Masters thesis]. University of Canterbury.

Rankin, C. H., Abrams, T., Barry, R. J., Bhatnagar, S., Clayton, D., Colombo, J., Coppola, G., Geyer, M. A., Glanzman, D. L., Marsland, S., McSweeney, F., Wilson, D. A., Wu, C.-F., & Thompson, R. F. (2009). Habituation revisited: An updated and revised description of the behavioral characteristics of habituation. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, *92*(2), 135–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2008.09.012

Rico, E., Rosado, J., & Cantón-Cortés, D. (2017). Impulsiveness and child-to-parent violence: The role of aggressor's sex. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, *20*, E15. https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2017.15

Rutter, N. (2023). "My [search strategies] keep missing you": A scoping review to map child-to-parent violence in childhood aggression literature. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *20*(5), 4176. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20054176

Senland, E. C. V., Amie K. (2022). *Moral Development: Theory and Applications* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429295461

Sheehan, M. (1997). Adolescent violence: Strategies, outcomes and dilemmas in working with young people and their families. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, *18*(2), 80–90. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1467-8438.1997.tb00274.x

Sikström, S., & Dahl, M. (2023). How bad is bad? Perceptual differences in the communication of severity in intimate partner violence. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01578-1

Simmons, M., McEwan, T. E., Purcell, R., & Ogloff, J. R. P. (2018). Sixty years of child-to-parent abuse research: What we know and where to go. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *38*, 31–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.11.001

Simmons, McEwan, T. E., & Purcell, R. (2019). "But all kids yell at their parents, don't they?": Social norms about child-to-parent abuse in Australia. *Journal of Family Issues*, *40*(11), 1486–1508. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X19842587

Skinner, R. (2003). *Perceptions and attributions for intimate violence: The roles of sex, size and severity*. https://doi.org/10.26021/11184

Snyder, H. N., & McCurleye, C. (2008). *Domestic assaults by juvenile offenders: (508092009-001)* [dataset]. https://doi.org/10.1037/e508092009-001

Sorenson, S. B., & Taylor, C. A. (2005). Female aggression toward male intimate partners: An examination of social norms in a community-based sample. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *29*(1), 78–96. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00170.x

Speizer, I. S. (2010). Intimate partner violence attitudes and experience among women and men in Uganda. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*(7), 1224–1241. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260509340550

Spencer, C., Mallory, A., Toews, M., Stith, S., & Wood, L. (2017). Why sexual assault survivors do not report to universities: A feminist analysis. *Family Relations*, *66*(1), 166–179. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12241

Taylor, A. R., Cantos, A., O'Leary, D., & Kessler, K. (2021). Stability of the severity of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *36*(1/2), NP942–NP959. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517736880

Tew, J., & Nixon, J. (2010). Parent abuse: opening up a discussion of a complex instance of family power relations. *Social Policy and Society*, *9*(4), 579–589. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746410000291

Ulman, A., & Straus, M. A. (2003). Violence by children against mothers in relation to violence between parents and corporal punishment by parents. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *34*(1), 41–60. https://doi.org/10.3138/jcfs.34.1.41

Voce, I., & Boxall, H. (2018). Who reports domestic violence to police? A review of the evidence. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 1–16.

Walsh, J. A., & Krienert, J. L. (2007). Child–parent violence: An empirical analysis of offender, victim, and event characteristics in a national sample of reported incidents. *Journal of Family Violence*, *22*(7), 563–574. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-007-9108-9

Walsh, J. A., & Krienert, J. L. (2009). A decade of child-initiated family violence: Comparative analysis of child-parent violence and parricide examining offender, victim, and event characteristics in a national sample of reported incidents, 1995-2005. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *24*(9), 1450–1477. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508323661

Waltermaurer, E., Butsashvili, M., Avaliani, N., Samuels, S., & McNutt, L.-A. (2013). An examination of domestic partner violence and its justification in the Republic of Georgia. *BMC Women's Health*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6874-13-44

Wang, L. (2019). Education, perception factors, and prevention of intimate partner violence: Empirical research on chinese university students' perceptions and attitudes concerning intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *34*(8), 1611–1632. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516652263

Williams, M., Tuffin, K., & Niland, P. (2017). "It's like he just goes off, BOOM!": Mothers and grandmothers make sense of child-to-parent violence. *Child & Family Social Work*, *22*(2), 597–606. https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12273

Wilson, J. M., & Smirles, K. (2022). College students' perceptions of intimate partner violence: The effects of type of abuse and perpetrator gender. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *37*(1–2), 172–194. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520908025

Woodward, M. J., & Beck, J. G. (2017). Using the trauma film paradigm to explore interpersonal processes after trauma exposure. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, *9*(4), 445–452. https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000169

Yamawaki, N., Ostenson, J., & Brown, C. R. (2009). The functions of gender role traditionality, ambivalent sexism, injury, and frequency of assault on domestic violence perception. *Violence Against Women*, *15*(9), 1126–1142. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801209340758

Appendix A

CONFIDENTIAL - FOR PEER-REVIEW ONLY

Perceptions of severity and reporting of Child-to-Parent Violence (#131629)

Created: 05/09/2023 09:13 PM (PT)

This is an anonymized copy (without author names) of the pre-registration. It was created by the author(s) to use during peer-review.
A non-anonymized version (containing author names) should be made available by the authors when the work it supports is made public.

---

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?
No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?
To what extent is the developmental stage of young people using CPV associated with the perceived severity of different behaviours that constitute CPV, and how likely people are to report those behaviours to police?

To what extent is the gender of young people using CPV associated with the perceived severity of different behaviours that constitute CPV, and how likely people are to report those behaviours to police?

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
Perceived severity of child-to-parent violence behaviours measured on a 5-point scale 1 = not severe at all – 5 = extremely severe. We will also ask participants how likely is it that they would report each behaviour to police if they witnessed it also on a 5-point scale 1= definitely not – 5 = definitely.

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
There are 8 conditions. We will start with 4:
Male child – mother
Female child – mother
Male teenager – mother
Female teenager – mother

Once we reach a sample size of 30 in the above conditions we will add in 4 more conditions:
Male child – father
Female child – father
Male teenager – father
Female teenager – father

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
We will use descriptive statistics to describe the sample. Then, to answer the research questions we will compare participants' responses across conditions with ANOVA and t-tests.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
Participants with incomplete responses will be excluded from the study.

7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.
The participants will be approximately 300-400 100-level students psychology students at the University of Waikato. So that we have sufficient a sample size to test the association between children's developmental stage and gender and the perceived severity and reporting of CPV behaviours, the survey will have 4 initial conditions (male/female children/teenagers with their mothers). If we reach a sample size of 30 in each of the initial conditions we will add in a 4 further conditions (male/female children/teenagers with their fathers) because parent gender is also of interest, but secondary to the primary focus on children's developmental stage and gender.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
We will conduct exploratory analyses comparing the responses by demographic characteristics, and by whether participants were parents, grew up with siblings, or had witnessed or experienced FV victimisation. We will also compare responses for different types of harm (e.g., psychological versus physical).

Appendix B

Section 1 [All conditions]

Thank you for your interest in taking part in our study. The project team, including Bridget O'Keeffe, Dr Apriel Jolliffe Simpson, and Professor Devon Polaschek, are interested in learning about people's perceptions of situations where young people use family violence towards their parents.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will answer questions about the severity and likelihood of reporting a number of behaviours that constitute child-to-parent violence. The survey will also include some questions about demographic information and previous experience with child-to-parent violence to help contextualise our findings. Completing the survey will take approximately 20-30 minutes.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. Participating in this study may not benefit you directly, but it will help us learn about factors that may influence the perceived severity of child-to-parent violence, and why people choose not to report family violence to police. If you participate in the study, you will receive 2 course credits towards a 100-level psychology paper. Because this survey concerns family violence, you may find answering some of the questions upsetting. We have made every effort to ensure that participants will not be harmed by taking part in this study; however, at any time during the survey, and for any reason, you may withdraw your participation.

The information you will share with us will be kept completely confidential. Anonymous data will be collected via the Qualtrics portal, and no identifying information will be connected to responses. The data we collect will be stored securely in a password protected file and only accessed by members of the research team. We will analyse the results in aggregate form, and any findings will be presented as summaries without identifying individual participants.

Human Research Ethics Committee Information

This research project has been approved by the University of Waikato Human Research Ethics Committee and any questions about the ethical conduct of this research may be sent to the Secretary of the Committee, email humanethics@waikato.ac.nz, postal address, University of Waikato, Te Whare Wananga o Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Dr Apriel Jolliffe Simpson (apriels@waikato.ac.nz) or Bridget O'Keeffe (bokeeffe@waikato.ac.nz).

- ☐ By checking this box I give my consent to participate in this study.

Section 2 [All conditions]

1. What is your age?
   - ☐ 17-20
   - ☐ 21-30

- ▢ 31-40
- ▢ 41-50
- ▢ 51-60
- ▢ 60+

2. What is your gender?
   - ▢ Male
   - ▢ Female
   - ▢ Non-binary
   - ▢ Other (please specify):

3. What ethnic group(s) do you belong to? Select all that apply.
   - ▢ Māori
   - ▢ New Zealand European
   - ▢ Samoan
   - ▢ Cook Islands Māori
   - ▢ Tongan
   - ▢ Niuean
   - ▢ Chinese
   - ▢ Indian
   - ▢ Other (please specify):

4. When you were a child, who were your parent(s) or caregiver(s)? Select all that apply.
   - ▢ Mother
   - ▢ Father
   - ▢ Stepmother
   - ▢ Stepfather
   - ▢ Grandparent(s)
   - ▢ Adoptive parent(s)
   - ▢ Other
5. When you were a child, did you grow up with siblings?
   - ▢ Yes
   - ▢ No
6. Are you a parent or caregiver?
   - ▢ Yes
   - ▢ No

Section 3 [Child conditions – only the child and parent gender changes between conditions]

Sometimes boys/girls can become aggressive during ordinary interactions with their mothers/fathers. Different families deal with conflict in many ways, and children may respond to their mothers/fathers with several different behaviours.

Section 3 [Teenager conditions – only the child and parent gender changes between conditions]

Sometimes teenage boys/girls can become aggressive during ordinary interactions with their mothers/fathers. Different families deal with conflict in many ways, and teenagers may respond to their mothers/fathers with several different behaviours.

Section 4 [All conditions – only the child and parent gender changes between conditions]

Below are some statements describing acts that children/teenagers may use towards their mothers/fathers. Please rate how severe you think these behaviours are:

1 = Not severe at all
2 = Mild
3 = Moderately severe
4 = Severe
5 = Extremely severe

1. He/she threw something at his/her mother/father
2. He/she pushed or grabbed his/her mother/father
3. He/she hit, kicked, or punched his/her mother/father
4. He/she hit, or tried to hit, his/her mother/father with an object
5. He/she choked his/her mother/father
6. He/she swore at his/her mother/father
7. He/she made offensive, degrading, and humiliating comments towards his/her mother/father
8. He/she told his/her mother/father "I hate you!"
9. He/she told his/her mother/father "I wish you were dead!"
10. He/she moved towards his/her mother/father when he/she was angry
11. He/she smashed or broke something
12. He/she threw or kicked something
13. He/she threatened to harm his/her mother/father
14. He/she threatened his/her mother/father with a weapon
15. He/she threatened to kill his/her mother/father
16. He/she threatened to harm his/herself
17. He/she threatened to commit suicide
18. He/she stole money from his/her mother/father
19. He/she demanded his/her mother/father buy something knowing his/her mother/father could not afford it
20. He/she told his/her mother/father that at home his/her mother/father must do what he/she wants
21. He/she demanded his/her mother/father stop what he/she was doing to pay attention to them
22. He/she refused to comply with a request was important to his/her mother/father
23. He/she falsely accused his/her mother/father of mistreatment
24. He/she blackmailed his/her mother/father to get what he/she wanted
25. He/she did something to purposely annoy his/her mother/father
26. He/she blamed his/her misbehaviour on his/her mother/father

Section 5 [All conditions – only the child and parent gender changes between conditions]

Below are the same statements describing acts that children/teenagers may use towards their mothers/fathers. Please rate how likely it is that you would report the behaviour to police if you witnessed it:

1 = Definitely not
2 = Probably not

3 = Possibly
4 = Probably
5 = Definitely

[Repeats list of behaviours above]

Section 6 [All conditions]

33. When you were a child, did you ever use any of the behaviours mentioned in this questionnaire towards your parent or caregiver?
    ▢ Yes
    ▢ No

[If participant checked yes to question 5 'When you were a child, did you grow up with siblings?']

34. When you were a child, did you ever witness a sibling use any of the behaviours mentioned in this questionnaire towards your parent or caregiver?
    ▢ Yes
    ▢ No

[If participant checked yes to question 6 'Are you a parent or caregiver?']

35. Has your child or children used any of the behaviours mentioned in this questionnaire towards you?
    ▢ Yes
    ▢ No

Section 7 [All conditions]

36. I consent for my responses to be included as part of this study.
    ▢ Yes
    ▢ No

37. I would like to receive a summary of the findings.
    ▢ Yes
    ▢ No

Section 8 [All conditions]

Dear student,
Thank you for agreeing to participate in our study. In our survey, you rated the severity of different behaviours that constitute child-to-parent violence (CPV), and indicated how likely it is that you would report each behaviour to police. CPV is defined as a type of family violence episode where children are the aggressors and their parents are the victim(s); this definition includes the use of physical, emotional, and psychological violence by children. Each participant was randomly assigned to one of eight possible conditions; assignment to these conditions dictated which version of the survey you saw.

The conditions were:

- Male teenagers and their mothers
- Female teenagers and their mothers

- Male teenagers and their fathers
- Female teenagers and their fathers
- Male children and their mothers
- Female children and their mothers
- Male children and their fathers
- Female children and their fathers

All participants rated the severity of, and likelihood they would report, the same 25 behaviours. Only the gendered pronouns for parents and young people, and the young persons' developmental stage (i.e., child or teenager) changed depending on the assigned condition. Questions 1- 6 of the survey remained the same for all conditions.

Our purpose in constructing this survey is to use the data we collect to answer two questions:

1. To what extent is the developmental stage of young people using CPV associated with the perceived severity of different behaviours that constitute CPV, and how likely people are to report those behaviours to police?
2. To what extent is the gender of young people using CPV associated with the perceived severity of different behaviours that constitute CPV, and how likely people are to report those behaviours to police?

Family violence is an extremely harmful and prevalent social issue in Aotearoa New Zealand. Researchers and practitioners are working hard to develop interventions to prevent recurrent family violence. However, most family violence episodes are not reported to police, making it difficult to provide interventions to whānau who need them. We want to understand why people might not report family violence to police; one reason might be that people think behaviours are not serious enough to require police attention.

Some researchers have previously examined whether the perceived severity of family violence is related to whether people think police should be notified, but most research focusses on intimate partner violence. When it comes to other types of family violence, such as CPV, we know very little. We hope that by answering the research questions above we can shed light on how perceptions of severity influence whether people decide to report family violence in situations where young people use family violence towards their parents.
We understand that family violence is a challenging topic that can be distressing for many people. If you need support after completing this survey, we have listed some of the many services available to you below. If you or someone you know is in immediate danger, call 111.
Women's Refuge Free call: 0800 733 843
1737, Need to talk? Free call or text: 1737
HEY BRO Free call: 0800 439 276
Youthline Free call: 0800 376 633 Free text: 324
Lifeline Free call: 0800 543 354
Shine Free call: 0508 744 633
Student Health Services Call: 07 838 4037
Tuu Oho Mai Services Call: 07 834 3184

We thank you for taking part in this research.

Appendix C

CONFIDENTIAL - FOR PEER-REVIEW ONLY

Components of the perceived severity and likelihood of reporting CPV (#137931)

Created: 07/09/2023 02:51 PM (PT)

This is an anonymized copy (without author names) of the pre-registration. It was created by the author(s) to use during peer-review.
A non-anonymized version (containing author names) should be made available by the authors when the work it supports is made public.

1) Have any data been collected for this study already?
No, no data have been collected for this study yet.

2) What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?
To what extent are fear, harm, aggression, normalcy, and responsibility associated with the perceived severity of different behaviours that constitute CPV, and how likely people are to report those behaviours to police?

We expect that the extent of the child's history of aggressive behaviour towards their parent will have an effect on participant's ratings of severity for each type of violence presented in the four vignettes.

3) Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.
Participants will read 4 vignettes: 1 involving psychological harm, 1 involving intimidation and threats, 1 involving verbal abuse, and 1 involving physical harm. Then participants will rate the following on 5 point likert scales:

- How severe the child's behaviour was
- How fearful the parent was
- How hurt the parent was
- How harmful the child's behaviour was
- How aggressive the child's behaviour was
- How ordinary the child's behaviour was
- How justified the child's behaviour was
- How responsible the parent was for the child's behaviour
- Extent to which police should address the child's behaviour
- Extent to which family should address the child's behaviour

4) How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?
Participants will be assigned to 4 conditions which vary according to the history of the child using aggressive behaviour towards their parent. The conditions are:

- No history of use of violent behaviour
- History of occasional use of violent behaviour
- History of regular use of violent behaviour
- No indication of history of use of violent behaviour

5) Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.
We will use descriptive statistics to describe the sample. Then, to answer the research questions we will compare participants' responses across conditions with ANOVA and t-tests.

6) Describe exactly how outliers will be defined and handled, and your precise rule(s) for excluding observations.
Participants with incomplete responses will be excluded from the study.

7) How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.
The participants will be approximately 300-400 100-level students psychology students at the University of Waikato.

8) Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., secondary analyses, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)
We will conduct exploratory analyses comparing the responses by demographic characteristics, and by whether participants were parents, grew up with siblings, or had witnessed or experienced FV victimisation. We will also compare responses for different types of harm presented in each of the vignettes.

Appendix D

Section 1 [All conditions]

Thank you for your interest in taking part in our study. The project team, including Bridget O'Keeffe, Dr Apriel Jolliffe Simpson, and Professor Devon Polaschek, are interested in learning about people's perceptions of situations where young people use family violence towards their parents.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will answer questions about the severity and likelihood of reporting 4 scenarios that constitute child-to-parent violence. The survey will also include some questions about demographic information and previous experience with child-to-parent violence to help contextualise our findings. Completing the survey will take approximately 20-30 minutes.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. Participating in this study may not benefit you directly, but it will help us learn about factors that may influence the perceived severity of child-to-parent violence, and why people choose not to report family violence to police. If you participate in the study, you will receive 2 course credits towards a 100-level psychology paper. Because this survey concerns family violence, you may find answering some of the questions upsetting. We have made every effort to ensure that participants will not be harmed by taking part in this study; however, at any time during the survey, and for any reason, you may withdraw your participation.

The information you will share with us will be kept completely confidential. Anonymous data will be collected via the Qualtrics portal, and no identifying information will be connected to responses. The data we collect will be stored securely in a password protected file and only accessed by members of the research team. We will analyse the results in aggregate form, and any findings will be presented as summaries without identifying individual participants.

Human Research Ethics Committee Information

This research project has been approved by the University of Waikato Human Research Ethics Committee and any questions about the ethical conduct of this research may be sent to the Secretary of the Committee, email humanethics@waikato.ac.nz, postal address, University of Waikato, Te Whare Wananga o Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Dr Apriel Jolliffe Simpson (apriels@waikato.ac.nz) or Bridget O'Keeffe (bokeeffe@waikato.ac.nz).

- ☐ By checking this box I give my consent to participate in this study.

Section 2 [All conditions]

1. What is your age?
   - ☐ 17-20
   - ☐ 21-30
   - ☐ 31-40

- ☐ 41-50
- ☐ 51-60
- ☐ 60+

2. What is your gender?
   - ☐ Male
   - ☐ Female
   - ☐ Non-binary
   - ☐ Other (please specify):

3. What ethnic group(s) do you belong to? Select all that apply.
   - ☐ Māori
   - ☐ New Zealand European
   - ☐ Samoan
   - ☐ Cook Islands Māori
   - ☐ Tongan
   - ☐ Niuean
   - ☐ Chinese
   - ☐ Indian
   - ☐ Other (please specify):

4. When you were a child, who were your parent(s) or caregiver(s)? Select all that apply.
   - ☐ Mother
   - ☐ Father
   - ☐ Stepmother
   - ☐ Stepfather
   - ☐ Grandparent(s)
   - ☐ Adoptive parent(s)
   - ☐ Other

5. When you were a child, did you grow up with siblings?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

6. Are you a parent or caregiver?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

Section 3 [No indication of history condition]

Sometimes teenage boys can become aggressive during ordinary interactions with their mothers. Different families deal with conflict in many ways, and teenage boys may respond to their mothers with several different behaviours.

Next you will see four short descriptions of interactions between a teenage boy named Oscar and his mother Julie. After reading each description please answer the questions below based on the description you have just read.

Section 3 [No history of use of aggressive behaviour towards parent condition]

Sometimes teenage boys can become aggressive during ordinary interactions with their mothers. Different families deal with conflict in many ways, and teenage boys may respond to their mothers with several different behaviours.

Next you will see four short descriptions of interactions between a teenage boy named Oscar and his mother Julie. Keep in mind that Oscar has never used aggressive behaviour towards Julie in the past. After reading each description please answer the questions below based on the description you have just read.

Section 3 [History of occasional use of aggressive behaviour towards parent condition]

Sometimes teenage boys can become aggressive during ordinary interactions with their mothers. Different families deal with conflict in many ways, and teenage boys may respond to their mothers with several different behaviours.

Next you will see four short descriptions of interactions between a teenage boy named Oscar and his mother Julie. Keep in mind that Oscar has occasionally used aggressive behaviour towards Julie in the past. After reading each description please answer the questions below based on the description you have just read.

Section 3 [History of regular use of aggressive behaviour towards parent condition]

Sometimes teenage boys can become aggressive during ordinary interactions with their mothers. Different families deal with conflict in many ways, and teenage boys may respond to their mothers with several different behaviours.

Next you will see four short descriptions of interactions between a teenage boy named Oscar and his mother Julie. Keep in mind that Oscar has regularly used aggressive behaviour towards Julie in the past. After reading each description please answer the questions below based on the description you have just read.

Section 4 [All conditions]

Julie was in the kitchen washing dishes when Oscar returned home from school. Oscar asked Julie if he can visit a friend's house. Julie politely told Oscar that he needed to stay home that afternoon because family were visiting. Oscar began shouting at Julie, before demanding she stop what she was doing and paying attention to her, then taking Julie's wallet and leaving the house without her permission.

7. How severe was Oscar's behaviour?
    - ☐ 1 – Not at all severe
    - ☐ 2
    - ☐ 3
    - ☐ 4
    - ☐ 5 – Very severe

8. How fearful was Julie?
    - ☐ 1 – Not at all fearful
    - ☐ 2
    - ☐ 3
    - ☐ 4
    - ☐ 5 – Very fearful

9. How hurt was Julie?
    - ☐ 1 – Not at all hurt
    - ☐ 2
    - ☐ 3
    - ☐ 4
    - ☐ 5 – Very hurt

10. How harmful was Oscar's behaviour?
    - ☐ 1 – Not at all harmful
    - ☐ 2
    - ☐ 3
    - ☐ 4
    - ☐ 5 – Very harmful

11. How aggressive was Oscar's behaviour?
    - ☐ 1 – Not at all aggressive
    - ☐ 2
    - ☐ 3
    - ☐ 4
    - ☐ 5 – Very aggressive

12. How ordinary was Oscar's behaviour?
    - ☐ 1 – Not at all ordinary
    - ☐ 2
    - ☐ 3
    - ☐ 4
    - ☐ 5 – Very ordinary

13. How justified was Oscar's behaviour?
    - ☐ 1 – Not at all justified
    - ☐ 2
    - ☐ 3
    - ☐ 4
    - ☐ 5 – Very justified

14. How responsible was Julie for Oscar's behaviour?
    - ☐ 1 – Not at all responsible
    - ☐ 2
    - ☐ 3

- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5 – Very responsible

15. Should Oscar's family address Oscar's behaviour?
    - ☐ 1 – Definitely not
    - ☐ 2
    - ☐ 3
    - ☐ 4
    - ☐ 5 – Definitely

16. Should the police address Oscar's behaviour?
    - ☐ 1 – Definitely not
    - ☐ 2
    - ☐ 3
    - ☐ 4
    - ☐ 5 – Definitely

Section 5 [All conditions]

Julie was in the kitchen washing dishes when Oscar returned home from school. Oscar asked Julie if he can visit a friend's house. Julie politely told Oscar that he needed to stay home that afternoon because family were visiting. Oscar began shouting at Julie, before swearing at her, telling her she is a terrible mum, and saying that he wishes she was dead.

[Repeat Questions 7 -16]

Section 6 [All conditions]

Julie was in the kitchen washing dishes when Oscar returned home from school. Oscar asked Julie if he can visit a friend's house. Julie politely told Oscar that he needed to stay home that afternoon because family were visiting. Oscar began shouting at Julie, before moving towards his mother and threatening to hit her.

[Repeat Questions 7 -16]

Section 7 [All conditions]

Julie was in the kitchen washing dishes when Oscar returned home from school. Oscar asked Julie if he can visit a friend's house. Julie politely told Oscar that he needed to stay home that afternoon because family were visiting. Oscar began shouting at Julie, before demanding she stop what she was doing and paying attention to her, then taking Julie's wallet and leaving the house without her permission.

[Repeat Questions 7 -16]

Section 8 [All conditions]

17. When you were a child, did you ever use any of the behaviours mentioned in this questionnaire towards your parent or caregiver?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

[If participant checked yes to question 5 ‘When you were a child, did you grow up with siblings?]

18. When you were a child, did you ever witness a sibling use any of the behaviours mentioned in this questionnaire towards your parent or caregiver?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

[If participant checked yes to question 6 ‘Are you a parent or caregiver?’]

19. Has your child or children used any of the behaviours mentioned in this questionnaire towards you?
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

Section 9 [All conditions]

20. I consent for my responses to be included as part of this study.
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

21. I would like to receive a summary of the findings.
    - ☐ Yes
    - ☐ No

Section 10 [All conditions]

Dear student,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our study. In our survey, you were presented with four descriptions of interactions between a teenage boy Oscar and his mother Julie that constitute child-to-parent violence, and answered a number of questions about the severity of each description. CPV is defined as a type of family violence episode where children are the aggressors and their parents are the victim(s); this definition includes the use of physical, emotional, and psychological violence by children. Each participant was randomly assigned to one of four possible conditions; assignment to these conditions dictated which version of the survey you saw.

The conditions were:

- History of regular use of aggressive behaviour towards parent
- History of occasional use of aggressive behaviour towards parent
- No history of use of aggressive behaviour towards parent
- No indication of history

All participants saw the same four descriptions of interactions between Oscar and Julie, and answered the same questions about each description. Only the context about the history of Oscar’s use of aggressive behaviour towards Julie changed depending on the assigned condition. Questions 1- 6 of the survey remained the same for all conditions.

Our purpose in constructing this survey is to use the data we collect to answer 2 questions:

1. What factors make up the perceived severity of, and the likelihood people would report to police, behaviours that constitute child-to-parent violence?

2. To what extent does context about the history of child-to-parent violence effect the perceived severity of, and likelihood people would report to police, behaviours that constitute child-to-parent violence?

Family violence is an extremely harmful and prevalent social issue in Aotearoa New Zealand. Researchers and practitioners are working hard to develop interventions to prevent recurrent family violence. However, most family violence episodes are not reported to police, making it difficult to provide interventions to whānau who need them. We want to understand why people might not report family violence to police; one reason might be that people think behaviours are not serious enough to require police attention.

Some researchers have previously examined whether the perceived severity of family violence is related to whether people think police should be notified, but most research focusses on intimate partner violence. When it comes to other types of family violence, such as CPV, we know very little. We hope that by answering the research questions above we can shed light on how perceptions of severity influence whether people decide to report family violence in situations where young people use family violence towards their parents.

We understand that family violence is a challenging topic that can be distressing for many people. If you need support after completing this survey, we have listed some of the many services available to you below. If you or someone you know is in immediate danger, call 111.

Women's Refuge Free call: 0800 733 843
1737, Need to talk? Free call or text: 1737
HEY BRO Free call: 0800 439 276
Youthline Free call: 0800 376 633 Free text: 324
Lifeline Free call: 0800 543 354
Shine Free call: 0508 744 633
Student Health Services Call: 07 838 4037
Tuu Oho Mai Services Call: 07 834 3184

We thank you for taking part in this research.

Appendix E

Table S1

Correlations Between Participants' Ratings of Appraisals that May Contribute to Perceptions of Severity for Verbal Abuse Vignettes

Item	Severity	Fear	Hurt	Harm	Aggressive	Ordinary	Justified	Responsible
Severity	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fear	0.51	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hurt	0.38	0.38	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
Harm	0.61	0.42	0.45	1.00	-	-	-	-
Aggressive	0.67	0.46	0.31	0.51	1.00	-	-	-
Ordinary	0.32	0.24	0.12	0.32	0.29	1.00	-	-
Justified	0.06	-0.04	0.00	0.14	0.04	0.23	1.00	-
Responsible	-0.02	-0.09	-0.08	0.01	0.01	0.09	0.32	1.00

Note. Pearson correlation coefficient was used

Table S2

Correlations Between Participants' Ratings of Appraisals that May Contribute to Perceptions of Severity for Physical Harm Vignettes

Item	Severity	Fear	Hurt	Harm	Aggressive	Ordinary	Justified	Responsible
Severity	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fear	0.38	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hurt	0.48	0.50	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
Harm	0.62	0.41	0.58	1.00	-	-	-	-
Aggressive	0.55	0.34	0.42	0.59	1.00	-	-	-
Ordinary	0.28	0.14	0.27	0.26	0.21	1.00	-	-
Justified	0.20	0.06	0.12	0.13	0.19	0.37	1.00	-
Responsible	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.13	0.30	1.00

Note. Pearson correlation coefficient was used

Table S3

Correlations Between Participants' Ratings of Appraisals that May Contribute to Perceptions of Severity for Psychological Harm Vignettes

Item	Severity	Fear	Hurt	Harm	Aggressive	Ordinary	Justified	Responsible
Severity	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fear	0.43	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hurt	0.44	0.47	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
Harm	0.61	0.42	0.50	1.00	-	-	-	-
Aggressive	0.61	0.43	0.40	0.64	1.00	-	-	-
Ordinary	0.25	0.05	0.09	0.27	0.25	1.00	-	-
Justified	0.08	0.00	0.02	0.12	0.12	0.39	1.00	-
Responsible	-0.07	-0.08	-0.20	-0.10	-0.13	0.14	0.29	1.00

Note. Pearson correlation coefficient was used

Table S4

Correlations Between Participants' Ratings of Appraisals that May Contribute to Perceptions of Severity for Threats and Intimidation Vignettes

Item	Severity	Fear	Hurt	Harm	Aggressive	Ordinary	Justified	Responsible
Severity	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fear	0.48	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hurt	0.40	0.37	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
Harm	0.66	0.44	0.46	1.00	-	-	-	-
Aggressive	0.65	0.39	0.37	0.55	1.00	-	-	-
Ordinary	0.21	0.12	0.11	0.21	0.27	1.00	-	-
Justified	0.13	0.04	0.00	0.15	0.12	0.31	1.00	-
Responsible	0.01	0.02	-0.13	-0.03	0.01	0.22	0.39	1.00

Note. Pearson correlation coefficient was used

Appendix F

Figure S1

Scree Plot of Eigenvalues for Factor Analyses of Appraisals that May Contribute to Severity