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Executive Summary: Understanding the Impact of Trauma and Urban Poverty on Family Systems: Risks, Resilience, and Interventions

Purpose: This white paper reviews the clinical and research literatures on the impact of trauma in the context of urban poverty on the family system including the individual child or adult, adult intimate partnership, parent-child, siblings and intergenerational relationships, as well as the family as a whole. The purpose is to widen the trauma-informed care lens by focusing on familial responses to trauma and by building the foundational knowledge needed to design family centered, trauma-specific interventions that strengthen the family’s ability to adapt, cope and heal.

Findings: Families living in urban poverty often encounter multiple traumas over many years. Further, they are less likely than families living in more affluent communities to have access to the resources that may facilitate the successful negotiation of their traumatic experiences. Thus, many families have difficulty adapting.

Repeated exposures can lead to severe and chronic reactions in multiple family members with effects that ripple throughout the family system and, ultimately, society. Research demonstrates that all levels of the family system are impacted:

- **Individual** distress can range from transient symptoms to Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) to more complex trauma-related disorders, with the potential to disrupt functioning across multiple domains.
- Though some research indicates that supportive **adult intimate relationships** can be a source of strength in coping with a traumatic experience or dealing with the stress of poverty, the majority focuses on difficulties faced by couples who have experienced trauma, such as problems with communication, difficulty expressing emotion, struggles with sexual intimacy, and high rates of hostility, aggression and interpersonal violence.
- Within the **parent-child relationship**, compromised attachment and mistrust may stem from parental withdrawal/worry and re-enactment of abandonment/betrayal themes.
- Though trauma may not affect the **parenting** practices of all parents, the experiences of chronic trauma and the stress associated with urban poverty have been associated with decreased parental effectiveness, less warmth, limited understanding of child development and needs, increased use of corporal punishment and harsh discipline, high incidents of neglect, and an overall strategy of reactive parenting.
- **Sibling relationships** may become negative and conflictual depending on the quality of individual parent-child relationships, differential treatment of siblings by parents, parental management of sibling conflict, individual children’s behavior and emotional regulation and coping skills, and family norms regarding aggression and fairness.
- Research on **intergenerational** trauma and urban poverty has demonstrated that adults with histories of childhood abuse and exposure to family violence have problems with emotional regulation, aggression, social competence, and interpersonal relationships, leading to functional impairments in parenting which transmit to the next generation.
• The family as a whole is also impacted by chronic conditions of high stress and exposure to multiple traumas and families often experience chaotic, disorganized lifestyles, inconsistent and/or conflicted relationships, and crisis-oriented coping.

Risk factors contributing to negative outcomes, such as developing trauma-related symptoms or becoming a trauma-organized family system, generally include prior individual or family psychiatric history, history of other previous traumas or adverse childhood experiences, pile up of life stressors, severity/chronicity of traumatic experiences, conflictual or violent family interactions, and lack of social support.

At each subsystem level and at the family system level, the ability to cope adaptively with extremely difficult circumstances is also documented although less emphasized. Some adults and adolescents grow stronger, develop a new appreciation for relationships, and their “why me” questions produce meaningful answers about their life purpose. Adult intimate partners, siblings, and families as a whole often join together around traumatic events, supporting one another and collaborating to deal with adversity and survive or thrive. The literature identifies the following factors as potentially protective including emotional and behavioral regulation, problem-solving skills, resource seeking, sense of efficacy, and spirituality.

Assessment: There are no instruments designed to assess the influence of trauma and urban poverty on families. For this reason, an assessment of family subsystems is recommended using multiple tools that have adequate reliability and validity for measuring specific subsystem impacts.

Interventions: Trauma-specific Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) for individual family members and for intimate partners has demonstrated efficacy for reducing symptoms of PTSD and depression. In addition, trauma-specific and trauma-adapted treatments targeting parenting practices and parent-child relations have proven efficacy at improving parent-child interactions, communication, trust, and decreasing harshness. There are few well-developed, standardized and empirically supported family therapies for treating family systems impacted by trauma.

Conclusions: Families exposed to urban poverty face a disproportionate risk of exposure to trauma and of becoming trauma-organized systems. Factors associated with urban poverty such as low neighborhood safety, daily hassles, and racial discrimination have been shown to increase the risk that trauma will negatively impact family functioning. The erosion in family functioning jeopardizes the ability of families to make effective use of structured treatment approaches and limits the success of treatments that require family support. Family treatments that are sensitive to the traumatic context of urban poverty, that include engagement strategies that incorporate alliances with primary and extended family systems, that build family coping skills, and that acknowledge cultural variations in family roles and functions are needed to adequately address the needs of this population. Additional treatment development research is needed to advance the child trauma field in its understanding and delivery of trauma-informed services to these families.
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Chapter 1

Introduction to Understanding the Impact of Trauma and Urban Poverty on Family Systems

It has long been understood that a family and its individual members, especially its children, are interdependent (Minuchin, 1985). Each member and family subsystem perform vital roles and functions within the context of multifaceted family relationships. Families can be negatively affected by chronic exposure to trauma, including the trauma and stressful conditions associated with living in urban poverty. For this reason, it is important to understand how trauma and urban poverty affect these familial relationships and functions in order to address trauma's full effect on children and their families. This White Paper presents the current status of knowledge in the field.

Optimal family functioning can be negatively impacted when families experience chronic exposure to trauma(s) and environmental stressors associated with urban poverty (Kaysen, Resick, & Wise, 2003). Urban poverty increases the number of trauma exposures, as well as distress associated with the high burden and hassles of daily living. When coping resources are depleted family relations can suffer and vital functions, such as protection from harm, provision of basic needs, and capacity to adapt and develop, are threatened, often resulting in perpetual cycles of crises (Brody & Flor, 1997; Clark, et al., 2000; Hill, 1958) Although it is widely accepted that parental response and family functioning are powerful mediators between trauma and its impact on children, including treatment outcomes (Repetti, et al., 2002; Cohen & Mannarino, 1996; Cohen, & Mannarino, 2000; Deblinger &. Heflin, 1996; Pfefferbaum, 1997; Whittlesey, et al., 1999; Banyard, et al., 2001; Laor, et al., 2001) more research is needed to understand how all levels of the family system promote resiliency and adaptation or present risks to positive outcomes.

This paper updates and expands on the findings reported by Kiser & Black (2005) in “Family processes in the midst of urban poverty: What does the trauma literature tell us?” By reviewing reports published between 2000 to 2008, we now examine the impact of chronic trauma in the context of urban poverty on all levels of the family system: individual children and adults, the family as a whole, intergenerational transmission of trauma, parent-child, adult intimate partner, and sibling relationships. This paper presents key research findings, risk and protective factors associated with each family subsystem, and available clinical tools and interventions. To further understand the mechanisms that promote or interfere with healthy parent-child relationships, a chapter on trauma’s effects on parenting practices is included. By synthesizing this information, we aim to widen the trauma-focused care lens to the entire family and to the contextual risks of urban poverty and to build foundational knowledge needed to design family-informed trauma interventions that strengthen the family’s innate ability to adapt, cope and heal in the aftermath of trauma.

Scope of Need: Research indicates that families living in urban poverty encounter multifaceted risks associated with the hardship of depleted resources, burdens of high stress and incivilities, and exposure to multiple traumas (Ackerman, et al., 1999; Repetti, Taylor, & Seeman, 2002; Kiser & Black, 2005). Because ethnic groups are overrepresented, there can be additional suffering secondary to racist attitudes and negative social perceptions of people living in poverty. The following statistics indicate the prevalence of trauma and poverty in American cities (Emery and Laumann-Billings 1998; Groves, 2002; Sherman & Arloc, 2006; Edelson, 1999; NCCP, 2007; NCCP, 2008):
- 49% of American children in urban areas (9.7 million) live in low-income families.
- Families of color are disproportionally represented in impoverished urban neighborhoods.
- Black and Latino families with children are more than twice as likely as white families with children to experience economic hardships.
- Families constitute two-fifths of the U.S. homeless population, which increases the risk of trauma exposure and intense anxiety and uncertainty.
- 83% of inner city youth report experiencing one or more traumatic events.
- 1 out of 10 children under the age of six living in a major American city report witnessing a shooting or stabbing.
- 59% - 91% of children and youth in the community mental health system report trauma exposure.
- 60% - 90% of youth in juvenile justice have experienced traumas.
- Urban males experience higher levels of exposure to trauma, especially violence related incidents, while females are four times more likely to develop Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) following exposure to traumatic events.

Trauma and contextual stress can negatively impact children and adults’ functioning, often undermines parenting efforts, family relationships, and family functioning, and can increase risk of family violence (Jaffe and Wolfe 1986; McCubbin & McCubbin, 1993; Appleyard & Osofsky, 2003; Scheeringa & Zeanah, 2001; Green, et al., 1991). Although the majority of family violence occurs between intimate partners and parent-children, multiple family subsystems can be affected or involved. Statistics reveal the prevalence of family violence in the United States (Emery and Laumann-Billings 1998; U.S. Department of Justice 2005; Kaufman and Zigler 1987):

- 27% of all violent crimes occur among family members.
- Between 3.3 and 10 million children witness domestic violence yearly.
- Almost 20% of adult women have been physically abused by a male partner.
- 22% of women and 7.5% of men reported that they were raped and/or physically assaulted by an intimate partner (e.g., spouse, partner, or date) at some time in their lifetime.
- Over 1,500 women were murdered in 1995 by their husband or boyfriend. More than 60% of femicides in 2004 were committed by a spouse or intimate partner.
- 2.5 million reports of child abuse are made each year.
- In the United States, almost 900,000 cases of neglect and abuse are substantiated yearly, with more than 300,000 youth placed in out-of-home care.
- Each year, 20–35% of abused children suffer a serious injury and between 1,200 and 1,500 die as a result of abuse.
- One-third of individuals who were abused as children will become perpetrators of abuse in adulthood.
- African American (82%) and American Indian/Alaskan Native (42%) children are disproportionally represented in the child welfare system.

Families raising children in low-income, urban neighborhoods are exposed to multiple on-going traumas, from potential to severe threats, all of which increase the likelihood of negative outcomes (Evans & English, 2002; Esposito, 1999). In fact, the consequences of community and family violence are well documented, and while direct victims are at greatest risk of harm, effects are systemic (Emery and Laumann-Billings 1998, p. 128). Understanding the effects of trauma and poverty on different family members and among familial relationships, as well as understanding the full range of family members’ responses to trauma and poverty, is critical to improving outcomes.
**Theories and Proposed Model:** Multiple theories help to explain how contextual risk and traumatic experiences impact the individuals, dyads and groups within families. The authors identify nine common theories to explain the complex mechanisms and mediators that impede or support family processes in the face of trauma and urban poverty: 1) family systems theory, 2) family resiliency theory, 3) McMaster model of family functioning, 4) ecodevelopmental theory, 5) attachment theory, 6) trauma theory, 7) social learning theory, 8) family stress theory, and 9) conservation of resources theory.

Building on general systems theory, family systems and family resiliency theories seek to explain the interconnectedness of individual family members and family subsystems to better understand how their shared history, familial bonds and collaborative coping strategies support the family’s functioning, as well as how family-level risk and protective factors impede or support their ability to perform essential family functions, such as nurturance, protection, stability and cohesion (Brodsky, 1999; Patterson, 1991).

Another key model influencing development of family intervention is the McMaster model of family functioning (MMFF). It assumes that the primary function of the family unit is to support each member’s development while maintaining an optimal level of functioning as demonstrated by effective problem solving, communication, role performance, affective responsiveness, affective involvement, and behavior control (Bishop, et al., 1980).

Ecodevelopmental and attachment theories explain the complex relationships and multidirectional interactions that influence child development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), and how the secure-base and emotional closeness provided by parents to their child provides a framework for the child to regulate emotions and behaviors and mediates the effects of trauma (Cicchetti et al., 2006; Toth et al, 2002).

Trauma and social learning theories are fundamental to the development of current trauma treatments. Trauma theory explains the neurobiological and psychological consequences of overwhelming and threatening life experiences, while social learning theory helps to explain how learning to recognize, correct and cope with trauma-related thoughts and to regulate emotional and behavioral responses are critical to effectiveness of trauma recovery models (Bandura 1989, Pynoos, et al., 1999; Cahill & Foa, 2007; Monson & Friedman, 2006).

Finally, several models and theories advance understanding of the impact of poverty on family functioning. One, the family stress model of economic hardship, examines how poverty affects families’ financial resources and influences emotions, behaviors, or relationships of family members (Conger et al, 2002; McCubbin & McCubbin, 1993; McCubbin, 1995). The conservation of resources (COR) theory highlights how families conserve resources to strengthen coping and prevent loss of future resources (Johnson, et al., 2007; Hobfoll, et al., 1992).

Together, these theories help explain the complex, multidirectional relationships and transactions in family systems and also set the stage for understanding the importance of nonlinear, ecological, systematic interventions.

**Proposed Model: The Family-Informed Trauma Treatment Model**

Aspects of these nine theories have been used to develop the family-informed trauma treatment (FITT) model, which recognizes that families living in under-resourced and dangerous communities are exposed to multiple traumas, including current dangers and traumatic reminders, while trying to manage daily responsibilities. Families in these communities report frequent exposure to illegal drug activities and community violence, safety concerns such as potential for house fires and rat
infestations, difficulty finding a safe way to get children to and from school, and multiple daily hassles due to inadequate access to resources and opportunities. (Figure 1)

**Figure 1:** The traumatic context of urban poverty includes increased risks of discrete traumas, such as violence and crime, as well as difficulties that exacerbate trauma’s effects.

The traumatic context of urban poverty has pervasive effects that slowly erode parent and family function and affect outcomes. Contextual risks of urban poverty (meager resources, crowded conditions, trauma, etc.) affect everyone exposed, but effects on children are exaggerated by reduced parental well-being and family functioning (Kiser, 2006). This is critical to understanding and mediating the effects of trauma and poverty because parental and family functioning affect risk for development of emotional and/or behavior problems in children.

The FITT Model provides an ecological, family systems approach to reduce symptoms of trauma-related distress and to promote safety and recovery for all family members. In particular, it considers the full spectrum of effects of trauma and poverty on individuals, familial relationships, and family functioning, which reveals a complex interplay of both direct and downstream effects of trauma on the family. (Figure 2)

**Figure 2:** Individuals and familial relationships are affected by trauma and poverty and, in turn, influence effects of trauma and poverty, creating a complex interplay of cause and effect. Solid lines
represent effects of exposure to chronic trauma on individual family members. Dotted lines represent effects of chronic trauma and individual responses to trauma on dyadic family subsystems. Dashed lines represent effects of responses to and effects of chronic trauma on family processes. The bold, dashed line indicates a direct causal relationship of trauma, family functioning and outcomes. (Adapted from Kiser & Black, 2005)

In this paper, we highlight the salient risk and protective factors for individuals and familial relationships that impact coping resources and adaptation to living and thriving in harsh, traumatic conditions. Risk factors are conditions that predispose individuals to trauma-related disorders while protective and resilience factors increase chances of positive adaptation. Some aspects of the family system, such as child, adult and parent-child relations and parenting practices, have been widely studied and have well established clinical tools and interventions available, while research and interventions in other areas, particularly intergenerational relationships, sibling relationships, and family as a whole, are limited. We have applied available findings from studies of trauma and family systems to the growing understanding of how the combination of contextual risks and traumas impact families’ life cycles and recovery and report on assessment tools normed for and interventions conducted with African-American families living in urban settings, when available. However, other relevant tools and treatments are also presented for this comprehensive examination of an emerging area of research.

Favorable outcomes for families affected by trauma and urban poverty are highly dependent upon the availability of and access to assessment and treatment practices that are trauma-specific, family-centered, and target all levels of the system impacted by trauma. Our review of key clinical and research findings points to the need for further research on the impact of trauma and urban poverty on families and for the development of interventions that address family systems’ issues and integrate them into a trauma-informed, family-centered system of care.
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Chapter 2

Impact of Trauma and Urban Poverty on Children and Adolescents

Mounting evidence suggests that children and adolescents growing up in urban poverty are more likely than those growing up in other contexts to experience multiple traumas and significant adverse life events, and to thus develop complex symptoms of traumatic distress at disproportionate rates. Repeated exposure creates a complicated set of reactions that occur before, during, and after traumatic events and carry long-term developmental risks. Although exposure to and effects of chronic trauma in children from low-income, urban environments have been labeled a public health concern, there is still limited treatment effectiveness or practice research available to guide the delivery of services to this highly impacted, underserved population.

Theory

Efforts to explain the severity and chronicity of reactions to repeated traumas traditionally focus on the cumulative effects of multiple traumatic episodes. Yet circumstances that create persistent feelings of not being safe and of being unable to control situations cause children to anticipate further events even as they deal with the effects of one trauma (Pynoos, Steinberg, & Goenjian, 1996; Kiser et al., 1993; Overstreet & Braun, 2000; Schwab-Stone et al., 1999). Thus, according to this view, it is the combination of experience and anticipation of traumatic events that leads to the long-term functional changes in multiple systems that is characteristic of complex posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). In fact, anticipatory anxiety results in a spectrum of symptoms similar to PTSD, including fears, preoccupations, nightmares, vigilance, avoidance, and enactments, and it may contribute to the development of some symptoms, coping mechanisms, and general expectancies commonly associated with complex PTSD (Kiser et al., 1993; McCarroll, Ursano, Fullerton, Liu, & Lundy, 1995).

Key Research Findings

Studies of children living in poor inner-city neighborhoods document extremely high rates of exposure to trauma (70-100%) (Dempsey, Overstreet, & Moely, 2000; Fitzpatrick & Boldizar, 1993; Macy, Barry, & Noam, 2003). In addition to normal childhood stresses, children in these circumstances are often exposed to violent crime in their neighborhood or school; gang and drug activity; house fires; victimization, incarceration, or death of a family member; family violence; and maltreatment (Black & Krishnakumar, 1998; Buckner, Bassuk, Weinreb, & Brooks, 1999; Coulton, Korbin, & Su, 1999; Dempsey, 2002; Dubow, Edwards, & Ippolito, 1997). This rate of exposure raises public health concerns (Cooley-Quille, Turner, & Beidel, 1995; Margolin & Gordis, 2000).

Because feeling safe and secure is a prerequisite for healthy emotional development and general welfare (Hirsch et al., 2000; Stevenson, 1998), many children growing up in urban poverty exhibit distress. Their reactions to trauma include increased monitoring of their environment for dangers, anxiety when separated from trusted adults, irritability and aggression, or increased need for affection, support, and reassurance. In the short term, such reactions may signal appropriate upset and serve as strategies for successful adaptation. However, persistence of the reactions or interference with functioning may be labeled posttraumatic stress symptoms (PTSS), which progress
to PTSD in 24-34% of children exposed to urban community violence (Wethington et al., 2008). Co-
morbidity with other mental health problems also is likely.

Unfortunately, current diagnostic criteria for PTSD may be insufficient to describe the disorders resulting from exposure to multiple traumas. Children growing up in urban poverty often display symptoms of complex PTSD (Briere, 2002; Cummings & Davies, 2002; Herman, 1992; Terr, 1985 & 1991), also referred to as Type II trauma disorder (Terr, 1983 & 1985) or Developmental Trauma Disorder (van der Kolk, 2005). Complex trauma is a varied and multifaceted phenomenon, frequently embedded in a matrix of other psychosocial problems (e.g., neglect, marital discord, and domestic violence) that carry ongoing threat. The symptom presentation of children exposed to prolonged, repeated trauma is best described by affective and physiological dysregulations; attachment disorders and disturbed relatedness; changes in consciousness and self-perception; cognitive distortions regarding trauma and perpetrator; and changes in systems of personal meaning (Cook, Blaustein, Spinazzola, & van der Kolk, 2003).

Developmental processes are also at risk. In relation to the symptoms affecting attention, concentration, and memory, these children often experience disruptions in academic learning and skill development. Their hypervigilance, heightened sense of alert, and posttraumatic play may set them apart from peers, restrict the normalcy of their social interactions, and place them at risk for delays in social competence. Childhood victims of chronic trauma risk development of a lack of basic trust in the ability of others to protect them, a view of the world as threatening, a lack of self-confidence, and a dysregulated nervous system (Macy, Barry, & Noam, 2003; Perry & Pollard, 1998; Pfefferbaum, 1997; Pynoos et al., 1996; Warren, Emde, & Sroufe, 2000). Finally, lowered future expectations are often formed as children with chronic trauma histories experience ongoing functional impairments, including substance abuse, delinquency, suicidality, acts of self-destruction, chronic anger, unstable relationships, and dissociation (Davies & Flannery, 1998; Pynoos, Steinberg, & Piacentini, 1999).

There is a small but growing literature on the potential for positive outcomes following exposure to trauma. Some adolescents demonstrate both outward and intrapersonal growth through their struggle to deal with the bad things that happen to them (Levine, Laufer, Hamama-Raz, Stein, & Solomon, 2008).

### Risk and Protective Factors

Epidemiological and social science research is beginning to document the extent and cost of youth traumatization. Both risk and protective factors for development of trauma-related disorders exist at multiple levels—individuals, families, schools, neighborhoods, and society. Risk factors are the conditions in these settings that predispose children and adolescents to trauma-related disorders. Protective and resilience factors increase chances of positive adaptation. (Table 2.1)

Given that characteristics of the traumatic event, such as frequency and duration, greatly influence a victim’s reaction, the epidemiology of trauma experienced by children growing up in poor urban settings is not directly comparable to trauma induced by single events or child sexual abuse (Kiser, Millsap, & Heston, 1992; Graham-Bermann & Levendosky, 1998; Pynoos et al., 1996). The context of urban poverty along with multiple individual, family, school, and community risk factors not only increases the likelihood of trauma exposure, but also heightens vulnerability to traumatic distress after exposure (Whittlesey et al., 1999; Levendosky & Graham-Bermann, 1998; Erel & Burman, 1995). For children and adolescents, individual vulnerability (female gender, genetic predisposition), characteristics of the trauma (loss, proximity, etc.), and parental distress combine to increase the risk of maladaptation.
Although exposure to the social ecology of urban poverty carries significant risk, most children continue to function well and do not develop PTSD (Wethington et al., 2008). Through supportive relationships with family and friends, these children learn and use coping and problem-solving skills that encourage positive adaptation.

**Table 2.1: Risk and Protective Factors for Children and Adolescents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Protective Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric history</td>
<td>Socioeconomic advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other previous trauma</td>
<td>Easygoing temperament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other adverse childhood experience</td>
<td>High intellectual ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma severity</td>
<td>Problem-solving skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peritraumatic psychological processes (high emotion and dissociative)</td>
<td>Coping skills (self-regulation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time since trauma</td>
<td>Caring and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and genetic predisposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ degree of distress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor parent-child and family attachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Instruments**

There is no “gold standard” for assessing childhood complex traumatic stress disorders; instruments are slowly being evaluated psychometrically and specific measures are being developed to address effects of multiple exposures. Some best-practice guidelines include the need to gather information from multiple sources, especially from both child and caregiver. It is also important to measure symptoms in all three clusters (reexperiencing, avoidance, and hyperarousal) plus indicators of complex trauma such as futurelessness, shame, guilt, and changes in self-esteem and systems of meaning. See Appendix A for a list of frequently used measures for assessing traumatic exposure and responses in children and adolescents.

**Interventions**

Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), both individual and group models, is the single intervention model with empirical support in children and adolescents. Although both individual and group CBT therapies have demonstrated efficacy, additional study of their effectiveness with minority populations living in urban poverty is needed (Wethington et al., 2008). There is inadequate evidence of effectiveness for other psychosocial treatments and for psychopharmacology.

Empirical evidence and clinical support are lacking for current models of treatment for children who have experienced chronic trauma. There is general consensus that, in addition to treating the symptoms of PTSD, treatment of disorders related to chronic trauma exposure must also address the
following: improving the child’s sense of safety; using problem-solving techniques for minimizing 
additional stresses; diminishing dysregulations; and promoting resilience by clearing up maladaptive 
beliefs, rebuilding a sense of mastery, restoring trust in self and others, renewing a sense of positive 
meaning, and making connections to appropriate supports (Banyard, Rozelle, & Englund, 2001; 
Cohen, Berliner, & Mannarino, 2000; Davies & Flannery, 1998; Herman, 1992; Miller, 1999; 
Temple, 1997).

Numerous detailed descriptions of CBT approaches with traumatized children exist (Parson, 1997; 
Cohen, Mannarino, Berliner, & Deblinger, 2000). One CBT model, Trauma Focused-Cognitive 
Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT), has been studied in numerous randomized, controlled clinical trials, 
and multiple published reports have supported its effectiveness (Cohen, Deblinger, Mannarino, & 
Steer, 2004; Cohen & Mannarino, 1996a; Cohen & Mannarino, 1996b; Cohen & Mannarino, 1997; 
Cohen, Mannarino, & Knudsen, 2005; Deblinger, Steer, & Lippman, 1999). In general, the treatment 
manualization, control design, training of clinicians, fidelity checks, and follow-up in these studies 
were exemplary.

These trials’ samples included children between the ages of 8-17 years (one study focused on 3-7- 
year-olds). All of the children experienced sexual abuse; one sample included 229 multiply 
traumatized children with sexual abuse-related PTSD symptoms. The racial composition of the 
samples was mixed but predominantly Caucasian. Non-offending parents/primary caretakers 
participated in all of the trials.

These trials compared TF-CBT for 12 weeks with nondirective supportive therapy (NST), consisting of 
play therapy for children and supportive therapy for parents; child-centered supportive therapy (CCT); 
and community treatment as usual (TAU). One of these trials compared multiple formats of TF-CBT 
including treatment with child only, mother only, and both child and mother. Results indicated that 
TF-CBT was significantly better than NST, CCT, and TAU for improving children’s PTSD, internalizing, 
externalizing, and sexual problems. Differences were sustained for up to 24 months. Furthermore, 
TF-CBT for child and parent was superior to TF-CBT for either parent or child alone.

Overall, the evidence suggests that TF-CBT is more effective than no treatment or treatment that is 
not designed to address trauma. This research also generally affirms the effectiveness of TF-CBT 
that includes orientation and psychoeducation, coping skill development, direct exploration of the 
traumatic experience coupled with exposure/contingency reinforcement programs, evaluation and 
reframing of cognitions regarding the event, and parent/caregiver support (Cohen, 1998; Cohen, 
Mannarino, Berliner, & Deblinger, 2000; Perrin, Smith, & Yule, 2000). Given the positive findings 
across multiple well designed trials conducted by several research groups, TF-CBT has been labeled 
an evidence-based practice (Chadwick Center for Children and Families, 2004; Substance Abuse & 
Mental Health Services Administration, 2005; Bisson, 2005; Saunders, Berliner, & Hanson, 2004).

Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools (CBITS) has been disseminated nationwide 
(Ngo et al., 2008), and in culturally diverse settings (Morsette et al., 2009). Designed to be 
implemented in school settings, CBITS is a group intervention with the potential for increasing 
access to needed services in the actual communities where children are exposed to trauma and 
violence. CBITS is a SAMHSA model program and listed as a proven practice on the Promising 
Practices Network.

Structured Psychotherapy or Adolescents Responding to Chronic Stress (SPARCS), another group 
therapy modality, was designed to treat chronically traumatized children/adolescents who continue 
to live in stressful situations.
Table 2.2: Interventions: Child and Adolescent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Name</th>
<th>Developer(s)</th>
<th>Essential Elements</th>
<th>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT)</td>
<td>Cohen, Mannarino, Berliner, &amp; Deblinger (2000)</td>
<td>Psychoeducation and parenting skills; relaxation techniques; Affective Expression and Regulation; Cognitive Coping and Processing; Trauma Narrative; In vivo Exposure, Conjoint parent/child sessions, Enhancing Personal Safety and Future Growth.</td>
<td>Effectiveness of TF-CBT has been well established in several randomized, controlled clinical trials. Studies have indicated TF-CBT reduces targeted internalizing symptoms (e.g., PTSD, depression, anxiety, self-blame) as well as sexualized and other externalizing behaviors (e.g., defiance, oppositionality).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools (CBITS)</td>
<td>RAND Corporation, the Los Angeles Unified School District, and UCLA (Jaycox, Stein, Wong, Kataoka) (2003)</td>
<td>Education about reactions to trauma; relaxation training; cognitive therapy, real life exposure, stress or trauma exposure; social problem-solving.</td>
<td>Two published studies (Ngo et al., 2008; Morsette et al., 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion and Comment

Children and adolescents growing up in urban poverty face increased risks for exposure to trauma. Ongoing stressors may include violent crime, family violence, death of a family member, maltreatment, and many others. Such harsh environments and poor living conditions often result in high levels of distress and posttraumatic stress symptoms. Although children and adolescents are at risk for numerous negative outcomes, there is also the potential for resilience and growth following traumatic experiences. Researchers have worked to identify those factors which can either put youth at a higher risk for future difficulties or help shield them from negative outcomes.

Despite progress in better understanding the effects of trauma on children and adolescents, more work remains in developing empirically-supported, developmentally appropriate assessment tools and interventions, especially for children exposed to multiple or chronic trauma. As current assessment tools continue to be studied and empirical support for them obtained, it is important for
treatment providers to consult multiple sources and to thoroughly evaluate the child's or adolescent's symptoms. When treating youth with PTSD, TF-CBT remains the gold standard. For youth displaying other symptoms related to on-going risk and chronic stressors, several promising treatment approaches are emerging. Research with children and adolescents living in urban poverty has shown that youth are resilient, and with help, can learn to survive and emerge stronger from even the most challenging environments. However, the possibility of resilience does not reduce the public health need to improve challenging environments and the services available to individuals living in poverty.
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Chapter 3

Impact of Trauma and Urban Poverty on Adult Family Members

The impact of trauma on adults is well documented for a variety of trauma types and populations, including, to some degree, in the context of urban poverty. Although much of the research focuses on the characteristics of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and factors that contribute to its development, increasing attention is being paid to reactions to trauma beyond the symptomatology of PTSD, especially in the case of complex trauma involving chronic or multiple traumatic experiences.

Theory

Cahill and Foa (2007) presented an overview of the theoretical perspectives used to account for the development of PTSD. These included the following six theoretical groupings: (1) conditioning theories such as Mowrer’s two-factor learning theory of fear and anxiety; (2) schema theories, which are rooted in theories of personality and social psychology; (3) emotional processing theory, which led to the development of a comprehensive theory of PTSD centered on the concept that individuals with PTSD possess “pathological fear structures” in their memory; (4) classical cognitive theory, which led to Ehlers and Clark’s (2000) model of PTSD organized around the concept of the traumatic memory; (5) dual representation theory, which is connected to contemporary cognitive neuroscience; and (6) the SPAARS model, with its four levels or formats of mental representation (schematic, propositional, analogue, and associative representational systems) (Cahill & Foa, 2007). Other theoretical perspectives represented within the literature include: attachment theory (Scheeringa & Zeanah, 2001), family systems theory (Punamaki, Qouta, El Sarraj, & Montgomery, 2006), conservation of resources theory (Walter & Hobfoll, 2009), stress response theory (Kira, 2001), the self-trauma model (Briere & Scott, 2006), and general cognitive and behavioral theories (Monson & Friedman, 2007). Discussions within the literature around the traumatic nature of poverty and trauma within the context of poverty are rooted in the family stress model and the context of stress model (Wadsworth & Santiago, 2008).

Key Research Findings

There is a plethora of conceptual and empirical findings on the impact of chronic trauma and economic deprivation on adults’ functioning, health, and well-being. It is well established from national epidemiological studies of PTSD that approximately 50% to 90% of adults in the United States have experienced one or more traumatic events; and 10% to 20% of those exposed will develop all of the symptoms necessary to establish a diagnosis of PTSD. Furthermore, a much higher percentage, up to 68%, will develop some symptoms of PTSD (Norris & Slone, 2007). Adults surviving the stress of urban poverty are not only more likely to experience multiple traumatic events; they are also more likely to develop trauma-related symptoms that impact their functioning, health, and well-being (Breslau, Chilcoat, Kessler, Peterson, & Lucia, 1999; Cooper-Patrick et al., 1999; Kessler et al., 1999). Research by Switzer et al. (1999) showed that 42% of adult urban residents exposed to trauma met diagnostic criteria for PTSD at 12 months and as many as 69% met the criteria at some point in their lifetime.

The symptoms of PTSD include feelings of intense fear, helplessness, or horror; reexperiencing of a traumatic event through dreams, flashbacks, or dissociative experiences; avoiding reminders of the trauma (concrete triggers such as people and places, as well as thoughts and feelings), which can
lead to feelings of detachment and emotional numbing; and increased anxiety and other symptoms of hyperarousal such as sleep disturbances, irritability, or concentration difficulties (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). These symptoms will impact, to varying degrees, an individual’s ability to function in professional, social and familial contexts (Breslau, 2002).

Much of the research on trauma is now moving beyond the conceptualization of PTSD to address symptoms exhibited by individuals who have experienced complex trauma, which involves chronic or multiple traumatic events and is often interpersonal in nature. The experience of chronic trauma has been connected to a host of symptoms not captured in the PTSD diagnosis, including: altered self-capacities, such as dysfunctions in the areas of identity, affect regulation, and interpersonal relatedness; cognitive disturbance, such as low self-esteem, self-blame, helplessness, hopelessness, and expectations of rejection and loss; mood disturbance, such as anxiety, depression, anger and aggression; and overdeveloped avoidance responses, such as dissociation, substance abuse and tension-reducing behaviors such as compulsive sexual behavior, binging and purging, and self-mutilation (Briere & Spinazzola, 2005). Furthermore, experiencing childhood abuse, neglect or other traumatic stressors, known as adverse childhood experiences, increases the individual’s risk for a variety of health problems as an adult, including alcoholism, heart disease, obesity, drug use, liver disease, and depression, among others (Felitti et al., 1998).

Research into the characteristic effects of experiencing specific types of trauma is also widely available, specifically addressing the impacts of medical trauma (Santacroce, 2003), interpersonal violence (Helfrich, Fujirua, & Rutkowski-Kmitt, 2008), and military combat (Matsakis, 2007). Not only does the impact of trauma depend on the nature and severity of the traumatic incident, research also shows that the impact may differ depending on the cultural background of the individual (Jobson & O’Kearney, 2008). The oppressive experience of racism in and of itself can be considered a form of traumatic stress (Bryant-Davis, 2007). Poverty can also be considered a form of trauma (Kira, 2001). Constant worry about hunger, violence, illness and accidents, economic strain, and discrimination experienced by those dealing with poverty-related stress has been tied to reduced physical and mental health such as depression and anxiety (Wadsworth & Santiago, 2007).

On the other end of the spectrum, some research suggests that successful negotiation of a traumatic event can lead to positive outcomes. This is known as posttraumatic growth and may include improved relationships with others, openness to new possibilities, greater appreciation of life, enhanced personal strength, and spiritual development (Peterson, Park, Pole, D’Andrea, & Seligman, 2008). However, individuals struggling with both trauma and poverty are less likely to have access to resources that may facilitate successful negotiation of a traumatic event and the resulting positive outcomes. Walter and Hobfoll (2009) found that inner-city women with PTSD who were able to limit the loss of material, energy, and familial interpersonal resources demonstrated significant traumatic symptom reduction over a 6-month period.

**Risk and Protective Factors**

Information about risk and protective factors for adults is abundant within the literature. A meta-analysis by Brewin, Andrews, and Valentine (2000) helped sort out which factors are stronger predictors of the development of PTSD and which seem to be predictors only within certain populations. Gender, age at trauma, and race only predicted PTSD in some populations: for example, the gender effect (PTSD being more likely to develop in women than men) was not seen in combat veterans, and race was a weak predictor in almost all populations. While education, previous trauma, and general childhood adversity were more dependable predictors of PTSD, they still varied based on the population studied. The strongest predictors were psychiatric history, reported childhood abuse, and family psychiatric history (Brewin et al., 2000). Risk factors that occurred during or after the
traumatic event, such as trauma severity, lack of social support, and additional life stress, had a stronger impact than factors in existence prior to the trauma (Brewin et al., 2000).

Another meta-analysis, conducted by Ozer, Best, Lipsey, and Weiss (2003), found that peritraumatic psychological processes, such as high emotion or dissociative experiences immediately before and/or after the traumatic incident, were the strongest predictors of the development of PTSD. Also, biological factors, such as allostatic load and predisposing genetic factors, may increase an individual’s vulnerability to the development of PTSD (Layne, Warren, Watson, & Shaleve, 2007). Some of the protective factors identified include: an easygoing temperament, high intellectual ability, positive family environment, internal locus of control, socioeconomic advantage, coping skills, social support, self-concept, self-efficacy, and self-regulation (Layne et al., 2007). A qualitative study with parents of murdered children identified the following six resources as possible protective factors: personal qualities, spirituality, continuing bond with the victim, social support, previous coping experience, and self-care (Parappully, Rosenbaum, van den Daele, & Nzewi, 2002).

### Table 3.1: Risk and Protective Factors for Adult Family Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Protective Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric history</td>
<td>Easygoing temperament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood abuse</td>
<td>High intellectual ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family psychiatric history</td>
<td>Positive family environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low socioeconomic status</td>
<td>Internal locus of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of education</td>
<td>Socioeconomic advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low intelligence</td>
<td>Coping skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other previous trauma</td>
<td>Social support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other adverse childhood experience</td>
<td>Self-concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma severity</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of social support</td>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life stress</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female gender</td>
<td>Self-care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (minority status)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peritraumatic psychological processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(high emotion &amp; dissociative experiences)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and genetic predisposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Instruments

Two of the most consistently used instruments to assess adult responses to trauma are the PTSD Checklist (PCL) (Weathers et al., 1993) and the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV, PTSD module (SCID-PTSD). The PCL consists of 17 self-report items and has shown test-retest reliability and validity in both veteran and civilian populations, with military (PCL-M) and civilian (PCL-C) versions available for use. The scoring allows for the measurement of both symptom severity and diagnostic status (Keane, Brief, Pratt, & Miller, 2007). The SCID-PTSD must be administered by a clinician, who rates the presence of PTSD symptoms based on the individual’s response to prompts and follow-up questions pertaining to the diagnostic criteria for PTSD (Keane et al., 2007).

Keane et al. (2007) included the following assessment instruments in their overview of the best evidence-based measures of responses to trauma: the Clinician Administered PTSD Scale (CAPS) (Blake et al., 1990), PTSD Symptom Scale Interview (PSS-I) (Foa, Riggs, Dancu, & Rothbaum, 1993), Structured Interview for PTSD (SIP) (Davidson, Smith, & Kudler, 1989; Davidson et al., 1997), and Posttraumatic Diagnostic Scale (PDS) (Foa et al., 1997). For a complete list of other assessment instruments appearing in the literature, see Appendices A and B.

Interventions

A variety of interventions have been designed to assist adults struggling to recover after trauma. Some have been evaluated and empirically proven effective; however, even in the most successful programs, 50% of individuals who finish treatment continue to experience symptoms that warrant an ongoing diagnosis of PTSD (Monson & Friedman, 2006). Friedman, Resick, and Keane (2007) observed that “all clinical practice guidelines for PTSD recommend cognitive behavior therapy (CBT) as the treatment of choice” and noted that the most successful treatment modalities are prolonged exposure (Foa, Hembree, & Rothbaum, 2007), cognitive therapy, cognitive processing therapy, and stress inoculation therapy, all of which may be considered CBT approaches (Friedman, Resick, & Keane, 2007, p. 9). Similarly, a recent meta-analysis of different treatment methods for PTSD found that three methods — Trauma-Focused CBT (TF-CBT) and Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR), stress management, and group CBT — each improved PTSD symptoms more than placement on a waiting list or usual care methods. TF-CBT or EMDR were superior to all other interventions (Bisson et al., 2007). Other interventions, such as supportive therapy/nondirective counseling, psychodynamic therapies, and hypnotherapy, demonstrated inconclusive or unsuccessful results (Bisson et al., 2007). A meta-analysis by Davidson and Parker (2001) also highlighted the effectiveness of CBT and EMDR for dealing with trauma, but it questioned the necessity of the eye movement stimulation aspect of EMDR treatment.

Critical incident stress debriefing (CISD), which consists of brief treatment immediately following a traumatic incident, showed little promise in reducing post-traumatic stress symptoms in a meta-analysis conducted by van Emmerik, Kamphuis, Hulsbosch, and Emmelkamp (2002). Other new intervention strategies, such as the “comprehensive, integrated, trauma-informed, and consumer-involved services” provided through the Women, Co-occurring Disorder and Violence Study (WCDVS) (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2000), show the potential to reduce both posttraumatic stress symptoms and severity of drug use (Cocozza et al., 2005).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Name</th>
<th>Developer(s)</th>
<th>Essential Elements</th>
<th>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive- Behavioral Therapy (Prolonged Exposure Therapy)</td>
<td>Edna Foa, Hembree &amp; Rothbaum (2007)</td>
<td>3 components: psychoeducation, imaginal exposure (recounting the trauma and emotional reliving of the trauma); in vivo exposure (gradually approaching reminders of the trauma)</td>
<td>Empirical studies demonstrate positive results for exposure therapy in treating PTSD in a variety of populations including Vietnam Veterans, sexual assault survivors and mixed trauma survivors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Processing Therapy (CPT)</td>
<td>Patricia Resick &amp; Monica Schnicke (1992)</td>
<td>Includes both cognitive and exposure components. Manualized to be conducted over 12 sessions, individual or group format</td>
<td>Developed for use with sexual assault survivors, successful in reducing PTSD symptoms and trauma-related guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR)</td>
<td>Francine Shapiro (1993)</td>
<td>8 phases of treatment combining aspects of exposure therapy, cognitive therapy, psychodynamic therapy and eye movement stimulation.</td>
<td>Meta-analysis of studies evaluating CBT &amp; EMDR highlights the effectiveness of CBT and EMDR for dealing with trauma, but questions the necessity of the eye movement stimulation aspect of EMDR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Inoculation Training</td>
<td>Donald Meichenbaum (1985)</td>
<td>3 phases of treatment: conceptualization phase (includes psychoeducation &amp; goal setting); coping skills acquisition and rehearsal (relaxation training); application and follow through (may include in vivo and imaginal exposure)</td>
<td>2 studies demonstrated effectiveness in treating PTSD with SIT in female sexual assault survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“comprehensive, integrated, trauma-informed, and consumer-involved services”</td>
<td>Women, Co-occurring Disorder and Violence Study (WCDVS); Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) (2000)</td>
<td>Designed for women experiencing mental health and substance use disorders who have a history of physical and/or sexual abuse</td>
<td>9 sites are currently implementing these services, early results indicate potential to reduce both posttraumatic stress symptoms and severity of drug use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion and Comment

Risk and protective factors associated with the development of PTSD in response to single incident trauma exposures among adults have included education level, minority status, previous trauma, social support, socioeconomic status, degree of life stress and coping experience (Layne et al., 2007; Parapully et al., 2002; Brewin et al., 2000). Adults that live within the context of urban poverty are not only more likely to be at risk for multiple traumatic experiences but are also more likely to be susceptible to the very risk factors associated with the development of PTSD. This increased risk is, in turn, associated with the development of trauma-related symptoms that can impact functioning, health and well-being (Breslau, Chilcoat, Kessler, Peterson & Lucia, 1999; Cooper-Patrick et al., 1999; Kessler et al., 1999). Moreover, specific factors related to poverty-related stress such as violence, discrimination and economic strain have been associated with negative physical and mental health outcomes (Wadsworth & Santiago, 2007), making recovery from trauma exposures more difficult. Because up to 50% of individuals who finish treatment continue to experience symptoms that qualify them for an ongoing diagnosis of PTSD (Monson & Friedman, 2006), it is important to continue research in this area as well as to further develop interventions that will address the complex and specific needs of adults who live in urban poverty and experience multiple traumatic events in order to achieve the goal of improving long term outcomes.
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Chapter 4

Impact of Trauma and Urban Poverty on the Family as a Whole

Families exposed to urban poverty face a disproportionate risk of exposure to trauma and of becoming trauma-organized systems. Families living in urban poverty often encounter multiple traumas over many years. Repeated exposures can lead to severe and chronic reactions in multiple family members with effects that ripple throughout the family system and, ultimately, society. Although some families show resilience, many families living under chronically harsh, traumatic circumstances have difficulties adapting. These families struggle to maintain healthy structure, relationships, and coping. The erosion of family processes jeopardizes the ability of families to make effective use of structured treatment approaches and limits the success of treatments that require family support.

Theory

Systems theory is the dominant theory relevant to understanding the impact of trauma on families living in urban poverty (Shochet & Dadds, 1997; Patterson, 1991; Gelles & Maynard, 1987; Howes, Cicchetti, Toth, & Rogosch, 2000; Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Two central tenets of systems theory are important: 1) when an event occurs that affects one member of the family, the entire family system is affected; and 2) all systems strive to maintain balance or homeostasis, and when thrown out of balance by threats or traumas, try to regain balance as quickly as possible. Trauma can impact the family system through several distinct pathways: simultaneous exposure when all members of the family are exposed to the same event; vicarious traumatization or contagion of trauma from an exposed family member to others in the family; intrafamilial trauma when one family member is the perpetrator of the trauma; and secondary stress when traumatic distress symptoms disrupt family functioning (Figley, 1988).

Other theories have been used to explain family reactions to the pressures and stresses of urban poverty, including ecodevelopmental theories (Hill, Fonagy, Safier, & Sargent, 2003; Kazak, 1989; Meyers, Varkey, & Aquirre, 2002); family stress theory (Patterson, 2002; Hammack, Robinson, Crawford, & Li, 2004; Conger et al., 2002; McCubbin, 1995); family resilience theories (Patterson, 2002; Carver, 1998; Delage, 2002; Greeff & Human, 2004; Harvey & Hill, 2004; Hernandez, Gangsei, & Engstrom, 2007); and resource theories (Thornton, 1998; Johnson, Palmieri, Jackson, & Hobfoll, 2007).

Key Research Findings

Families living in urban poverty face any number of major family stressors, such as family conflict, violence and dissolution, victimization/incarceration or death of a family member, and more neglect and maltreatment than families living in more affluent communities. They are also prone to experiencing financial hardship, residential instability, homelessness, and racial discrimination. Parental mental illness, substance abuse, or both are prevalent (Coulton, Korbin, & Su, 1999; Buckner, Bassuk, Weinreb, & Brooks, 1999; Esposito, 1999; Elliott et al., 1996; Furstenberg & Hughes, 1997). Worry over the physical safety and well-being of family members is a frequent concern for families living in impoverished, urban environments. Often these circumstances are not short-term, but ongoing, multigenerational patterns of existence (Putnam & Trickett, 1993).
Strong empirical evidence demonstrates the impact of chronic trauma on individual family members and, in turn, on multiple family subsystems. Additionally, there is evidence that living under chronically harsh, traumatic circumstances slowly erodes the critical family processes of structure, relationships, and coping (Kiser & Black, 2005). Well-designed studies using large, diverse, multiethnic samples and a wide variety of methods indicate that negative changes in family functioning are often associated with conditions of high stress, trauma, and grief or loss.

**Structure**
Families living in urban poverty struggle with the most fundamental family functions required to provide for basic needs and safety. Because uncontrollable stresses make it difficult to sustain a stable and predictable daily schedule, many families become chaotic and disorganized (Brody & Flor, 1997; Clark, Barrett, & Kolvin, 2000; Hill & Herman-Stahl, 2002; Kiser, Medoff, & Black, 2009; Evans, Maxwell, & Hart, 1999; Ackerman, Kogos, Youngstrom, Schoff, & Izard, 1999; Figley, 1988; Meyers et al., 2002; Wheaton, 1997). High rates of parental distress, psychopathology, and substance abuse mean that parents are often unavailable to organize family life.

**Relationships**
Urban poverty may also have a pervasive influence on family relationships. When significant adults are consistently unable to provide protection and control over the environment, relational models become characterized by mistrust (Ackerman et al., 1999). Frequent changes in family membership create inconsistency and increase the risk for family conflict and violence. Families exposed to chronic trauma experience sudden, unpredictable, or violent losses at a higher rate, making members vulnerable to traumatic grief reactions (Burgess, 1975). Finally, families living in urban poverty often have fewer social support resources and more difficulty mobilizing them for coping and problem solving.

**Coping**
Trauma and the context of urban poverty (high-burden, uncontrollable, unpredictable, and recurring conditions) dictate the choice of family coping responses. Many families find that their coping resources are depleted and their efforts to plan, solve problems, and follow through are futile. Based on the ABCX family crisis model (Hill, 1958), the combination of depleted coping resources and reactive coping styles suggests that families will repeatedly move through one crisis after another (Repetti, Taylor, & Seeman, 2002; Kiser, Ostoja, & Pruitt, 1998).

The literature also reflects that some families faced with difficult environments and multiple stressors show resilience, adaptation, and positive outcomes. Indeed, certain families experience posttraumatic growth and begin to cope in more productive ways following traumatic events (Calhoun & Tedeschi, 1998). Burton and Jarrett (2000) note that families showing resilience make deliberate accommodations to cope with the unpredictable, dangerous contexts of urban poverty. Resilient families structure their routines to accomplish daily tasks safely. They stress the importance of frequent communication when apart. They adopt relatively strict rules and limits to maintain control of what they can control (Gaudin, Polansky, Kilpatrick, & Shilton, 1996), and they also pull together, support each other, and believe that they can overcome their difficulties (Greeff & Human, 2004; Lauterbach, Koch, & Porter, 2007; McCubbin & McCubbin, 1993; Patterson, 2002). Resilient families often rely on a collective value and belief system that helps them in understanding what is important to the family and in explaining and justifying the positive and negative events in their lives (Evans, Boustedt, & Owens, 2008; Haight, 1998).
Risk and Protective Factors

Studies of families impacted by trauma related to urban poverty have delineated some consistent risk and protective factors. The strongest of these may be parental characteristics, and parental adjustment and support following trauma have been related to favorable family responses. The caregiving subsystem is typically responsible for structuring daily routines and for setting the tone for family interactions. When caregivers experience high stress and significant trauma, their availability to function in this role may be compromised. Parental responses to trauma directly affect family functioning, including emotional expression and problem solving, and can lead to an increased risk of family violence (Davidson & Mellor, 2001; Margolin, Christensen, & John, 1996).

While parental functioning is both a risk and protective factor for adjustment to trauma, other important contributors to family response are preexisting family characteristics. Unclear leadership, decreased organization and verbal expression, negative affect expression, increased isolation, unresolved conflict, and increased chaos appear more prominently among neglectful than non-neglectful families (Gaudin et al., 1996). In addition, low family income and isolation increase the risk for multiple forms of family violence, including intimate partner violence and child abuse. Davies, Myers, Cummings, and Heindel (1999) found that family physical violence resulted from poor interpersonal interactions in the family and contributed to avoidance of conflict and to hopelessness about the future.

Protective factors in families include preexisting intrafamilial assistance and support from family and friends, in addition to positive physical affection, cohesion, adaptability and involvement in a religious community (Greeff & Human, 2004; Higgins & McCabe, 2003). Family self-efficacy, along with a survivor mentality (as opposed to a victimization mentality), also are related to better outcomes (Chaitin, 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Protective Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic deprivation</td>
<td>Birth spacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress and trauma pileup</td>
<td>Sufficient caretakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family conflict and discord</td>
<td>No history of violence in family of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>High expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support network</td>
<td>Beliefs in family efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate family problem-solving skills</td>
<td>Spiritual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of alcohol and drug abuse and/or mental health problems in parents</td>
<td>Caring and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor communication patterns among family members</td>
<td>Warm and positive interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor supervision of the child</td>
<td>Ability to manage unpredictable stressors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Factors</td>
<td>Protective Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor parent-child relationships</td>
<td>Ability to manage conflict effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family chaos and stress</td>
<td>Adaptability of family roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to community violence</td>
<td>Maintenance of routines and rituals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Instruments**

A variety of accepted assessment measures for measuring family functioning have been described. The Family Empowerment Scale is an instrument used widely in studies of family engagement and participation in treatment (Koren, DeChillo, Friesen, 1992). Two other measures of family functioning have been used widely in research on the impact of trauma and economic hardship. The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES) were employed in multiple studies to assess family interaction, adjustment, adaptability, and cohesion across a variety of traumatic circumstances (Ackerman et al., 1999; Barakat et al., 1997; Higgins & McCabe, 2003; Jordan, 1991; Northam, Anderson, Adler, Werther, & Warne, 1996). The Family Assessment Device (FAD) also appeared frequently in studies addressing poverty, war trauma, and natural disaster (Clark et al., 2000; Davidson & Mellor, 2001; Kilic, Ozguven, & Sayil, 2003). In addition, the Family APGAR (Adaptability, Partnership, Growth, Affection, and Resolve) is a popular measure due to its brevity (Smilkstein, 1978), and Family Processes is a specific measure to examine family functioning in ethnic minority families living in urban poverty (Smith, Prinz, Dumas, & Laughlin, 2001). A summary of these assessment measures appears in Appendices A and B.

**Interventions**

There are few well-developed, standardized, and empirically supported family therapies for treating trauma, but the available literature on family trauma therapy does provide a framework for family intervention. Specific areas for trauma work with families include assuring that the child is safe from further trauma and feels safe; rapidly stabilizing family and child functioning with normal behavioral expectations; understanding trauma-related symptoms; working through trauma(s); developing a shared sense of meaning; using problem-solving techniques for minimizing additional stresses; and connecting family members to appropriate supports (Cohen, Goodman, Brown, & Mannarino, 2004; MacDonald, Chamberlain, Long, & Flett, 1999; Cozza, 2006; Cicchetti, Rogosch, & Toth, 2006; Lieberman, Van Horn, & Ghosh Ippen, 2006; Lieberman, Van Horn, & Ghosh Ippen, 2006; Toth, Maughan, Manly, Spagnola, & Cicchetti, 2002; Chaffin, et al., 2004; Taylor & Chemtob, 2004; Neimeyer, 1998). Traumatic grief research points to shared meaning making and cognitive appraisal as curative factors (Taylor & Chemtob, 2004; Neimeyer, 1998).

Descriptions of several family-level interventions appear in the literature. Some are in early stages of efficacy testing, but none have been studied rigorously.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Name</th>
<th>Developer(s)</th>
<th>Essential Elements</th>
<th>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Resolution Therapy (FRT)</td>
<td>Saunders &amp; Meinig (2000)</td>
<td>Follows a series of procedures designed for intervention to create strong family relationships in spite of long-term traumatic impact. Focuses on creating or rebuilding safe family structures that can continue to function following professional involvement.</td>
<td>A promising treatment; no controlled studies of efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Family Preservation Services (IFPS)</td>
<td>Tracy, Haapala, Kinney, &amp; Pecora (1991)</td>
<td>Family-focused and community-based crisis intervention services that strive to maintain family unity and prevent the removal of children from the home. Hallmarks include small caseloads for clinicians, who provide short lengths of service; 24-hour staff availability; and provision of services directly in the home.</td>
<td>Kirk (2001) retrospective study: IFPS reduced or delayed number of placements of children in welfare system. Highest-risk families experienced improved family functioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse-Informed Family Therapy</td>
<td>Kolko &amp; Swenson (2002)</td>
<td>Seeks to reduce domestic violence and improve positive family outcomes through promoting cooperation, development of new understandings about the value of violence-free interactions, and skill building.</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Family Therapy (CFT)</td>
<td>Rojano (2004)</td>
<td>Developed specifically for low-income urban families, CFT combines many systems and theories in order to engage clients. Therapy requires specific commitments of both family and therapist: families commit to change by accessing community resources and civil action; and therapists seek personal growth, collaboration within the community, and provision of volunteer services.</td>
<td>No data available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Name</td>
<td>Developer(s)</td>
<td>Essential Elements</td>
<td>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Family Therapy</td>
<td>Boszormenyi-Nagy (1987)</td>
<td>Based on the psychodynamic model, this process accentuates the need for trust, loyalty, and mutual support to hold families together. Dysfunction is believed to result from the breakdown of the above elements, which leads to the loss of a sense of fairness. Fairness can be regained through guided discussion of previously avoided emotional conflicts.</td>
<td>Bernal, Flores-Ortiz, &amp; Sorensen (1990): although little empirical attention has been paid to this therapy, development of an action index for this form of therapy is helpful in discerning which areas a therapist should focus on in treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project FOCUS</td>
<td>Saltzman, Lester, Beardslee, &amp; Pynoos (2008)</td>
<td>A resilience-based program centered on opening lines of communication between parents and children. In eight sessions, families learn to communicate feelings about difficult life events and acknowledge the uniqueness of each member’s experience.</td>
<td>A promising treatment; no controlled studies of efficacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Focused Family Therapy</td>
<td>Hughes (2007)</td>
<td>Works on developing behaviors between children and parents that provide physical and psychological safety for the child. This is achieved through coaching of parents on communication and play and the creation of a safe haven and secure base from which the child can explore the world.</td>
<td>No data available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Family Coping Resources (SFCR)</td>
<td>Kiser (2006)</td>
<td>Uses family ritual and routine to increase the family's sense of safety, stability, and ability to cope with crises. Intended to help families regulate their emotions and behaviors and improve family communication about and understanding of the traumas they have experienced. Consists of a 15-week multifamily group process that includes work on storytelling and creation of a family trauma narrative.</td>
<td>A promising treatment; no controlled studies of efficacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion and Comment

Families living in urban poverty are at high risk for exposure to chronic, recurrent trauma. The impact of such trauma is felt by all members of the family and can affect the family system through multiple pathways (Figley, 1988). The gradual erosion of healthy family processes due to living with trauma exposures in a high-stress context that includes on-going danger has been well documented. As coping resources are depleted over time, families struggle to maintain healthy and trusting family relationships, a positive present and future family identity, and stability and structure both within the family system and in their day-to-day lives. However, despite the struggles faced by many families living in harsh conditions, resilient families exist who are not only able to adapt following difficult times, but can even grow stronger as a family unit. Knowledge gained from both the distressed and highly adaptive families can aid development of appropriate interventions to address safety concerns, stabilize the family unit, connect the family with resources, and work through the trauma to alleviate associated symptoms. By working with the family as a whole to address the impact of trauma, the family unit can grow stronger and move forward, together.
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Chapter 5

Impact of Trauma and Urban Poverty on Intergenerational Relationships

Although scant, the literature that specifically addresses the interplay of risk and protective factors related to trauma exposures and their effects across generations – from grandparents to parents and onto their children raises some important issues. As a reference point, information can be gleaned from the literature on Holocaust survivors and their children, studies of family-of-origin violence, literature on indigenous peoples and studies of complex trauma and its effects on adult functioning and infant mental health, as well as through research on risk and protective factors associated with posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in adults and children. There is much more to understand about the complex mechanics of intergenerational transmission of risk and protective factors in the context of urban poverty and the interventions that may positively affect outcomes.

Theory

Several authors have attempted to organize the literature regarding the mechanisms of transmission of intergenerational trauma effects into models or frameworks. Weingarten (2004) groups these mechanisms into four categories: biological, based on studies showing a second generational vulnerability to PTSD possibly caused by lower cortisol levels; psychological, including attachment disturbances and projection; and familial and societal, which both center around issues of silence. Ancharoff, Munroe, & Fisher (1998) developed a working model of what they refer to as secondary trauma, in which a parent’s “traumatized worldview” is learned through the parent-child relationship. They identify four primary mechanisms for this transmission: silence, overdisclosure, identification, and reenactment. Bowen (1978) contributed to contemporary understanding of intergenerational transmission of trauma by articulating the transmission of emotional processes from one generation to the next. He notes that the current family system and functioning difficulties, including experiences with and impacts of trauma, are often influenced by previous generations of the family. Kira (2001) put forward a complex classification of trauma types and transmission mechanisms. This system views poverty as a form of trauma that acts through a “collective cross-generational transmission” and “community violence as survival trauma.” Further, it classifies intrafamilial physical abuse/incest as “generational family trauma” because interpersonal insults experienced by the victim generation produce attachment-style problems and distorted internal working models of relationships that go on to negatively affect the next generation.

In their review of the literature on influence of family-of-origin violence on later involvement in violent relationships, Delso & Margolin (2004) identify the main theoretical perspectives used both in this specific context and more generally regarding intergenerational effects of trauma. These are attachment theory (Bar-On et al., 1998), social learning theory (Margolin, Gordis, Median, & Oliver, 2003; Kwong, Bartholomew, Henderson, & Rinke, 2003), family systems theory (Margolin et al., 2003), continuity of antisocial behavior, and genetics and heritability.

It is well established in the trauma literature that adults with histories of childhood maltreatment have noted problems with modulating feelings states (van der Kolk, B.A., McFarlane, A.C., & Weisaeth, L., 1996), anger management (Briere, 1988), and social competence (Shipman, Zeman, Penza-Clyve & Champion, 2000). These difficulties produce functional impairments in parenting patterns that affect their children’s outcomes. While women who suffer a traumatic experience in adulthood often have functional impairments related to PTSD symptoms, women with unresolved childhood abuse histories demonstrate impairments in emotional regulation and interpersonal
relationships that exceed those explained by PTSD symptoms (Cloitre, M., Miranda, R., Stovall-McClough, K. C., & Han, H., 2005).

Extending attachment theory to an exploration of how parents with trauma histories transmit elements of that history to their children through the parent-child relationship, Grienenberger, Kelley, and Slade (2005) found that mothers who were able to accurately reflect on their children’s affect and intentions were better able to provide integrated responses to their children in times of distress. However, maternal reflective functioning requires the mother to set aside her own affective experience and reflect on the child’s subjective intention in the moment. Parents with histories of complex trauma have difficulty with emotional regulation and interpersonal relationships that may persist even after PTSD symptoms resolve. Those difficulties make the task of responding to the strong negative affect states of their children especially difficult. Children won’t feel safe or contained if their adult caregivers fall apart or react harshly or punitively when the child expresses fear, anger or sadness.

**Key Research Findings**

The original research regarding the intergenerational transmission of trauma effects grew out of studies done with survivors of the Holocaust and their children. Researchers offer basically two perspectives. The first is the **resilience perspective**, which maintains that children of survivors who were able to cope with their traumatic experiences will have increased resilience in the face of future trauma. The second is the **vulnerability perspective**, which contends that the “permanent psychic damage” of trauma leaves children of survivors more vulnerable to future negative impacts of trauma (Danieli, 1998). Summarizing a variety of studies, Felsen (1998) described the presence of a “common constellation of personality characteristics” in children of Holocaust survivors that fall into the vulnerable range of psychological functioning, including higher tendency to depressive experiences, mistrustfulness, elevated anxiety, difficulties in expressing emotions, difficulties in the regulation of aggression, higher feelings of guilt and self-criticism, and a higher incidence of psychosomatic complaints. Children of Holocaust survivors also seem to experience greater difficulty in the area of psychological separation-individuation (Felsen, 1998), which has been related to parental overprotection and the parentification of children in this population (Bar-On et al., 1998). A prominent theme throughout these studies is the **conspiracy of silence**, which describes how survivors were not listened to and not believed immediately following the Holocaust, silencing the voices of some survivors (Danieli, 1998). Studies have shown that the survivors who had difficulties communicating their traumatic experiences to their families had children with more adverse effects, with female children showing greater adverse effects than male children.

Although a history of childhood exposure to family violence increases the risk for adult marital violence, it is not predictive and can be interrupted at various stages. Delsol and Margolin (2004) compiled the results of nine relevant studies and found that approximately 60% of maritally violent men report family-of-origin violence compared to approximately 20% of non-maritally violent men. Kwong et al. (2003) noted that all types of family-of-origin violence can be correlated to future relationship abuse, regardless of the role or gender of the victims and perpetrators. For example, a male child raised in a family with father-to-mother violence is not necessarily more likely to become a perpetrator, and a female child raised in a family with father-to-mother violence is not necessarily more likely to become a victim. However, both male and female children raised in families with father-to-mother violence have significantly higher rates of involvement in abusive relationships of some sort, whether intimate or parent-child (Kwong et al., 2003). Family-of-origin violence has been linked to higher rates of future child abuse, with co-occurrence rates ranging from 6% to 14% (Margolin et al., 2003).
Finally, several studies have looked at the role of parental trauma exposures on various elements of the child’s experience and functioning. One study found that the children of caregivers with unresolved loss histories have increased behavior problems (Zajac & Kobak, 2009). Cohen, Hien, & Batchelder (2008) found that cumulative maternal trauma predicted child abuse potential, punitiveness, substance abuse, and depression. In a study of African-American women with PTSD, the researchers found that women who had high levels of social support, self esteem and religious coping were less likely to have experienced intimate partner violence and child maltreatment (Bradley, Schwartz & Kaslow 2005). Parenting stress has been shown to be affected by social support, self-efficacy, family risk, and income (Raikes and Thompson, 2005). In a study of traumatized inner-city mothers, higher levels of reflective function, regardless of the severity of PTSD symptoms, were associated with balanced classifications of their children on the Working Model of the Child Interview (WMCI) (Zeanah & Benoit, 1995). The study suggested that good reflective function may inhibit trauma-associated dysregulation (Schechter, D.S., Coots, T., Zeanah, C.H., Davies, M., Coates, S.W., Trabka, K.A., Marshall, R.D., Liebowitz, M.R., & Myers, M.M., 2005).

**Risk and Protective Factors for Intergenerational Transmission of Trauma Effects**

Risk and protective factors related to intergenerational transmission of trauma effects can be found in the family violence literature, where they are categorized as personal characteristics or contextual factors. Risk factors for men with violent families of origin include the following personal characteristics: psychopathology and psychological distress; antisocial personality traits; hostility; approval of marital violence and attitudes condoning violence against women; patriarchal attitudes and nonegalitarian marital role expectations; and substance abuse (Delsol & Margolin, 2004). Studies have found inconsistent results in examining risk factors at the contextual level. Delsol and Margolin (2004) found that the contextual factors of marital problems and life stress, which are often stronger predictors of domestic violence than is family-of-origin violence per se, “do not appear to play a role in the intergenerational transmission of violence” (Delsol & Margolin, 2004, p. 115). However, Choice et al. (1995) found that marital problems were a partial mediator between family-of-origin violence and marital violence. At the same time, research has shown that socioeconomic factors and cultural mores are also important contextual components in the intergenerational transmission of trauma (Waller 2001).

Research shows that “extreme or chronic” poverty multiplies risks to children’s safety (i.e. exposure to toxins, pollution, and community violence) and reduces opportunities and resources needed for parents to moderate the negative impact of poverty (Knitzer, & Perry, 2009). Exposure to violence is a major “breach in safety” that leaves the young child to manage their fear and anxiety alone; without the needed relational support to modulate their neurobiological stress responses (Schechter, & Willheim, 2009). Chronic lack of resources and compromised early parent relationships interfere with the child’s ability regulate their social emotional needs. Early exposure to community violence can compromise parent-child relations and result in long term patterns of negative parent-child interactions (Scheeringa, & Zeanah, 2001).

Protective factors that limit the potential intergenerational transmission of violence include strong social bonds, attitudes about the inappropriateness of violence, strong sense of culture and racial identity and disengagement from family-of-origin trauma (Delsol & Margolin, 2004; Goodman & Olatunji 2008; Waller 2001). For violence-exposed children raised in urban poverty contexts, positive relationships with parents and community members, as well as a high self-reliance are protective factors (Vazsonyi, Pickering, & Bolland, 2006; Goodman and Olatunji 2008).
Table 5.1: Risk and Protective Factors for Intergenerational Transmission of Trauma Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Protective Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathology and psychological distress</td>
<td>Strong social bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial personality traits</td>
<td>Disengagement from family-of-origin trauma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>Attitudes about the inappropriateness of violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of marital violence and attitudes conditioning violence against women</td>
<td>Reflective functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarchal attitudes and nonegalitarian marital role expectations</td>
<td>Strong sense of racial and cultural identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Instruments

Due to the paucity of standardized assessment instruments measuring trauma within the family of origin, use of qualitative open-ended questions is suggested. Many of the studies described here score family-of-origin trauma dichotomously along variables such as father-to-mother aggression, mother-to-father aggression, father-to-self aggression, and mother-to-self aggression (Kwong et al., 2003). Examples of possible qualitative questions include: “When you think back to your childhood, what sorts of traumatic events did your parent(s), grandparent(s), or primary caregiver(s) experience? Please explain each person’s experience with a traumatic event;” and “How did your parent(s), grandparent(s), or primary caregiver(s) respond, deal with or manage their feelings regarding the traumatic event?”

The Family History Research Diagnostic Criteria (FHRDC) (Andreasen, Endicott, Spitzer, & Winokur, 1977) is designed to collect family psychiatric information by interviewing a single family member (i.e., the study participant). The instrument includes diagnostic criteria for 12 psychiatric disorders and has been used in studies examining the impact of trauma within one’s family of origin.

In addition to the adult and child measures for PTSD and mood/behavior problems, studies have used the Adult Attachment Interview, the Parenting Stress Index, the Child Abuse Potential Inventory and the Lifetime Trauma Interview. The Working Model of the Child Interview (WMCI) is a 1-hour semi-structured interview that assesses caregivers’ mental representations of their children and their current relationships with their children (Zeanah & Benoit, 1995). The WMCI was developed for use in connection with the Adult Attachment Interview. Narrative responses are coded for content and quality into three categories: balanced, disengaged, and distorted.

The Parent Development Interview-Revised (PDI-R) is a 45-item semi-structured interview that assesses “parents’ representations of their children, themselves as parents, and their relationships with their children” (Slade, A., Aber, J. L., Berger, B., Bresgi, I., & Kaplan, M. 2002; Slade, A., Aber, J. L., Bresgi, I., Berger, B., & Kaplan, M., 2004, p. 276). Researchers have coded the maternal narrative on the WMCI and combined this with the PDI-R to get a current rating of parental reflective function.
Interventions

Although no evaluations were found in the literature regarding interventions to address trauma within the parent’s family of origin, several authors offer guidelines and recommendations to clinicians regarding intergenerational transmission of trauma. Danieli (2007) suggested that examining the former generation’s trauma exposure will offer a more complete assessment of an individual’s posttraumatic status. Weingarten (2004) stressed the need for clinicians to be aware of mechanisms of intergenerational transmission of trauma and offered suggestions to help foster awareness and empowerment around trauma within the family of origin.

The Clinician Assisted Videofeedback Exposure Session (CAVES) is a research assessment measure and experimental intervention that uses video to engage mothers with trauma histories in rating their interactions with their toddlers at key developmental points. It uses questions from the WMCI to probe the nature of the interaction and was found to be effective at reducing negative attributions (Schechter, D. S., Myers, M. M., Brunelli, S. A., Coates, S. W., Zeanah, C. H., Davies, M., Grienenberger, J.F., Marshall, R.D., McCaw, J.E., Trabka, K.A., & Liebowitz, M.R., 2006).

There are very few family intervention strategies geared to urban poverty. SURVIVE (Supporting Urban Residents to be Violence-Free in a Violent Environment) is a promising family-based intervention for urban youth and parents with a focus on family and community violence (DeVoe, Dean, Traube, & McKay, 2005). It incorporates 12-week, multi-family group sessions that include psychoeducation about trauma and its effects, coping skills, self care and problem solving; safety planning; risk assessment; and harm reduction.

Engagement strategies that incorporate alliances with primary and extended family systems are essential to trauma interventions in urban poverty contexts. With the overrepresentation of ethnic groups in urban poverty populations, intervention strategies will be most effective if they build on cultural variations in family roles and functions. Finally, given what the trauma literature tells us about survivors’ enduring difficulties with interpersonal relationships and affect management, engagement strategies that incorporate a high level of sensitivity and affect containment will be most effective.

Table 5.2: Interventions: Intergenerational Trauma Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Name</th>
<th>Developer(s)</th>
<th>Essential Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinician Assisted Videofeedback Exposure Session (CAVES)</td>
<td>Schechter, Myers, Brunelli, Coates, Zeanah, Davies, Grienenberger, Marshall, McCaw Trabka, &amp; Liebowitz (2006)</td>
<td>Video session with mother and child to review interactions; used in conjunction with WMCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Supporting Urban Residents to be Violence-Free in a Violent Environment” (SURVIVE)</td>
<td>DeVoe, Dean, Traube &amp; McKay (2005)</td>
<td>Family-based intervention for urban youth; 12 week program with family group format. Includes psychoeducation, safety planning, risk identification, and harm reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion and Comment

Research shows that when parents have experienced traumatic events during childhood, especially within their familial relationships, their children may experience secondary effects of these exposures through complex and overlapping relationship processes. Risk factors for increased likelihood of transmission of trauma effects include the “conspiracy of silence,” witnessing violence in the family of origin, poor attachment with caregivers, functional impairments in parenting, certain personality characteristics and contextual factors. Protective factors that limit intergenerational transmission include strong social bonds, attitudes about the inappropriateness of violence, and disengagement from the parent’s family-of-origin trauma. In urban poverty contexts, positive relationships with parents and high self-reliance are protective factors that limit transmission of violence. Interventions for reducing transmission of trauma effects include addressing the prior generation’s trauma exposure with current clients, increased clinician awareness of intergenerational trauma effects, video assisted interviews with parents and their children, and family-based models that address community violence. Although studies to date mainly inform understanding of intergenerational dynamics of family violence, the literature suggests that interventions geared to addressing trauma effects in families living in urban poverty should emphasize primary and extended family systems, build on an understanding of cultural variations in family roles and functions, and incorporate strategies that promote affect management.
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Chapter 6

Impact of Trauma and Urban Poverty on Parent-Child Relationships

Trauma, urban poverty, and parent-child relational variables interact in complex ways to affect child and family mental health outcomes. Generally speaking, research indicates that the quality of the parent-child relationship is negatively impacted when a parent (mother) has experienced a traumatic event or events and when the child being parented experiences an event or events. Relational variables reported in the literature include compromised attachment, parental withdrawal/worry, and reenactment of abandonment themes. Factors associated with urban poverty such as racial discrimination, economic hardship, and chronic stress increase the likelihood of a negative impact of trauma on the parent-child relationship. Moreover, trauma in a setting of poverty has been found to be more detrimental to the parent-child relationship than poverty alone.

Theory

Two well-known theories that provide a framework for examining impact of trauma on the parent-child relationship are attachment theory (Bar-On et al., 1998; Lewin & Bergin, 2001; Magnus, Cowen, Wyman, Fagen, & Work, 1999) and family systems theory (Dalla, 2003; Dickstein et al., 1998). The family stress model of economic hardship (Conger, Wallace, Sun, Simons, Mcloyd & Brody, 2000) and the mundane extreme environmental stress model (Peters & Massey, 1983) provide additional perspective for understanding this impact in an urban poverty context. In a study that expanded the original family stress model of economic hardship, Conger et al. (2002) concluded that economic hardship was associated with caregiver emotional stress, which was associated with disruption in the caregiver-child relationship. Using the mundane extreme environmental stress model to explore the relationship between emotional distress and parent-child relationship quality, Murray (2001) concluded that experience of racial discrimination worsens the two variables' negative effects.

Key Research Findings

Most research examines the parent-child relationship by assessing the impact of the parent’s trauma experience on the relationship. For example, reduced quality of the parent-child relationship has been attributed to the following: mothers’ compromised ability to attach to her offspring due to her own trauma history (Bar-On et al., 1998); reenactment of parental abandonment themes (Dalla, 2003); and parental withdrawal and parent-child relationship conflict stemming from parental psychological symptoms such as depression (Conger et al., 2002). In a nationally representative sample of men and women with a diagnosis of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD, non-military), numbing was found to predict increased parent-child aggression (Lauterbach et al., 2007). Parental worry partially explained the association between parental depression and the development of posttraumatic symptoms in children being treated for assault or accident (Meiser-Stedman, Yule, Dalglish, & Smith, 2006). In a study examining the parent-child relationship subsequent to the child’s traumatic experience, mothers of child sexual abuse victims showed increased depression, anxiety, and decreased attachment behaviors when compared to mothers of non-abused children (Dickstein et al., 1998). In another study, mothers’ depressive symptoms were found to be linked to their concerns about safety in the neighborhood, but maternal displays of affection and warmth were not (Hill & Herman-Stahl, 2002).
Risk and Protective Factors

The literature has suggested numerous maternal factors that increase the likelihood of negative impacts of trauma and stress on parent-child relationships. These risk factors include depression (Conger et al., 2002; Dickstein et al., 1998; Lewin & Bergin, 2001; Meiser-Stedman et al., 2006; Hill & Herman-Stahl, 2002); history of parental abandonment (Dalla, 2003); alcohol/drug abuse (Dalla, 2003); and insecure attachment to the child (Bar-On et al., 1998). Maternal factors noted to be protective were reflective functioning (Schechter et al., 2005) and secure attachment (Lewin & Bergin, 2001). Positive parental mental health and emotional responsiveness predicted resilience in a group of 7-to-9-year-olds living in high-risk urban environments (Wyman et al., 1999). Richards et al. (2004) found that for children, unstructured and unmonitored free time with peers was a risk factor for exposure to community violence. Child protective factors were spending time with family and structured activity (Richards et al., 2004).

Contextual risk factors included racial discrimination (Meiser-Stedman et al., 2006); economic hardship (Dalla, 2003; Lauterbach et al., 2007); work-related stress (Lauterbach et al., 2007); chronic stress; and current domestic violence (Dalla, 2003). Lauterbach et al. (2007) found that social support buffered the negative effects of PTSD on parent-child relationships. Meiser-Stedman et al. (2006) concluded that a stable marital relationship buffered the negative effects of racial discrimination.

Table 6.1: Risk and Protective Factors for Parent-Child Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Protective Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insecure Attachment</td>
<td>Secure attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of parental abandonment</td>
<td>Reflective functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/drug abuse</td>
<td>Social support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic hardship</td>
<td>Time spent with family and structured activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal (parental) depression</td>
<td>Stable and satisfying marital relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-related stress</td>
<td>Emotionally responsive parenting attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial discrimination</td>
<td>Positive mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured and unmonitored free time with peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current domestic violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic stress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Instruments

Though not specifically designed to do so, two measures may have potential for evaluating the parent-child subsystem in the context of traumatic experience. The Parent-Child Conflict Tactic Scales (CTS PC) (Straus, Hamby, Finkelhor, Moore, & Runyan, 1998) and Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire – Child Version (PARQ-Child) (Rohner, Saavedra, & Granum, 1980).

Interventions

Several interventions that target parent-child relationships have evidence supporting their effectiveness when used with traumatized children and their families: These include:

- **Parent-Child Interaction Therapy (PCIT)**, which combines elements of attachment and learning theories, systems theory, and behavior modification. PCIT was developed for the treatment of young children with significant behavior problems. With a focus on balancing positive parent-child interaction and consistent limit setting, treatment involves direct practice and coaching skills in sessions and establishes daily positive interaction time in the home. It has been empirically validated in more than 80 studies.

- **Child-Parent Psychotherapy (CPP)**, which was specifically designed to treat children under the age of 6 years with domestic violence exposures. Theoretical underpinnings include attachment, social learning, cognitive behavioral, developmental traumatology, and psychodynamic theories. A key component of CPP is a focus on improving the caregiver-child relationship. Several randomized controlled trials have demonstrated the effectiveness of CPP (Lieberman, Van Horn & Gosh Ippen, 2005; Toth, Maughan, Manly, Spagnola & Cicchetti, 2002; Cicchetti, Rogosch, & Toth, 2006).

- **Abuse-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Child Physical Abuse (AF-CBT)**, designed to treat physically abusive families (including the offending caregiver). Theoretical underpinnings include family systems, cognitive behavioral, and developmental traumatology theories. Parent-child- or family system-directed components include communication and pro-social problem-solving skills training. A randomized controlled trial demonstrated the effectiveness of AF-CBT (Kolko, 1996).

- **Combined Parent-Child Cognitive Behavioral Approach for Children and Families at Risk for Child Physical Abuse (CPC-CBT)**, which integrates several CBT models and was developed to treat families with a history of harsh discipline strategies and/or physical abuse (Runyon, Ryan, Kolar & Deblinger, 2004).

### Table 6.2: Interventions: Parent-Child Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Name</th>
<th>Developer(s)</th>
<th>Essential Elements</th>
<th>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Child Interaction Therapy (PCIT)</td>
<td>Eyberg (2003)</td>
<td>Relationship enhancement &amp; child behavior management</td>
<td>Empirically validated in over 80 studies, with findings including decrease in parental distress; decrease in maternal depressive symptoms; generalization to untreated siblings; positive changes in parents’ interaction style; and maintenance of gains up to 6 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Name</td>
<td>Developer(s)</td>
<td>Essential Elements</td>
<td>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Child Physical Abuse (AF-CBT)</td>
<td>Kolko (1996)</td>
<td>Child-directed components; caregiver-directed components; parent-child- or family system-directed components</td>
<td>When compared with routine community service, treatment group had better outcomes in the following: parent-child aggression, child externalizing behavior, family conflict, and family cohesion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion and Comment**

The parent-child dyad is one of the units within a family that can be negatively impacted by exposure to traumatic events. Parental emotional symptoms and behaviors associated with relationship impairment stem from responses to current and historical trauma exposures, and can be exacerbated by additional stress of minority status and living in urban poverty. Risk factors include racial discrimination, economic hardship, maternal depression and history of parental abandonment. Protective factors include secure attachment, reflective functioning, stable and satisfying marital relationship, emotionally responsive parenting attitudes and social support. The two assessment measures of general parent-child relationship (the Parent-Child Conflict Tactic Scales and Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire – Child Version) should be evaluated for their utility and feasibility in evaluation and treatment planning with traumatized families. Evidence-supported trauma-specific interventions that target the parent-child relationship demonstrate improvements in dyadic interaction, child positive behavior, attachment and reduction in parental distress.
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Chapter 7

Impact of Trauma and Urban Poverty on Parenting Practices

Research has firmly demonstrated both that parenting practices have a direct effect on children’s behaviors and outcomes, and that trauma and the stress of urban poverty may impact an individual’s ability to function in a variety of circumstances, including an individual’s ability to be a parent. Here we provide an overview of the ways in which trauma and poverty affect parenting practices and the interventions designed to ameliorate these effects.

Theory

Literature on impact of trauma on parenting practices and intervention strategies is rooted in a variety of theoretical perspectives: attachment theory (Appleyard & Osofsky, 2003; Banyard, Williams, & Siegel, 2003; DiLillo & Damashek, 2003; Newcomb & Locke, 2001); social learning theory (Banyard et al., 2003; DiLillo & Damashek, 2003); developmental perspective (Marcenko, Kemp, & Larson, 2000); trauma theory (Levendosky & Graham-Bermann, 2001; Elliott, Bjelajac, Fallot, Markoff, & Reed, 2005); empowerment theory and relational theory (Elliott et al., 2005); stages of change model and solution-focused approach (Van deMark, Brown, Bornemann, & Williams, 2004); cognitive behavioral approach (Van deMark et al., 2004); ecological perspective (Levendosky & Graham-Bermann, 2001; Pinderhughes, Nix, Foster, & Jones, 2001); observational learning (Locke & Newcombe, 2004); developmental lifespan model of child sexual victimization (Manion et al., 1996); parental acceptance-rejection theory (Newcomb & Locke, 2001); and Bowen family systems theory (Harris & Topham, 2004).

Key Research Findings

As with all adults, parents may react to trauma in different ways; thus, while parenting practices of some will not be affected by trauma, parental functioning of others may be diminished. Parental practices are especially dependent upon the parents’ ability to manage stress reactions (Appleyard & Osofsky, 2003). Decreased parental effectiveness, less warmth, and a lack of ability to appropriately control children’s behaviors have all been connected to parental experiences with trauma (Levendosky & Graham-Bermann, 2001). Parents dealing with trauma may lack an understanding of child development and age-appropriate needs, practice corporal punishment as a means of control, and express a firm belief in obedience and suppression of feelings (Green, Miranda, Daroowalla, & Siddique, 2005). Parents may hold unrealistic expectations and misattributions about the causes of their children’s behavior due to traumatic experiences (Kolko & Swenson, 2002).

One of the primary mediating factors between the stress of living in poverty and poor child outcomes is the role of poor parenting practices (National Institute of Child Health and Development [NICHD], 2005; McLoyd, 1998). Living in a stressful environment with high levels of community violence and trauma, as seen in the context of urban poverty, can be linked to less positive perceptions of one’s children, the use of harsh discipline, an overall strategy of reactive parenting (Pinderhughes, Dodge, Bates, Pettit, & Zelli, 2000), and decreased ability to monitor one’s children (Spano, Rivera, Vazsonyi, & Bolland, 2008). Early-age parenthood is associated with harsh parenting practices, and living in chronic poverty, specifically during one’s adolescence, is correlated with a much greater likelihood of early parenthood (Scaramella, Neppi, Ontai, & Conger, 2008). Raikes and Thompson
(2005) explored the connections between parenting stress, income, and “family risk”, which included experiencing trauma. They learned that whereas lower-income mothers exhibited greater parenting stress, this association became less evident for mothers with higher ratings of self-efficacy (although family risk strongly predicted parenting stress). Some researchers suggest that the effects of chronic poverty on children appear to follow different pathways among different racial-ethnic groups, with parenting practices, maternal depression, and neighborhood context all playing different roles in African-American, Latino and white families (Pachter, Auinger, Palmer, & Weitzman, 2006).

Recent research shows that parents who are able to maintain effective parenting practices in the face of the stress of living in an inner-city environment have the potential to protect their adolescent sons from the negative health consequences and violent behaviors associated with that environment (Vazsonyi, Pickering, & Boland, 2006; Spano et al., 2009). Specifically, some suggest that non-coercive restrictive parenting that is consistent can shield children from the negative consequences of the stress of living in poverty (Bhandari & Barnett, 2007).

The impact of childhood sexual abuse (CSA) is one of the most widely researched forms of trauma in terms of the trauma’s impact on parenting practices. One review of this body of research found three studies demonstrating a connection between maternal CSA and difficulty establishing appropriate hierarchical boundaries with children; five studies that connected a history of CSA to utilization of excessively harsh discipline; three studies demonstrating a tendency for mothers with a history of CSA to become more permissive parents; and two studies indicating that maternal CSA may lead to increased stress about one’s performance as a parent (DiLillo & Damashek, 2003). Other parenting practices associated with a history of CSA include negative views of oneself as a parent, the use of physical discipline and violence towards children, neglectful behaviors, and less satisfaction with parenting (Banyard, 1997; Banyard et al., 2003; Manion et al., 1996; Schuetze & Eiden, 2005).

Risk and Protective Factors

Risk factors that increase parents’ vulnerability to trauma’s potential impact on parenting practices include: parental history of childhood abuse, low marital relationship quality, low income, large family size, and mother’s young age (Banyard et al., 2003); parental alcoholism and/or substance use (DiLillo & Damashek, 2003; Locke & Newcombe, 2004; Marcenko et al., 2000); living in an impoverished neighborhood (Pinderhughes et al., 2001; Ceballo & Mcloyd, 2002); high levels of symptoms related to posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), particularly emotional numbing and avoidance (Lauterbach et al., 2007); allowing children excessive unstructured and unmonitored free time (Richards et al., 2004); maternal depression and current partner violence (Schuetze & Eiden, 2005); maternal mental illness (Dickstein et al., 1998); use of avoidant coping mechanisms (Wright, Fopma-Loy, & Fischer, 2005); and racial discrimination (Murry, Brown, Brody, Cutrona, & Simons, 2001).

Protective factors that increase a parent’s resilience in the face of trauma and lessen its potential to impact parenting practices include: problem-solving abilities, positive coping and self-care skills, self-esteem, spirituality, and connections to friends and other social supports (Banyard et al., 2003); spending time with family and providing structured activities for adolescents (Richards et al., 2004); spousal/partner support (Wright et al., 2005); social support networks (Burchinal, Follmer, & Bryant, 1996; Ceballo & Mcloyd, 2002); family cohesion and involvement (Anderson, 2008) and maternal awareness of and communication about children’s exposure to violence (Ceballo, Dahl, Aretakis, & Ramirez, 2001).
Table 7.1: Risk and Protective Factors for Parenting Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Protective Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental history of childhood abuse</td>
<td>Problem-solving abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low marital relationship quality and current partner violence</td>
<td>Positive coping and self-care skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>Time with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large family size</td>
<td>Spousal/partner support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s young age</td>
<td>Social support networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental alcoholism and/or substance use</td>
<td>Maternal awareness of children’s exposure to violence and parent-child communication about community violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in an impoverished neighborhood; low neighborhood safety</td>
<td>Family cohesion and involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of PTSD-related symptoms, particularly emotional numbing and use of avoidant coping mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal depression and/or mental illness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Instruments

In the literature on the impact of trauma on parenting, two measures appear repeatedly as assessments of parenting practices. The first is the Parenting Stress Index (PSI) (Abidin, 1995), a self-report measure that includes 36 items that assess caregiver stress and inappropriate parenting. This measure provides for scoring in the following three areas: parental distress (contributing parental factors), difficult child (contributing child factors), and parent-child dysfunction interaction. The PSI has been demonstrated to be an appropriate measure of parenting practices in a context of urban poverty (Reitman, Currier, & Stickle, 2002). The second is Parent Sense of Competence Scale (PSOC) (Gibaud-Wallston & Wandersman, 1978), a strengths-based measure of parenting attitudes that includes 17 self-report items divided into parent satisfaction and parent self-efficacy subscales. Other assessment instruments to measure the impact of trauma on parenting practices are provided in Appendices A and B.

Interventions

Although a wide variety of interventions have been designed to support development of effective parenting practices, few of them explicitly address trauma and its impacts on parenting behaviors. A recent meta-analysis of 77 evaluations of parent training programs, by Kaminski, Valle, Filene, &
Boyle (2008), helps illustrate which components of parenting programs in general are connected to greater improvements in both parenting behavior and child externalizing behavior. The most important components were “parent training in creating positive interactions with their child” and “requiring parents to practice new skills with their own child during sessions” (Kaminski et al., p. 581). Although not labeled as trauma-informed practices, some programs included in this meta-analysis have been used successfully with populations dealing with trauma: filial therapy helped to increase parents’ attitudes of acceptance and empathic behavior towards their children (Landreth & Lobaugh, 1998); cognitive-ecological preventive intervention for children living in inner-city and other urban poor communities showed success in preventing adolescent aggression at greater rates when it included a parenting component (Metropolitan Area Child Study Research Group, 2002); use of the Keys to Interactive Parenting Scale assessment and intervention has been shown to increase parenting outcomes (Comfort & Gordon, 2009); participation in the STAR Parenting Program led to decreased levels of verbal and corporal punishment, anger, stress, and child behavior problems (Nicholson, Anderson, Fox, & Brener, 2002); and PARTNERS Parent Training Groups demonstrated effectiveness with the use of less harsh discipline and an increase in positive parenting by families involved in Head Start (Webster-Stratton, 1998).

Another resource for trauma-related parenting programs is the literature surrounding parent training programs that have been established as evidence-based or promising practices when used in cases of child abuse and neglect. Some of these programs have been evaluated with families living in the context of urban poverty (Johnson et al., 2008; Barth et al., 2005). Several trauma-informed comprehensive service programs addressing issues such as domestic violence and substance abuse include components on parenting practices (Elliott et al., 2005; Sullivan, Egan, & Gooch, 2004; Van deMark et al., 2004). There is also the potential to mediate the impact of trauma on children by creating interventions aimed at supporting and encouraging positive parenting practices immediately following traumatic experiences (Gerwitz, Forgatch, & Wieling, 2008).

Table 7.2: Interventions: Parenting Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Name</th>
<th>Developer(s)</th>
<th>Essential Elements</th>
<th>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2-3 Magic</td>
<td>Bradley et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Group format, geared to parents with children between the ages of 2-12. Three steps: control negative behavior, encourage good behavior, strengthen relationships.</td>
<td>Parents receiving intervention demonstrated improved parenting practices and reported reduced negative child behaviors compared to a control group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Name</td>
<td>Developer(s)</td>
<td>Essential Elements</td>
<td>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCE</td>
<td>Lovell &amp; Richey (1997)</td>
<td>Social support skill training (SSST) intervention; training for parents on appropriate use of consequences, positive reinforcement, and ignoring; weekly parent discussion group on child development; daily living skills for parents. 17-session SSST groups on: creation of metaphor for friendship, the Relationships Road Map, strengths and gaps in personal networks, positive and negative indicators of potential network members, and conversational and assertiveness skills.</td>
<td>Participants reported significantly higher proportions of contacts with formal service providers and people from known organizations, and more conversations about finances and fewer about housework than control. Though nonsignificant, participants also reported increases in “quick contacts,” self-initiated interactions, and child-related topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Connections</td>
<td>DePanfilis &amp; DuBowitz (2005)</td>
<td>Community-based intervention that focuses on: emergency assistance/concrete services; home-based family intervention (e.g., family assessment, outcome-driven service plans, individual and family counseling); service coordination with referrals targeted toward risk (e.g., substance abuse treatment) and protective factors (e.g., mentoring program); and multifamily supportive recreational activities.</td>
<td>Positive changes in protective factors (parenting attitudes, parenting competence, and social support); diminished risk factors (depressive symptoms, parenting stress, life stress); improved safety (physical and psychological care of children); and improved behavior (decreased internalizing and externalizing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filial therapy</td>
<td>Landreth &amp; Lobaugh (1998)</td>
<td>10-week filial therapy parent training group for incarcerated fathers, utilizes play therapy techniques, teaches parents to take on the therapeutic role.</td>
<td>Helped to increase parents’ attitudes of acceptance and empathic behavior towards their children; reduced stress related to parenting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Name</td>
<td>Developer (s)</td>
<td>Essential Elements</td>
<td>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incredible Years</td>
<td>Webster-Stratton &amp; Reid (2003)</td>
<td>Focuses on strengthening the core parenting competencies of monitoring, positive discipline, and confidence. Encourages parental involvement with children’s scholastic experiences. Program divided based on child’s age: 0-3, 3-6, 6-12, 4-12 years. Group based, utilizes videos and role playing.</td>
<td>Demonstrated success with parents with a history of child maltreatment, with improvements in parental positive affect; nurturing/supportive parenting practices and discipline competence; and the reduced use of critical statements and commands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys To Interactive Parenting Scale (KIPS)</td>
<td>Comfort &amp; Gordon (2006)</td>
<td>Assesses parenting behaviors through observation, including: “sensitivity of responses, supports emotions, physical interaction, involvement in child’s activities, open to child’s agenda, engagement in language experiences, reasonable expectations, adapts strategies to child, limits &amp; consequences, supportive directions, encouragement, promotes exploration &amp; curiosity”</td>
<td>Tested reliably for children ages zero through five; thoroughly tested for validity, reliability; tested with diverse populations. “Parenting outcomes assessed using increase significantly with intervention” (2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisystemic Therapy (MST)</td>
<td>Bordin et al. (1995)</td>
<td>Present-focused and action-oriented. Directly addresses intrapersonal (e.g., cognitive) and systemic (family, peer, school) factors. Individualized and highly flexible to client’s needs. Most sessions held in the family’s home at a convenient time or in community locations. Treatment time-limited. Goal is to empower parents to handle challenges themselves.</td>
<td>MST has demonstrated an increase in supportiveness and decrease in conflict-hostility in families. It has also shown decreased symptomatology in parents (self-report) and decreased behavior problems in youth (parental report). Further, participant youth have a lower rate of recidivism, drug and alcohol use, and peer aggression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing Parent Programs</td>
<td>Bavolek (2002)</td>
<td>May be home-based (for children preschool age and below) or group-based. An empowerment-based program, the Nurturing Parent Program teaches parents what to expect from children at each developmental stage, helps parents develop nurturing, nonviolent discipline strategies, and increases effective, nurturing communication.</td>
<td>Parents who demonstrated maladaptive parenting practices prior to this intervention demonstrated nurturing parent attitudes after completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Name</td>
<td>Developer(s)</td>
<td>Essential Elements</td>
<td>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Child Interaction Therapy (PCIT)</td>
<td>Eyberg (2003)</td>
<td>Therapists observe and coach parents during parent-child interactions. Most appropriate for children ages 2-7. Two major components, <em>relationship enhancement</em> to teach parents to decrease negative aspects of their relationship and develop supportive communication; and <em>strategies for compliance</em> to teach effective discipline and child management skills.</td>
<td>Program shown to be effective in reducing child behavior problems and maternal stress and increasing the number of positive parent-child interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNERS Parent Training Groups</td>
<td>Webster-Stratton (1998)</td>
<td>Group format, parents watch video vignettes of positive parenting interactions followed by discussion and teaching of positive discipline strategies.</td>
<td>Evaluated with families involved in Head Start programs, who demonstrated the use of less harsh discipline and an increase in positive parenting following this intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 12-Ways</td>
<td>Lutzker &amp; Rice (1984)</td>
<td>Project 12-Ways uses behavioral methods and focuses on various targets in the ecology of multi-problem families entering the system for child neglect. Parents are taught skills in safety, bonding, and health care.</td>
<td>Improved assertion skills, job skills, and home management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Safe Care</td>
<td>Taban &amp; Lutzker (2001)</td>
<td>15-session training program focused on home safety, infant and child health care, and bonding and stimulation. Interventions included verbal instructions, discussions, reading materials, modeling, role-play and practice, and feedback administered via research assistants, videotapes, and, in few cases, a nurse or a caseworker.</td>
<td>Parents felt more confident about their knowledge and ability regarding their children's health and safety. Showed improvement in their interaction with their children, and reported enjoying being with their children more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Name</td>
<td>Developer (s)</td>
<td>Essential Elements</td>
<td>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project SelfCare</td>
<td>Fraser, Armstrong, Morris, &amp; Dadds (2000)</td>
<td>Project SelfCare uses a treatment team of pediatricians, nurses, and social workers to encourage utilization of community services. Promotes social support systems and informal resources, and enhances skills and confidence to access resources. Services guided by individual need and offered in home.</td>
<td>Showed a relationship between maternal, family and environmental factors in the immediate postnatal period and adjustment to the parenting role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Psychotherapy Mother’s Group/ Enhanced Behavioral Family Intervention (EBFI)</td>
<td>Sanders et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Enhanced group behavioral family intervention focuses on parents' negative attributions regarding their child's and their own behavior, and parents' anger-control deficits. Parent workbook, and sessions to teach 17 core child-management strategies, Planned Activities Training; plus 4 sessions addressing risk factors associated with child abuse and neglect. Parents were also taught anger management techniques, and cognitive techniques that challenged their attributions.</td>
<td>Control and EBFI showed reduced dysfunctional attributions, with EBFI showing a significantly greater reduction in the potential for child abuse and unrealistic expectations. Both groups showed decreased anger experience and expression. EBFI showed a significantly greater reduction in negative attributions than control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR Parenting Program</td>
<td>Nicholson, Anderson, Fox &amp; Brenner (2002)</td>
<td>STAR strategy (Stop, Think, Ask, Respond) utilizes cognitive behavioral and anger management techniques to help parents develop a more “thoughtful” parenting style.</td>
<td>Research indicates decreased levels of verbal and corporal punishment, anger, stress, and child behavior problems following this intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps Towards Effective Enjoyable Parenting (STEEP)</td>
<td>Egeland &amp; Erickson Farrell (2004)</td>
<td>Rooted in attachment theory and the ecological perspective, STEEP uses home visits, small group format, and videotaped interaction and review, with goal of teaching parents about child development and problem solving to increase positive parenting. Developed for use with parents of young children.</td>
<td>Participants demonstrated better understanding of child development and life management skills, and fewer depressive symptoms and repeat pregnancies (within two years of the birth of their baby), and increased sensitivity to their child’s cues and signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Training for Effective Parenting (STEP) Program</td>
<td>Wilczak &amp; Markstrom (1999)</td>
<td>Utilizes a parent study group format to educate parents regarding child development. Teaches parents the four goals of misbehavior (attention, power, revenge, inadequacy) and how to develop effective discipline that is firm and kind.</td>
<td>Increased fathers’ knowledge about effective parenting practices and feelings of efficacy as parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Name</td>
<td>Developer(s)</td>
<td>Essential Elements</td>
<td>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple P-Positive Parenting Program</td>
<td>Sanders et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Behavioral based parenting intervention provided at the individual level, group level, or in a self-directed format. Provides parents with tip sheets on child development for each age group and promotes self-efficacy, self-management, and problem solving skills.</td>
<td>Evaluation research demonstrates a reduction in children’s disruptive behaviors and dysfunctional parenting practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion and Comments**

When parents experience trauma, research shows it can affect their parenting abilities in various ways. Risk factors include pre-existing poor parenting practices, poor parental mental health, parental PTSD symptoms, parental substance use/abuse, low family income, living in an impoverished neighborhood, mother’s young age, current intimate partner violence, parental history of childhood abuse, large family size, and racial discrimination. Parents who maintain effective parenting practices despite these risks have good problem solving abilities, good coping skills and self-care skills, spend time with family, have partner and social support, have strong family cohesion and involvement and are likely to benefit from these protective factors. Another protective mechanism is parents’ awareness of child exposure to violence and discussion of it with their children. The most effective interventions include parental training to create positive interactions with their child, and the use of parental practice of these skills in session with the child. Specific programs that have shown improved parenting practices among families exposed to trauma include filial therapy, cognitive-ecological preventive intervention, the STAR parenting program, and PARTNERS parent training groups. Supportive parenting practice training immediately following trauma has been shown to mediate some of trauma’s effects and should be studied further.
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Chapter 8

Impact of Trauma and Urban Poverty on Intimate Partner Relationships

Combined traumas (past or present) and urban poverty can cause undue burden on intimate adult partner relationships. Individually, each partner must manage their personal responses to traumatic stress and burdens associated with lack of resources and opportunities for personal and familial mobility. Within their relationship, the couple negotiates acceptable levels of closeness, communication and collaboration, tolerance of each other’s stress responses as well as safe ways to manage conflict and distress. Although there is limited research on the effects of trauma and urban poverty on couples, the following summary outlines theories, research findings, and intervention tools.

Theory

The literature regarding the impact of trauma on adult intimate relationships is rooted in a variety of theoretical perspectives, including attachment theory (Liang, Williams, & Siegel, 2006; Johnson, 2002; Nelson Goff & Smith, 2005; Whiffen & Oliver, 2004); object relations theory (Mazor, 2004); behavior theory and cognitive theory (Glynn et al., 1999; Leonard, Follette, & Compton, 2006; Monson, Schnurr, Stevens, & Guthrie, 2004; Monson, Stevens, & Schnurr, 2005); family systems theory (Nelson Goff et al., 2006; Nelson & Wampler, 2000); secondary traumatic stress theory (Nelson Goff et al., 2006; Nelson Goff & Smith, 2005; Nelson, Wangsgaard, Yorgason, Kessler, & Carter-Vassol, 2002); traumatic stress theory (Nelson et al., 2002); the family stress model (Conger et al., 2002); and chaos theory (Remer, 2004).

Nelson Goff and Smith (2005) used secondary traumatic stress theory and the empirical literature regarding the impact of trauma on adult intimate relationships to create the couple adaptation to traumatic stress (CATS) model, which identifies the “primary and secondary trauma effects in individuals, as well as the interpersonal effects within the couple system” (Nelson Goff & Smith, 2005, p. 148). Although no research studies have been able to empirically prove the mechanisms through which a trauma history for one partner affects the intimate relationship, Nelson Goff and Smith (2005) suggest the following processes of transmission: chronic stress, attachment, identification and empathy, projective identification, and conflict and physiological responses.

Key Research Findings

Varying perspectives exist regarding the conceptualization of poverty as trauma or poverty as an example of stress (Cassiman, 2005; Wadsworth & Santiago, 2005). Although most studies regarding the impact of stress on intimate partner relationships is from white, middle-class families, two help shed light on other populations. A study by Cutorna, Russella, Abrahama, Garderna, Melbya, Bryanta, and Congera (2003) examined the impact of stress from neighborhood-level disadvantage and financial strain on rural and suburban African-American couples. This study found an unanticipated association between living in an economically disadvantaged neighborhood and higher marital quality, which the authors attributed to the results of "social comparison processes and degree of exposure to racially based discrimination" (Cutrona et al., 2003, p. 389). As anticipated, however, family financial strain appears to predict lower levels of perceived marital quality (Cutrona et al., 2003). Another examination of African-American families, including from rural and smaller
urban contexts, demonstrated a connection between economic hardship and the experience of economic pressure, which in turn contributed to emotional distress and problems within the intimate partner relationship (Conger, et al., 2002). Distress and problems within the caregiving relationship then negatively influence child outcomes (Cummings and Davies, 2002), demonstrating the potential for couples’ experiences of poverty-related stress to negatively influence the children’s health and well-being (Conger et al., 2002).

The majority of studies looking at the impact of trauma on intimate relationships use samples where at least one partner has experienced trauma in connection with military combat, political violence, chronic illness, or childhood abuse, with the majority of studies using samples of veterans and their partners (Monson & Taft, 2005). A variety of studies and reviews have highlighted the following difficulties in couples where one or both partners have a trauma history: problems with communication, expressing emotion, self-disclosure, sexual intimacy, family cohesion, hostility, aggression, and interpersonal violence (Calhoun & Wampler, 2002; Monson & Taft, 2005; Cook, Riggs, Thompson, Coyne, & Sheikh, 2004). Couples dealing with trauma also express greater levels of marital distress and are three to six times more likely to separate or divorce than couples without a history of trauma (Monson & Taft, 2005). However, Whiffen and Oliver (2004) point out that supportive adult intimate relationships can be a source of strength in recovering from traumatic experiences and identify three qualitative and two empirical studies that demonstrate this point.

Some studies have demonstrated the effects of specific types of trauma on intimate relationships. For instance, female childhood sexual abuse survivors may avoid intimate relationships as adults (Whiffen & Oliver, 2004) or in the context of intimate relationships express higher rates of conflict with and fear of their partners as well as difficulties with sexual intimacy (Follette & Pistorrello, 1995). Whisman (2006) examined the effects of seven types of childhood trauma on two specific marital outcomes, finding that childhood experiences of physical abuse, rape, or serious assault were all associated with a greater probability of marital disruption, while childhood experiences of rape and sexual molestation were associated with lower levels of marital satisfaction. For adult women who have survived a sexual assault, the event may disrupt an intimate relationship; however, there is research showing that the ability to communicate openly about the traumatic incident with an intimate partner can minimize its long-term effects (Whiffen & Oliver, 2004). In Oliver’s 1999 study on the effects of a child’s death on couples, one third of couples who have experienced a shared trauma, the death of a child, experience a significant disruption to their relationship; however, qualitative research shows that the quality of the relationship prior to the traumatic incident can determine the trauma’s potential impact (Oliver, 1999; Whiffen & Oliver, 2004).

A discussion of trauma’s impact on intimate relationships must differentiate between the effects of interpersonal violence within the couple relationship and the effects of one or both partner’s individual experiences of trauma on the couple relationship. While a sizable body of research examines interpersonal violence in the context of urban poverty, research on trauma and stress on the couple system focuses almost exclusively on white, middle-class families (Fein & Ooms, 2006; Conway & Hutson, 2008). Not only is living in an impoverished neighborhood associated with higher rates of interpersonal violence (Cunradi, 2000), but low-income women of color disproportionately experience more severe interpersonal violence (Benson & Fox, 2004; West, 2004). Intimate partner relationships in the context of urban poverty are thus doubly at risk of traumatization due to greater risk of trauma within the relationship and greater risk that an individual in the couple will experience trauma that in turn impacts the relationship.

Qualitative studies have helped identify the themes prevalent among intimate partners dealing with trauma, which include “increased communication, decreased communication, increased cohesion/connection, increased understanding, decreased understanding, sexual intimacy
problems, symptoms of relationship distress, support from partner and relationship resources” (Nelson Goff et al., 2006). Some qualitative research has indicated that there may be different patterns of relating between single-trauma couples (in which only one partner has a history of trauma), and dual-trauma couples (in which both do) (Nelson et al., 2002).

**Risk and Protective Factors**

Little of the research in this area has examined risk and protective factors that make couples more vulnerable or more resilient in the face of traumatic experiences. Nelson Goff and Smith (2005) applied the general trauma literature to couples and identified the following risk factors: multiple traumatic experiences, mental illness, poor coping responses, and severe trauma. The protective factors include positive coping strategies, high self-esteem, social support, and good physical health (Nelson Goff & Smith, 2005).

**Table 8.1: Risk and Protective Factors for Intimate Partner Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Protective Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple traumatic experiences</td>
<td>Social support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of mental illness</td>
<td>High self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor coping responses</td>
<td>Positive coping strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma-specific characteristics (severity, age at time of trauma, etc.)</td>
<td>Good physical and mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low relationship quality</td>
<td>Couple resources such as cohesion, adaptability, and shared power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Instruments**

The most frequently used assessment instrument measuring the impact of trauma within adult intimate relationships is the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) (Spanier, 1976). Studies have also used a variety of measures of relationship satisfaction and standardized instruments (See Appendices A and B).

**Interventions**

A variety of therapeutic interventions geared toward the couple subsystem within a family have been designed specifically to address issues of trauma. Although the following interventions have not yet been studied empirically, case studies indicate their potential positive impact: 1) emotionally focused couple therapy with trauma survivors, which is rooted in attachment theory (Johnson, 2002); 2) relational couple therapy for child survivors of trauma, which is based on object relations theory (Mazor, 2004); 3) critical interaction therapy, a nine-step therapy process developed for use with Vietnam veterans (Johnson, Feldman, & Lubin, 1995); and 4) a framework for couple therapy guided by the three clusters of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms (re-experiencing, avoidance, and arousal) (Sherman, Zanotti, & Jones, 2005).

Two types of couple-level interventions have been tested empirically. Directed therapeutic exposure (DTE) for couples was found to reduce some symptoms of PTSD, such as hypersensitivity and hyperarousal, although addition of behavioral family therapy did not further reduce these or other
symptoms in comparison to a control group (Glynn et al., 1999). In addition, a small empirical study showed the positive impact of cognitive behavioral couples therapy (CBCT) in cases where one partner is diagnosed with PTSD (Monson et al., 2004).

**Table 8.2: Interventions: Intimate Partner Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Name</th>
<th>Developer(s)</th>
<th>Essential Elements</th>
<th>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A framework for couples therapy developed for use with Vietnam veterans guided by the three clusters of PTSD symptoms: re-experiencing, avoidance and arousal</td>
<td>Sherman et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Describes how each cluster of PTSD impacts the relationships and then offers guidelines for intervention. <strong>Re-experiencing:</strong> to assist the veteran in teaching his partner how to support him during episodes, teach the couple a debriefing process to help deescalate the situation, and promote learning from the episode. <strong>Avoidance:</strong> to empower the couple to risk trust and openness with each other and negotiate how much of the trauma is shared in the relationship; encourage the pursuit of enjoyable activities, teaching interpersonal problem-solving skills. <strong>Increased arousal:</strong> to assist the couple in coping effectively with irritability and/or expressions of anger, teach conflict disengagement strategies, and educate the couple about anxiety management strategies and sleep hygiene tips.</td>
<td>Case studies demonstrated reduction of traumatic stress symptoms and improved relationship quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Behavioral Couples Therapy (CBCT)</td>
<td>Monson et al. (2004)</td>
<td>CBCT for PTSD includes 15 sessions with 3 phases of treatment: (1) treatment orientation and psychoeducation about PTSD and its related intimate relationship problems; (2) behavioral communication skills training; and (3) cognitive interventions.</td>
<td>Clinician and partner reports showed significant improvements in PTSD symptoms, while veterans denied reduction in PTSD symptoms but reported decreased depression and anxiety. Partners reported improved relationship satisfaction, while veteran reports remained the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Name</td>
<td>Developer(s)</td>
<td>Essential Elements</td>
<td>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Interaction Therapy</td>
<td>Johnson, Feldman, &amp; Lubin (1995)</td>
<td>Nine-step therapy process: (1) free discussion; (2) emergence of the critical interaction; (3) identifying the traumatic memory; (4) establishing the physical connection; (5) reporting the traumatic story; (6) linking trauma with current conflict; (7) checking in with spouse; (8) reviewing the critical interaction sequence; and (9) offering directives.</td>
<td>Through case reports, the developers found once the nascent mutuality of perspective within the couple was established, the couples could support each other in the relationship and family system, thereby reducing the trauma symptomatology or symptom formation within the family system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed Therapeutic Exposure (DTE) for couples</td>
<td>Boudewyns &amp; Shipley (1983)</td>
<td>18 twice-weekly sessions in 3 stages: (1) introduction and data gathering (2 sessions); re-exposure-cognitive restructuring (13-14 sessions); and (3) generalization training and termination (1-2 sessions).</td>
<td>Sample included 42 Vietnam veterans with PTSD and a family member (89% participated with their spouse or an intimate partner). DTE resulted in improvement of positive symptoms (such as hypersensitivity and hyperarousal), but no significant change in negative symptoms (such as avoidance and numbing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally Focused Couple Therapy (EFT)</td>
<td>Johnson &amp; Greenberg (1988)</td>
<td>EFT for trauma survivors follows 3 stages: (1) creation of stability and de-escalation of trauma symptoms and relationship distress; (2) restructuring of interactions to create the secure bonding that fosters relationship healing; and (3) integration of these changes into the life of the couple.</td>
<td>Meta-analysis of studies of EFT with “maritally distressed couples” (not necessarily trauma survivors) showed an effect size of 1.3, meaning that almost 90% of treated couples rated themselves better than controls following this intervention (Johnson et al., 1999). Although case studies indicate success with trauma survivors, no empirical studies reported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Treatment Name
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relational Couple Therapy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developer(s)</th>
<th>Essential Elements</th>
<th>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mazor (2004)</td>
<td>Based upon object relations theory, designed for use with couples with one partner who survived the Holocaust. Three phases of intervention: (1) developing a “containing therapeutic environment” to establish a sense of trust and secure relations with the therapist and, later on, within the couple bond; (2) relating each partner’s life/trauma story, increasing empathy, reducing automatic projections and fears of each other; (3) creating new responses and behaviors in the couple “that may extend the couple’s emotional system.”</td>
<td>Qualitative case studies indicate potential success of this intervention, but no empirical research has been reported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Conclusion and Comment

Cunradi et al. (2000) demonstrated that socio-environmental characteristics including poverty are associated with intimate partner violence. Other studies have shown the impact of trauma and poverty on intimate partner relationships can affect communication, understanding of one another, cohesion, sexual intimacy, partner support, and resources in the relationship (Nelson Goff et al., 2006). Patrick Calhoun and Tim Wampler (2002) note that in couples in which one partner is diagnosed with PTSD, the other partner often experiences stressors such as “crisis management, symptom management, social isolation, financial problems, strain on the family system and adjustment to the course of PTSD” (p. 17). These vicarious trauma effects are serious and well-documented for veterans, but not as well researched in other populations. Further, protective factors such as positive coping strategies and social support may help the couple strengthen resilience and build cohesive partner relationships within the context of poverty and trauma exposure. Empirically tested interventions include directed therapeutic exposure and cognitive behavior couples therapy. Interventions with potential include emotionally focused couple therapy, relational couple therapy, critical interaction therapy, and a framework for couple therapy focused on three PTSD symptoms. In sum, the experience of trauma in couples is often affected by socio-environmental (e.g., poverty, income, age, substance use, etc.) factors making some couples more vulnerable, and mediating the effects for others. The need for more empirically tested and effective interventions geared toward intimate partners is evident, as research demonstrates that trauma not only affects the family as a whole, but also its subsystems.
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Chapter 9

Impact of Trauma and Urban Poverty on Sibling Relationships

Outside of the parent-child relationship, siblings may represent a child’s most important and long-term relationships. Siblings may provide a protective function when parenting is compromised or when a child suffers a significant adverse life event. For families surviving poverty and chronic stressful situations, siblings may develop deep bonds of support centered on shared traumatic experiences. The strong sibling bond can also present opportunities for further trauma, for example, through effects of trauma experienced by one or more siblings (Alderfer, Labay, & Kazak, 2003). Traumatic loss of a sibling can be particularly difficult for children and result in higher rates of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) as well as other problems (Applebaum & Burns, 1991).

Theory

Several theoretical models have been used to explain the importance of sibling relationships, including psychoanalytic theory, family systems theory, family role theory, and social learning theory (Bank & Kahn, 1982). Brody (1998) explored the relationship between family experiences and sibling relationship quality and developed a model that included the following influential components: parent-child relationship quality; differential treatment of siblings by parents; parental management of sibling conflict; children’s individual behaviors and emotional regulation and coping skills; and family norms regarding aggression and fairness. Sibling relationships can also be understood in a theoretical model that places the early attachment to siblings in an object relations framework (Bank & Kahn, 1982). Within this framework, younger siblings may develop sibling attachments as strong and intense as those with parent figures. These attachments may result in positive outcomes from strong and supportive relationships with older siblings, or negative outcomes if older siblings are ambivalent, inconsistent, or abusive.

Key Research Findings

The influence of siblings on children’s behavior and development is just beginning to be understood. Research has yet to identify specific pathways for this influence above and beyond that of parenting. Deviant attitudes and behaviors in older siblings, when coupled with high levels of harsh-inconsistent and low levels of nurturing-involved parenting, were associated with conduct problems in younger siblings. This effect was stronger in children residing in disadvantaged neighborhoods (Brody et al., 2003). In another study, children who demonstrated good relationships with a friend or a sibling were less likely to demonstrate aggressive or disruptive behavior (McElwain & Volling, 2005).

Limited research exists on siblings who experience trauma, although some studies have explored the effect of family violence and conflict on sibling relationships. Graham-Bermann (1996) found that in families experiencing domestic violence, children expressed a heightened level of worry about family members including siblings. The presence of family stressors increased the risk of maltreatment to other siblings in families where abuse and maltreatment were reported. In the majority of these families, either the index child was scapegoated and no other children were maltreated, or all of the children were maltreated (Hamilton-Giachritsis & Browne, 2005). Maternal hostility was a mediating factor between marital conflict and sibling warmth and conflict, while paternal hostility was a mediating factor between marital conflict and sibling conflict/rivalry and problematic peer relationships (Stocker & Youngblade, 1999).
Additional studies highlight the impact of a sibling’s medical illness, injury or sudden death. A review of studies of siblings of children with a chronic illness found that the majority (60%) of studies reported an increased risk of negative outcomes for siblings; 30% found no increased risk; and 10% found both positive and negative outcomes (Williams, 1997). A study of adolescents grieving the sudden, violent death of a sibling demonstrated various grief reactions and changes in behavior up to 2 years after a sibling’s death (Lohan & Murphy, 2001). Furthermore, a study of siblings of burn victims showed better psychological adjustment for these siblings than the normative group, except in the area of social competence. Such findings show the possible benefits of coping with the experience of medical trauma in the family (Mancuso, Bishop, Blakeney, Robert, & Gaa, 2003).

**Risk and Protective Factors**

Affectionate or positive sibling relationships can mediate the effect of stressful life events on children. For example, affectionate sibling relationships mediated the effect of stressful life events on a child’s internalizing behavior even after controlling for mother-child relationship quality, although, sibling relationships were not predictive of internalizing behavior in the absence of stressful life events (Gass, Jenkins, & Dunn, 2007). Pike, Coldwell, and Dunn (2005) also found that the link between sibling relationship quality and children’s adjustment is not entirely mediated by the parent-child relationship. Sibling relationship quality was found to be linked to older (but not younger) siblings’ adjustment, and positive sibling relationships were linked to better individual adjustment, while negative sibling relationships were not linked to problem behaviors (Pike, Coldwell & Dunn, 2005). In addition, an older sibling’s behavioral willingness to use substances has been associated with a younger sibling’s future substance use (Pomery et al., 2005).

**Table 9.1: Risk and Protective Factors for Sibling Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Protective Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living in a high-risk neighborhood</td>
<td>Affectionate relationship with an older sibling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsh-inconsistent parenting</td>
<td>Positive parent-child relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional family stressors or marital conflict</td>
<td>Positive parenting practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of family cohesion and expressiveness</td>
<td>Good marital adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental depression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Instruments**

Instruments used to assess sibling relationships noted in the literature include: Sibling Relationship Inventory (Stocker & McHale, 1992); Sibling Injury Questionnaire; Maternal Interview of Sibling Relationships (adapted); Sibling Relationship Questionnaire (child report) (Buhrmester & Furman, 1990); coding team assessments of videotaped interactions between siblings (free play and sharing tasks) on measures of individual behavior and dyadic interactions; and the Berkeley Puppet Interview to obtain child report of sibling and parent-child relationships (Ablow & Measelle, 1993).
Two child self-report measures of sibling relationships are commonly used in research: the Sibling Relationship Inventory (SRI) and the Sibling Relationship Questionnaire (SRQ). The SRI is a 17-item measure structured in a standardized interview format to capture three dimensions: reflecting affection, hostility, and rivalry. The SRQ is a 48-item measure of a child’s relationship with one identified sibling. A parallel parent version is also used, and a shorter, 39-item version is also available. The instrument consists of 15 subscales: pro-social, maternal partiality, nurturance of sibling, nurturance by sibling, dominance of sibling, dominance by sibling, paternal partiality, affection, companionship, antagonism, similarity, intimacy, competition, admiration of sibling, admiration by sibling, and quarrelling. These scales can be used to derive four factors: warmth/closeness, relative status/power, conflict, and rivalry.

Interventions

Few interventions have been developed specifically to assist the siblings of individuals who have experienced trauma or to help heal sibling relationships affected by trauma. The majority of existing interventions focus specifically on medical trauma and have been developed to provide services and support to siblings of children with chronic illnesses. The Surviving Cancer Competently Intervention Program (SCCIP), developed by Kazak, Alderfer, Streisand, Simms, Rourke, Barakat, and others (2004), is one such intervention and consists of a 1-day, four-session intervention combining cognitive behavioral and family therapy approaches for family members, including siblings, of childhood cancer patients. Evaluations of this program showed no reduction in PTSD symptoms for siblings upon completion of the intervention, although fathers and adolescent cancer survivor showed some benefits (Kazak et al., 2004). Another example is Camp Okizu, developed by Packman, Fine, Chesterman, VanZutphen, Golan, and Amylon (2004), which offers siblings of children with cancer the chance to participate in week-long camp sessions that combine traditional camp activities with interventions aimed at building confidence and self-esteem in the face of serious illness in the family. Siblings who completed this intervention exhibited decreased anxiety, decreased PTSD symptoms, and increased self-esteem (Packman et al., 2004).

One study compared sibling play group therapy to filial therapy used in domestic violence shelters to assist child witnesses of domestic violence. Filial therapy was more effective than sibling play therapy in reducing behavioral problems and increasing in self-concept among child witnesses of domestic violence, as well as higher attitudes of acceptance and empathic behavior among mothers (Smith & Landreth, 2003). Sibling therapy has also been used in the inpatient setting to help rebuild a sibling relationship that was severely damaged by extreme physical and emotional abuse at the hands of the biological mother (McGarvey & Haen, 2005). In this study, therapy helped with issues of survivor guilt, self-worth and sibling relationship quality.

Table 9.2: Interventions: Sibling Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Name</th>
<th>Developer(s)</th>
<th>Essential Elements</th>
<th>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surviving Cancer Competently Program (SCCIP)</td>
<td>Kazak et al. (2004)</td>
<td>For children of siblings with cancer. One-day, 4 session intervention using cognitive behavioral and family therapy approaches.</td>
<td>No reduction in PTS symptoms for siblings although some positive results for other family members (Kazak et al., 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Name</td>
<td>Developer(s)</td>
<td>Essential Elements</td>
<td>Research Evidence &amp; Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Okizu</td>
<td>Packman et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Week-long day camp for siblings of children with cancer that also offers traditional camp activities. Goal is to provide these siblings with “peer interaction to validate their feelings as normal in the context of serious illness in the family and to bolster their self-confidence and esteem”.</td>
<td>Statistically significant differences found for all sibling self-report measures. No significant group differences on demographic variables (sibling age, grade, ethnicity, mother or father education, or income).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion and Comment**

The effect of the relationship between siblings is complicated by the relationship itself, whether the siblings experience it as strong and supportive or ambivalent, inconsistent, or abusive. Furthermore, the sibling relationship, its effects, and the siblings’ experience of it are affected by the birth order, relationship with parent(s), conflict, individual behavior, emotion regulation and coping skills, and trauma. While there is little research on the relationship of siblings and trauma exposure, we can conclude that family violence and conflict and serious illness or death of a sibling are each associated with an increased risk of negative outcomes. Some siblings experience positive outcomes following trauma exposure. Risk factors include living in a high-risk neighborhood, harsh/inconsistent parenting, family stress, marital conflict, lack of cohesion and expressiveness and parental depression. Affectionate relationship with sibling, positive relationship with parent(s), positive parenting practices, and good marital adjustment can mediate trauma’s effect on sibling relationships. Developed interventions for siblings who have faced trauma focus on medical traumas. Among therapies used to treat children exposed to trauma, filial therapy and sibling play therapy demonstrate an ability to increase positive behaviors, coping and adjustment.

**References**


Families living in urban poverty encounter multiple traumas. Access to resources, including mental health intervention, is critical for recovery, stability and growth. Families living in urban poverty are less likely than families living in more affluent communities to have access to the services and capital resources that may facilitate successful negotiation of their traumatic experiences, but they often utilize relational resources within the family and community to provide essential protection and support needed for recovery from posttraumatic stress. Nurturing, protective and supportive relationships between parents, intimate partners, siblings and extended family members as well as with neighbors and faith-based groups increase the safety and stability of family functioning needed for recovery and growth. Risk factors contributing to family instability generally include prior individual or family psychiatric history, history of other previous traumas or adverse childhood experiences, pile-up of life stressors, severity/chronicity of traumatic experiences, conflictual or violent family interactions, and lack of social support. When families face significant risks, including limited resources, their ability to adapt is comprised and they are at risk of becoming trauma-organized systems.

Research demonstrates that all levels of the family system are impacted the risks associated with chronic exposure to trauma and stressors:

- **Individual** distress can range from transient symptoms to Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) to more complex trauma-related disorders, with the potential to disrupt functioning across multiple domains.
- The **family as a whole** is impacted by chronic conditions of high stress and exposure to multiple traumas and families often experience chaotic, disorganized lifestyles, inconsistent and/or conflicted relationships, and crisis-oriented coping.
- Research on **intergenerational trauma** and urban poverty has demonstrated that adults with histories of childhood abuse and exposure to family violence have problems with emotional regulation, aggression, social competence, and interpersonal relationships, leading to functional impairments in parenting which transmit to the next generation.
- Within the **parent-child relationship**, compromised attachment and mistrust may stem from parental withdrawal/worry and re-enactment of abandonment/betrayal themes.
- Though trauma may not affect the **parenting practices** of all parents, the experiences of chronic trauma and the stress associated with urban poverty have been associated with decreased parental effectiveness, less warmth, limited understanding of child development and needs, increased use of corporal punishment and harsh discipline, high incidents of neglect, and an overall strategy of reactive parenting.
- Some research indicates that supportive **intimate partner relationships** can be a source of strength in coping with a traumatic experience or dealing with the stress of poverty, but the majority focuses on difficulties faced by couples who have experienced trauma, such as problems with communication, difficulty expressing emotion, struggles with sexual intimacy, and high rates of hostility, aggression and interpersonal violence.
- **Sibling relationships** may become negative and conflictual depending on the quality of individual parent-child relationships, differential treatment of siblings by parents, parental management of sibling conflict, individual children’s behavior and emotional regulation and coping skills, and family norms regarding aggression and fairness.

Repeated exposures can lead to severe and chronic reactions in multiple family members with effects that ripple throughout the family system and, ultimately, society.
In summary, living under chronically harsh, traumatic circumstances erodes parental functioning, parent-child relationships and family processes. This erosion jeopardizes families’ ability to make use of structured treatment approaches and limits success of treatments that require family support. Availability of trauma-specific assessments varies across the family system, and there are no instruments designed specifically to assess the influence of trauma and urban poverty on families. For this reason, an assessment of family subsystems is recommended using multiple tools that have adequate reliability and validity for measuring specific subsystem impacts. Family treatments sensitive to the traumatic context of urban poverty, inclusive of engagement strategies that incorporate alliances with primary and extended family systems and that build family coping skills and acknowledge cultural variations in family roles and functions, are needed to adequately address the needs of families living in urban poverty experiencing chronic trauma. More research is needed to better understand how to design and deliver family-centered trauma treatments that engage families in change processes that effect positive outcomes for all their members.
### Appendix A: FITT Assessment Table

#### Assessment of Impact on the Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Instrument</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Domains Assessed</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</th>
<th>Where to obtain</th>
<th>Psychometric Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Events Screening Inventory for Children – Brief Form (TESI-C-Brief) &amp; Parent Report (TESI-PR)</td>
<td>Ribbe, 1996; Ford et al., 2000</td>
<td>A measure of experiencing and witnessing of traumatic events for children. TESI-C-Brief covers 16 categories of events arranged hierarchically.</td>
<td>3-18 years</td>
<td>Interview format or as self-report; parent-report</td>
<td>Link to PDF at NCPTSD: <a href="http://www.ncptsd.va.gov/ncmain/ncdocs/assmnts/traumatic_events_screening_inventory_tesi.html">http://www.ncptsd.va.gov/ncmain/ncdocs/assmnts/traumatic_events_screening_inventory_tesi.html</a></td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma Exposure Screening Inventory - Parent Report Revised (TESI-PRR)</td>
<td>Ghosh et al., 2002</td>
<td>A measure of experiencing and witnessing of traumatic events for young children. Includes traumas more frequently occurring to young children (i.e., animal attacks, prolonged or sudden separations and intense family conflict).</td>
<td>0-6 years</td>
<td>Interview format or parent-report</td>
<td>Request from: <a href="mailto:Chandra.ghosh@ucsf.edu">Chandra.ghosh@ucsf.edu</a></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Exposure Scale for Children - Preschool Version (VEX-PV)</td>
<td>Fox &amp; Leavitt, 1995</td>
<td>A measure of experiencing and witnessing of traumatic events for young children.</td>
<td>4-10 years</td>
<td>Interview format with children</td>
<td>Request from: Ariana Shahinfar, Ph.D.; Department of Psychology; University of North Carolina - Charlotte; 9201 University City Blvd.; Charlotte, NC 28223</td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Exposure Scale for Children-Preschool Version-Revised Parent Report (VEX-RPR)</td>
<td>Fox &amp; Leavitt, 1995</td>
<td>This measure asks questions related to violence exposure.</td>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>Interview format with parents</td>
<td>Request from: Ariana Shahinfar, Ph.D.; Department of Psychology; University of North Carolina - Charlotte; 9201 University City Blvd.; Charlotte, NC 28223; Cost: Free</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinician Administered PTSD Scale for Children (CAPS-CA)</td>
<td>Nader et al., 1994</td>
<td>A measure of DSM IV diagnostic criteria for PTSD that determines exposure to events meeting DSM-IV criterion, frequency and intensity for the 17 symptoms in criteria B, C, and D, and criterion E, the 1-month duration requirement.</td>
<td>8-15 years</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>Request from National Center for PTSD: <a href="http://www.ncptsd.va.gov/ncmain/assessment/assessmnt_request_form.html">http://www.ncptsd.va.gov/ncmain/assessment/assessmnt_request_form.html</a> OR Purchase from Western Psychological Services; Cost: Informal version free from NCPTSD. From publisher: $104.50 initial kit. $3.80/ interview booklet (pkgs of 10)</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School Age Children – Present (K-SADS-P/L)</td>
<td>Kaufman, Birmaher, Brent, Rao, Ryan, 1995</td>
<td>Diagnostic interview keyed to DSM-IV.</td>
<td>6-18 years</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>Varies by version, but the following link provides information for access: http:\www.wpic.pitt.edu\Ksads; Cost: Free for research and not-for-profit clinical use.</td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and validity (as specifically related to PTSD diagnoses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA PTSD Index for DSM-IV</td>
<td>Pynoos et al., 1998</td>
<td>Instrument keyed to DSM-IV PTSD symptoms for youth who report traumatic stress experiences.</td>
<td>7-12 years</td>
<td>Self-report or interview format; parent report version also exists.</td>
<td>Request from: UCLA PTSD Index for DSM-IV: UCLA Trauma Psychiatry Service; 300 Medical Plaza; Los Angeles, CA 90095-6968. Phone: (310) 206-8973 Email: <a href="mailto:HFinley@mednet.ucla.edu">HFinley@mednet.ucla.edu</a></td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma Symptom Checklist for Children (TSCC)</td>
<td>Briere, 1996</td>
<td>A measure of PTSD and related symptoms, including those related to complex trauma disorders [41]. TSCC comprises 2 validity scales and 6 clinical subscales (Anxiety, Depression, Anger, Posttraumatic Stress, Sexual Concerns, Dissociation).</td>
<td>8-16 years</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Psychological Assessment Resources</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children (TSCYC)</td>
<td>Briere, 2000</td>
<td>The instrument contains eight clinical scales: Posttraumatic Stress-Intrusion (PTSI), Posttraumatic Stress-Avoidance (PTS-AV), Posttraumatic Stress-Arousal (PTS-AR), Sexual Concerns (SC), Dissociation (DIS), Anxiety (ANX), Depression (DEP), and Anger/Aggression (ANG).</td>
<td>3-12 years</td>
<td>Caregiver report</td>
<td>Psychological Assessment Resources</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Semi-Structured Interview and Observational Record</td>
<td>Scheeringa &amp; Zeanah, 1994</td>
<td>Interview and observation of the primary caretaker and the child, includes interview for caregiver's own PTSD symptoms. Symptoms measured by the interview include those similar to the Diagnostic Classification of Mental and Developmental Disorders in Infancy and Early Childhood (DC: 0–3). Includes 18 DSM-IV criteria.</td>
<td>0-7 years</td>
<td>Parent administered interviews by highly trained clinician</td>
<td>Contact author: Michael Scheeringa 1440 Canal Street, TB52 Tidewater Building, 10th Floor New Orleans, LA 70112 OR <a href="mailto:mscheer@tulane.edu">mscheer@tulane.edu</a></td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and validity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths - Trauma Exposure and Adaptation Version (CANS-TEA)</td>
<td>Lyons, 2009</td>
<td>Assesses 12 areas: Trauma History, Traumatic Stress Symptoms, Regulation of Emotions, Regulation of Behavior, Other Behavioral Health Concerns, Attachment Difficulties, Problem Modifiers, Stability of Social Environment, Child Strengths, Functioning, Acculturation.</td>
<td>4-18 years</td>
<td>Clinician administered interview</td>
<td>Contact: Melanie Buddin Lyons; phone: 847-501-5113; fax: 847-501-5291; email: <a href="mailto:Mlyons405@aol.com">Mlyons405@aol.com</a></td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and validity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL)</td>
<td>Achenbach &amp; Edelbrock, 1991</td>
<td>The instrument measures 8-9 subscales that can be collapsed into Internalizing, Externalizing, and a Total Problem Score.</td>
<td>6-18 years; 1.5 - 5 year forms also available</td>
<td>Primary caregiver report</td>
<td>ASEBA</td>
<td>Well validated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Appraisal of Individual Needs - Short Screener (GAIN-SS)</td>
<td>Dennis, Feeney, Stevens, &amp; Bedoya, 2006</td>
<td>The GAIN-SS is designed to screen general populations to quickly and accurately identify adolescents &amp; adults as having 1+ behavioral health disorders and a need for referral to some part of the behavioral health treatment system. It also serves as an easy-to-use quality assurance tool across diverse field-assessment systems for staff with minimal training or direct supervision. Can serve as a periodic measure of change over time in behavioral health.</td>
<td>Teens &amp; adults</td>
<td>Self or staff administration with paper and pen, on a computer, or on the web.</td>
<td>Available from: <a href="http://www.chestnut.org/LI/gain/GAIN_SS/index.html">http://www.chestnut.org/LI/gain/GAIN_SS/index.html</a></td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Inventory for Functioning</td>
<td>Hodges, 2003</td>
<td>Assesses 10 domains of functioning (school/job, feelings, home life, dealing with bad feelings, family life, alcohol and drugs, friends, thinking, neighborhood, health)</td>
<td>Teens &amp; parents</td>
<td>Computer self-administered interview</td>
<td>Unable to locate</td>
<td>Unable to locate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Assessment System for Children - Second Edition (BASC-2)</td>
<td>Reynolds &amp; Kamphaus, 2004</td>
<td>Behaviors, thoughts, emotions; also adaptive &amp; maladaptive behaviors in home, school, and community settings</td>
<td>2 years - 21 years, 11 mo</td>
<td>Self-report, teacher rating, parent rating, structured developmental history, classroom observation</td>
<td>Pearson Assessment</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Interview for Disorders of Extreme Stress</td>
<td>Pelcovitz, van der Kolk, Roth, Mandel, Kaplan, &amp; Resick, 1997</td>
<td>Complex PTSD may not be fully normed: regulation of affect and impulses, attention or consciousness, self-perception, perception of the perpetrator, relations with others, somatization, systems of meaning</td>
<td>Teens &amp; adults</td>
<td>Structured interview, self report version also available</td>
<td>The Trauma Center at JRI: <a href="http://www.traumacenter.org/products/instruments.php">http://www.traumacenter.org/products/instruments.php</a></td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment of Impact on the Adult Family Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Instrument</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Domains Assessed</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</th>
<th>Where to obtain</th>
<th>Psychometric Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, observation, lab, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV, PTSD module (SCID-PTSD)</td>
<td>First, Spitzer, Gibbon, &amp; Williams, 1996</td>
<td>Diagnostic criteria for PTSD</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Structured diagnostic interview</td>
<td>The Clinician Version of the SCID-I (SCID-CV), and the SCID-II, may be purchased from American Psychiatric Press (800-368-5777). Cost: Clinician's version, $167 initial kit (administration booklet, 5 score sheets, user's guide). $13.20/ score sheet (pkg of 5)</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity (as specifically related to diagnoses of PTSD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, observation, lab, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ)</td>
<td>Bernstein &amp; Fink, 1998</td>
<td>Caregiver history of abuse/neglect during childhood. The scale assesses three types of abuse (Emotional, Physical, Sexual), two types of neglect (Emotional, Physical), plus 2 validity scales.</td>
<td>12 and over</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Pearson Assessment</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma Symptom Inventory (TSI)</td>
<td>Briere, 1995</td>
<td>Measure of trauma symptoms. The TSI comprises 3 validity scales and 9 clinical scales (anxious arousal, depression, anger/ irritability, intrusive experiences, defensive avoidance, dissociation, sexual concerns, dysfunctional sexual behavior, impaired self-reference, tension reduction behavior).</td>
<td>Adults (18 years+)</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Psychological Assessment Resources 800.331.8378</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Stressor Checklist-Revised</td>
<td>Wolfe, Kimerling, Brown, Chrestman, &amp; Levin, 2003</td>
<td>Questionnaire about stressful life events. Covers disasters, accidents, incarceration, foster/adoption, parental divorce, financial problems, physical or mental illnesses, victim of crimes, child abuse, neglect, miscarriage or abortion, separation from your child, grief, etc.</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Write to: Rachel Kimerling, PhD; Education Division National Center for PTSD; VA Palo Alto Health Care System; Building 334-PTSD; 795 Willow Road; Menlo Park, CA 94025</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, observation, lab, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttraumatic Stress Diagnostic Scale (PDS)</td>
<td>Foa, Cashman, Jaycox, &amp; Perry, 1997</td>
<td>PTSD diagnosis, symptom severity score, symptom severity rating, level of impairment in functioning</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Pearson Assessment</td>
<td>Cost: $64 starter kit (manual, 1 booklet, 10 answer sheets, 10 worksheets). Reorder kit $150 (50 answer sheets, 50 worksheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)</td>
<td>Derogatis, 1993</td>
<td>Inventory of psychological symptoms. The BSI yields three global indices of distress, Global Severity Index (GSI) and nine subscales including Anxiety, Depression, Hostility, Obsessive-Compulsive, Somatization, Interpersonal Sensitivity, Phobic Anxiety, Paranoid Ideation, Psychoticism.</td>
<td>13 and over</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Pearson Assessment</td>
<td>Cost: $109 initial kit (manual, 50 answer sheets, 50 profile forms). $1.15/answer sheet (pkg of 50). $0.53/profile form (pkg of 50).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAGE</td>
<td>Ewing, 1984</td>
<td>Measures problems related to alcohol or drug abuse.</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Available in the public domain (Can access via online search engine by entering &quot;CAGE and Ewing.&quot;)</td>
<td>Cost: Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, observation, lab, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck Depression Inventory II (BDI-II)</td>
<td>Beck, Steer, &amp; Brown, 1996</td>
<td>Depression severity, 4 point scale, multiple symptoms: sadness, pessimism, past failure, loss of pleasure, guilty feelings, punishing feelings, self-dislike, self-criticism, suicidal thoughts, crying, agitation, loss of interest, indecisiveness, worthlessness, loss of energy, changes in sleep, irritability, changes in appetite, concentration, tiredness or fatigue</td>
<td>13 and over</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Pearson Assessment</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck Anxiety Inventory</td>
<td>Beck &amp; Steer, 1993</td>
<td>Severity of Anxiety, 4 point scale: cognitive and physiological symptoms</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Pearson Assessment</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg Sleep Quality Index</td>
<td>Buysse, Reynolds III, Monk, Berman, &amp; Kupfer, 2000</td>
<td>Sleep quality during the previous month; distinguish between good and poor sleepers. Domains include subjective sleep quality, sleep latency, sleep duration, habitual sleep efficiency, sleep disturbances, use of sleep medications and daytime dysfunction.</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Self-Report and Partner Report</td>
<td>Link - University of Pittsburgh Sleep Medicine Institute: <a href="http://www.sleep.pitt.edu/content.asp?id=1484&amp;subid=2316">http://www.sleep.pitt.edu/content.asp?id=1484&amp;subid=2316</a></td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, observation, lab, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiction Severity Index</td>
<td>McLellan, Luborski, Cacciola, Griffith, McGrahan, O’Brien, 1979</td>
<td>History, frequency, and consequences of drug and alcohol use. 5 other domains: medical, legal, employment, social/family, and psychological functioning. Rating scale of 0-4</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Face-to-face structured interview</td>
<td>Download from: <a href="http://www.tresearch.org/resources/instruments.htm#top">http://www.tresearch.org/resources/instruments.htm#top</a></td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissociative Experiences Scale, II</td>
<td>Bernstein-Carlson, &amp; Putnam, 1993</td>
<td>Help patients identify psychopathology and quantify dissociative experiences: memory, identity, cognition, feelings of derealization, depersonalization, absorption, imaginative involvement. Ranges from never (0%) to always (100%).</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Order from Sidran Institute: <a href="http://www.sidran.org/">http://www.sidran.org/</a></td>
<td>Cost: $12, unlimited use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment of Impact on the Family as a Whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Instrument</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Domains Assessed</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</th>
<th>Where to obtain</th>
<th>Psychometric Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Empowerment Scale</td>
<td>Koren, DeChillo, &amp; Friesen, 1992</td>
<td>Assesses parent and caregiver beliefs regarding their roles and responsibilities in addition to how they provide advocacy for their child.</td>
<td>18 and up</td>
<td>Caregiver report</td>
<td>Portland State University Link: <a href="http://www.rtc.pdx.edu">www.rtc.pdx.edu</a> Search publications for “Family Empowerment Scale”</td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self-report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale (FACES IV)</td>
<td>Olson, Gorall, &amp; Tiesel, 2007</td>
<td>Based on the Circumplex model. Revised version includes six subscales: two assess the mid-ranges of adaptability and cohesion, and four assess the extremes (rigid, chaotic, disengaged, and enmeshed).</td>
<td>12 and up</td>
<td>Self-administered instrument, each family member can complete</td>
<td>Life Innovations Link: <a href="http://www.facesiv.com/">http://www.facesiv.com/</a> Cost: $95 FACES IV package with unlimited use</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Assessment Device (FAD)</td>
<td>Epstein, Baldwin, &amp; Bishop, 1983</td>
<td>Designed to measure family functioning based upon the McMaster Model. The instrument provides scores for 7 scales, including problem-solving, communication, roles, affective responsiveness, affective involvement, behavior control, and overall functioning.</td>
<td>12 and up</td>
<td>Self-administered instrument</td>
<td>Brown University/Butler Hospital Family Research Program. Email: <a href="mailto:familyresearch@lifespan.org">familyresearch@lifespan.org</a> Cost: $41.95 for book, <em>Evaluating and Treating Families</em>, which includes permission to make copies of measure</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Processes</td>
<td>Smith, Prinz, Dumas, &amp; Laughlin, 2001</td>
<td>Cohesion, Structure, Beliefs, Defiant Beliefs</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Self-administered instrument</td>
<td>Unable to locate</td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APGAR</td>
<td>Smilkstein, 1978</td>
<td>Measure assesses a family member’s perception of satisfaction with family relationships including five dimensions: Adaptability, Partnership, Growth, Affection, and Resolve.</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Self-administered instrument</td>
<td>Available in the public domain. Also included in the original reference. Cost: Free</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Advocacy and Support Tool (FAST)</td>
<td>Lyons, 2005</td>
<td>The Family Assessment and Support Tool (FAST) is the family version of the Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS) for family of planning and outcome management tools. It has 4 domains: Family Together, Caregiver’s Status, Youth’s Status, and Advocacy Status.</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Clinician administrated</td>
<td>Available from the Buddin Praed Foundation. Direct link to measure: <a href="http://www.praedfoundation.org/About%20the%20FAST.html">http://www.praedfoundation.org/About%20the%20FAST.html</a></td>
<td>New or promising measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Crisis Oriented Personal Evaluation Scales (F-COPES)</td>
<td>McCubbin, Olson, &amp; Larsen, 1991</td>
<td>Five subscales: obtaining social support, redefinition of the problem, seeking spiritual support, mobilization of the family to obtain and accept formal support, passive appraisal of the crisis.</td>
<td>Family members age 12+</td>
<td>Self-administered</td>
<td>Unable to locate</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Inventory for Family Assessment</td>
<td>Werner &amp; Green, 1996</td>
<td>Assesses cohesion-enmeshment domain of family functioning re: intrusiveness (blurring or violation of boundaries) and closeness-caregiving (relationship-enhancing behaviors such as warmth and nurturance). Assesses dyadic relationship behavior (e.g., wife-husband; brother-sister) rather than behavior at the level of the family as a whole.</td>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>Self administered</td>
<td>Link to access manual: <a href="http://sites.google.com/site/californiainventoryforfamilyassessment/">http://sites.google.com/site/californiainventoryforfamilyassessment/</a></td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment of Impact on Intergenerational Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Instrument</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Domains Assessed</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</th>
<th>Where to obtain</th>
<th>Psychometric Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative questions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Examples of possible qualitative questions include: “When you think back to your childhood, what sorts of traumatic events did your parent(s), grandparent(s), or primary caregiver(s) experience? Please explain each person’s experience with a traumatic event” and “How did your parents(s), grandparent(s), or primary caregiver(s) respond, deal with or manage their feelings regarding the traumatic event?”</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Attachment Interview</td>
<td>George, Kaplan, &amp; Main, 1985</td>
<td>Adult strategies for identifying, preventing, and protecting the self from perceived dangers, particularly those associated with intimate relationships</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Stony Brook Attachment Lab; Link: <a href="http://www.psychology.sunysb.edu/attachment/measures/measures_index.html">http://www.psychology.sunysb.edu/attachment/measures/measures_index.html</a></td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Stress Schedule (TSS)</td>
<td>Norris, 1990</td>
<td>For use with general population and measures essential information about potentially traumatic events. Excludes emotional abuse and neglect.</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Brief interview</td>
<td>Embedded within original reference (Norris, 1990). Also, can contact author directly: <a href="mailto:Fran.Norris@dartmouth.edu">Fran.Norris@dartmouth.edu</a></td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessment of Impact on Parent-Child Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Instrument</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Domains Assessed</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</th>
<th>Where to obtain</th>
<th>Psychometric Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Child Conflict Tactic Scales (CTSPC-CA)</td>
<td>Straus, Hamby, Finkelhor, Moore, Runyan, 1995</td>
<td>Measures the frequency of parents’ behavior related to discipline, aggression, assault, neglect, and sexual abuse and the extent to which parents carried out specific acts of physical or psychological aggression, regardless of whether or not the child is injured.</td>
<td>Rec. for children 11 and younger, but can be used with teens</td>
<td>Child respondent, interviewer administered for pre-teens, self-report for older teens</td>
<td>Copyrighted, permission required for use. Information link: <a href="http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS24D.pdf">http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS24D.pdf</a></td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Child Conflict Tactic Scales (CTS PC)</td>
<td>Straus, Hamby, Finkelhor, Moore, Runyan, 1998</td>
<td>Areas assessed: Nonviolent discipline, physical assault, neglect, psychological aggression, weekly discipline, &amp; sexual abuse. Focuses on parent's experiences with their child, but also asks about parent's own experiences as a child.</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Parent self-report or interview</td>
<td>Western Psychological Services</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire – Child Version (PARQ – child)</td>
<td>Rohner, Saaredra, &amp; Granum, 1979</td>
<td>Designed to measure the way their mothers treat them in terms of 4 scales: warmth and affection; hostility and aggression; indifference and neglect; undifferentiated rejection.</td>
<td>Child age 6 - 15</td>
<td>Child self-report</td>
<td>Rohner Research Publications</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Name</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Examiner</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Parenting Relationship Questionnaire          | Kamphaus & Reynolds, 2006 | Indices: Attachment, Communication, Discipline Practices, Involvement, Parenting Confidence, Satisfaction with School, Relational Frustration. Also has a faking good scale. | Age 2:0 - 18:11 | Primary caregiver self-report | Pearson Assessment  
Cost: $132.85 initial kit (manual, 25 forms each of preschool, school-age, & parent feedback forms). $1.28/hand-scored forms (25 per pkg) | Not reported. More detailed information may be available in manual. |
Cost: Free | Not reported |
## Assessment of Impact on Parenting Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Instrument</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Domains Assessed</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</th>
<th>Where to obtain</th>
<th>Psychometric Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Stress Index (PSI)</td>
<td>Abidin, 1990</td>
<td>Parental distress (contributing parental factors), difficult child (contributing child factors), parent-child dysfunction interaction</td>
<td>Parents of children 1 mo to 12 yr</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Psychological Assessment Resources</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost: Full: $175 initial kit (manual, 10 reusable booklets, 25 forms); Short: $122 initial kit (manual, 25 forms); $2.72/form (25 per pkg)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost: Free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Report of Parenting Behavior Inventory (CRPBI-30)</td>
<td>Schludermann &amp; Schludermann, 1988</td>
<td>Measures 3 dimensions of parenting Acceptance, Psychological Control, and Firm Control/Discipline.</td>
<td>For older children and teens</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Available in the public domain. Can also contact first author Eduard Schludermann: <a href="mailto:schlude@ms.umanitoba.ca">schlude@ms.umanitoba.ca</a></td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost: Free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse Potential Inventory</td>
<td>Milner, 1980</td>
<td>Purpose is to screen for suspected physical child abuse cases. Possesses 6 factor scales: distress, rigidity, unhappiness, problems w/child &amp; self, problems w/family, and problems w/others. It also contains 3 validity scales: Lie, random response, &amp; inconsistency.</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Psychological Assessment Resources</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost: $180 initial kit (manuals, 10 booklets and various scoring sheets); $2.80/booklet and $0.50 scoring sheets (10 per pkg)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Practices Scale</td>
<td>Strayhorn &amp; Weidman, 1988</td>
<td>Measure favorable and unfavorable parenting such as how much approval and disapproval the parent gives the child, how and when the child is punished, etc. Three scales, positive and negative parenting practices, total score.</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Link (includes different versions): <a href="http://www.psypsych.com/parpractices.htm">http://www.psypsych.com/parpractices.htm</a></td>
<td>Cost: Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Dimensions Inventory-Short Version (PDI-S)</td>
<td>Power, 2002</td>
<td>Measure of parenting style. Eight dimensions are measured resulting in two scales: warmth and strictness.</td>
<td>Parents of children age 3-12</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Contact first author: <a href="mailto:tompower@wsu.edu">tompower@wsu.edu</a></td>
<td>Cost: Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment of Impact on Intimate Partner Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Instrument</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Domains Assessed</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</th>
<th>Where to obtain</th>
<th>Psychometric Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS)</td>
<td>Spanier, 1976</td>
<td>Measure of intimate partner relationships. It assesses four areas: Dyadic consensus, Dyadic satisfaction, Dyadic cohesion, and Affectional expression.</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Self report</td>
<td>Multi-Health Systems</td>
<td>Well validated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost: $35 (manual); $2.25 per Quikscore form (pkgs of 20). Computer scoring also available for $3 per profile report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)</td>
<td>Strauss, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, &amp; Sugarman, 1996</td>
<td>Scales measuring the physical and psychological attacks on a partner in a marital, cohabiting, or dating relationship. Also looks at use of reasoning or negotiation to deal with conflicts. Scales include: physical assault, psychological aggression, negotiation, and injury &amp; sexual coercion.</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Western Psychological Services</td>
<td>Well validated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost: $54.50 for the handbook; $1.70 per form (pkgs of 25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Violence Inventory (PVI)</td>
<td>Bernstein, 1998</td>
<td>Assesses physical, sexual, &amp; emotional assault, partner drug &amp; alcohol abuse, mutual physical fights, warmth &amp; affection, and minimization of problems</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Unable to locate</td>
<td>New or promising measure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment of Impact on Sibling Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Instrument</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Domains Assessed</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</th>
<th>Where to obtain</th>
<th>Psychometric Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Relationship Questionnaire</td>
<td>Buhrmester &amp; Furman, 1990</td>
<td>Measure includes 16 scales that represent four factors: warmth/closeness; status/power; conflict; and rivalry.</td>
<td>6-18 years</td>
<td>Self-report by child about one identified sibling; Parent report also available</td>
<td>Contact first author, Wyndol Furman: <a href="mailto:wfurman@du.edu">wfurman@du.edu</a> Cost: Free, with permission</td>
<td>Strong evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Instrument</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Domains Assessed</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Source/Form (self report, lab, observation, other)</td>
<td>Where to obtain</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Relationship Inventory</td>
<td>Stocker &amp; McHale, 1992</td>
<td>Three factor structure: affection, hostility, and rivalry.</td>
<td>6-18 years</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Contact first author, Clare Stocker: <a href="mailto:cstocker@du.edu">cstocker@du.edu</a> Cost: Free</td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Tactic Scales - SP</td>
<td>Strauss, Hamby, Finkelhor, Boney-McCoy, &amp; Sugarman, 1995</td>
<td>For use with children to describe conflict tactics with a sibling. Half items relate to respondents behavior towards sibling, half relate to siblings behavior towards respondent.</td>
<td>Children and teens</td>
<td>Self-report or interview format</td>
<td>Copyrighted, permission required for use. Information link: <a href="http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS24D.pdf">http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS24D.pdf</a> Cost: Free, with permission</td>
<td>Some evidence for reliability and validity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Additional assessments found in the literature

Adult Assessment Instruments

- Anxiety Disorders Interview Schedule-Revised (Di Nardo, P.A. & Barlow D.H., 1988)
- Automatic Thoughts Questionnaire (Hollon, S.D. & Kendall, P.C., 1980)
- Changes in Religious Beliefs Scale (Falsetti, 1992)
- Davidson Trauma Scale (Davidson, J.R.T., Book, S.W., Colket, J.T., Tupler, L.A., Roth, S., David, D., et al., 1997)
- Distressing Event Questionnaire (Kubany, E.S., Leisen, M.B., & Kaplan, A.S., 2000)
- Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale (Schwarzer, R. & Jerusalem, M., 1995)
- Impact of Event Scale-Revised (Horowitz, M., Wilner, N., & Alvarez, W., 1979)
- Keane PTSD Scale of the MMPI Form R (Keane, T.M., Malloy, P.F., & Fairbank, J.A., 1984)
- List of Threatening Experiences (Brugha, T., Bebbington, P., Tennant, C., & Hurry, J., 1985)
- Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)
- Mississippi Scale for Combat-Related PTSD (Keane, T.M., Caddell, J.M., & Taylor, K.L., 1988)
- Part II of the Hopkins Symptom Checklist (Derogatis, L.R., Lipman, R.S., Rickels, K., Uhlenhuth, E.H., & Covi, L., 1974)
- Resiliency Attitudes Scale (Bischoe, B. & Harris, B. 1994)
- Satisfaction with Life (caregiver) (Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J., & Griffon, S., 1985)
- Self-harm Behavior Questionnaire (Gutierrez, P.M., Osman, A., Barrios, F.X., Kopper, B.A., 2001)
- Trauma History Questionnaire (Green, B.L., 1996)
- Twenty Statement Test (Kuhn, M.H. & McPartland, T.S., 1954)
- UCLA PTSD Reaction Index (Pynoos, R.S., Rodriguez, N., Steinberg, A.S., Stuber, M. & Frederick, C, 1998)
- University of Rhode Island Change Assessment (DiClemente, C. C., & Hughes, S. O., 1990)
- Working Alliance Inventory (Horvath, A. O. & Greenberg, L. S., 1989)
- Schema Questionnaire (Young, J., 1990)
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Family as a Whole Assessment Instruments

- Assessment of Strategies in Families—Effectiveness (Friedemann, 1998; Friedemann & Smith, 1997)
- Beavers’ Self Report Family Inventory (SFI; Beavers & Hampson, 1990)
- Beavers Timberlawn Family Evaluation Scale (Lewis, Beavers, Gossett, & Phillips, 1976)
- Family Adaptation Checklist (McCubbin, Thompson, & McCubbin, 1996)
- Family Crisis-oriented Personal Evaluation Scales (FCOPES; McCubbin, Olson, & Larsen, 1991)
- Family Expressiveness Questionnaire (FEQ; Halberstadt, 1986)
- Family Environment Scale (Moos & Moos, 1994)
- Family Functioning Questionnaire (Linder-Pelz, Levy, Tamir, Spenser, & Epstein, 1984)
- Family Hardiness Index (FHI; McCubbin, 1991)
- Family History Questionnaire (Qureshi, et al., 2005)
- Family History-research Diagnostic Criteria (Andreasen, Endicott, Spitzer, & Winokur, 1977)
- Family Inventory of Life Events and Changes (FILE; McCubbin, 1991)
- Family Member Well-being Index (McCubbin, Thompson, & McCubbin, 1996)
- Family Messages Measure (Lux, 1989)
- Family Relations Scale (Barbarin, 1992)
- Family Sense of Coherence Scale (Antonovsky & Sourani, 1988)
- Family Worries Scale (Graham-Bermann, 1996)
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**Parenting Practices Assessment Instruments**

- Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales IV (FACES IV; Olson, Tiesel, & Gorall, 2007)
- Interaction Ratings Scale (Crnic & Greenberg, 1990)
- Keys to Interactive Parenting Scale (KIPS; Comfort, Gordon, & Unger, 2006)
- Parental Acceptance and Rejection Questionnaire (PARQ ; Rohner, 1991)
- Parenting Style Survey (PSS; Sameroff et al., 1989)
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**Intimate Partner Relationships Assessment Instruments**

- Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (Schaeffer & Olsen, 1981)
- Communications Pattern Questionnaire-Short Form (Christensen, 1987)
- Social Adjustment Scale–Self-Report (Weissman & Bothwell, 1976)
- Social Problem Solving Inventory (D'Zurilla & Nexu, 1990)
- Family Adaptability and Cohesion Scale (Olson, Gorall, & Tiesel, 2007)
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