

LAB CPI. CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND DATING VIOLENCE - INDIVIDUAL LEVEL DATA

The Research Question

Is having experienced corporal punishment by parents related to a higher probability of hitting a dating partner?

- Illustrates Individual level Research
- Other Lab Projects Will Use “macro” or societal level method

STEPS

- (1) Writing a hypothesis
- (2) Score the CTS scale for minor violence
- (3) Identify the Independent and Dependent variables
- (4) Cross-Tabulation to test your hypothesis about the relation of corporal punishment to hitting a dating partner
- (5) Write the Results section of the lab report
- (6) Write the Discussion of the results

STEP 1 -- THE HYPOTHESIS

- What is a hypothesis?
- What is your hypothesis about the relation of CP to violence against a dating partner? Write it on the Lab Report Form

You will NOT be graded on whether your hypothesis is supported by the results of the cross-tabulation. So put down whatever you think the results might show.

SAMPLE AND MEASURES

SAMPLE:

About 70 students: Students currently in Sociology 695
+ Students from last time the course was taught

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE Corporal Punishment measured
by Question 105.

“When I was less then 12 years old, I was spanked or hit a lot by my mother or father.”

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Agree
- 4 = Strongly Agree

DEPENDENT VARIABLE Conflict Tactics Scales score for Minor assaults on a dating partner in the past year

CONFLICT TACTICS SCALES (CTS) – VIOLENCE SCALE QUESTIONS

SPSS NAME	IDV Q #	ASSAULT – MINOR
CCAMS1	208	THREW SOMETHING AT PARTNER THAT COULD HURT
CCAMS2	210	TWISTED MY PARTNER'S ARM OR HAIR
CCAMS3	218	PUSHED OR SHOVED MY PARTNER
CCAMS4	246	GRABBED MY PARTNER
CCAMS5	254	SLAPPED MY PARTNER
		ASSAULT - SEVERE
CCASS1	222	USED A KNIFE OR GUN ON MY PARTNER
CCASS2	228	PUNCHED PARTNER OR HIT PARTNER WITH
CCASS3	234	CHOKED MY PARTNER
CCASS4	238	SLAMMED PARTNER AGAINST A WALL
CCASS5	244	BEAT UP MY PARTNER
CCASS6	262	BURNED OR SCALDED MY PARTNER PURPOSE
CCASS7	274	I KICKED MY PARTNER

STEP 2. SCORING THE CTS VIOLENCE SCALE

CTS has scales for “minor” and “severe” violence. For simplicity we will score only the “minor violence” scale.

Several ways to score the violence scale. The two main ways are

- Annual Frequency = sum of the 6 questions. Score range = 0 to 125
- Prevalence = Did any of the violent acts occur

Example Physical Assault Scale Item: “I Slapped my partner”

1 = Once in the past year

2 = Twice in the past year

3 = 3-5 times in the past year

4 = 6-10 times in the past year

5 = 11-20 times in the past year

6 = More than 20 times in the past y

7 = Not in the past year, but it did happen before

8 = This has never happened

We will use the Prevalence method of scoring the CTS

It has just 2 categories (yes and no) and that is easier to tabulate

Scoring Violence Against A Dating Partner

- * There are 5 questions, about minor violence
208, 210, 218, 246, 254
- * Check all 5 questions
- * If **ANY** one or more are answered 1 through 6 write a 1 in the upper left corner of side 1 of the answer sheet to indicate that this student had hit a partner
- * If **NONE** are marked 1-6 (i.e. if ALL are marked 7 for not in the past year, or 8 for never occurred) write a 0 in the upper left corner of side 1 of the answer sheet

STEP 4. CROSS TAB TO TEST THE HYPOTHESIS

Each of you will have an answer sheet for 1 to 3 students.

- We will go around the class and you will read out the value for the independent variable (Q 105 – corporal punishment) and then for the dependent (the minor violence scale score that you computed and wrote on the answer sheet)
- * As each pair of scores is read out, everyone will put a tally mark in the box where it belongs.
- Make every 5th tally mark horizontal: ~~////~~
- Add up each column and put the number in the N OF CASES row
- For each column, compute the percentage of cases coded 1 (violent to a partner) by dividing the number in the YES row by the number in the N Of Cases row. Put the sum in cell F.
- Compute the percent of cases who experienced each level of corporal punishment by dividing the numbers in row C by cell D and write the percents in the row labeled Percent Hit By Parents

Soc 695 Lab Project CPI. Is corporal punishment as a child related to hitting a dating partner?

CTS MINOR VIOLENCE	QUESTION 105 HIT BY PARENTS BEFORE AGE 12						
	Q105 =1 Strongly Disagree	Q105 = 2 Disagree	Q105 = 3 Agree	Q105 = 4 Strongly Agree	TOTAL N	% Violent	
A. NO = 0							
B. YES = 1							
C. N of cases					F		
D. % Violent to partner = b / c *100							
E. % Hit by parents = C / D * 100							100%

RESULTS (Number the parts)

1. What percent of UNH students experienced CP?
 - * To find out, look in the Total Column of row E
 - * Write this is the results section of your lab report
2. How prevalent is partner violence among the students in this course?
 - * To find out, look in the % Violent column
3. What is the relation of CP to violence against a dating partner?
 - * To find out, Compare the percent violent in the columns of the cross tabulation
 - * On the lab report form, say (1) whether the percent goes up, goes down, or does not show a trend in either direction, (2) what this indicates about the relation of corporal punishment to hitting a dating partner? (3) 4.
4. Whether your hypothesis is supported or not.
If there is a relationship, how close is it?
Anything else you noticed about the results?

IS THE RELATION BETWEEN CP AND VIOLENCE AGAINST A DATING PARTNER SIGNIFICANT?

- With about 70 cases, differences of the size we found would not be statistically significant
- I used a computer program to calculate it for , and found that
Chi-square = ?, $p < .001$
- What is a test of significance?
- What does the p value tell us?
- How low a p value is needed to be considered “significant”?
- What does it mean if the chi-square is not significant?

ctatsp ASSAULT TOT by self - prev * vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12 Crosstabulation

			vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12				Total
			1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Strongly Agree	
ctatsp ASSAULT TOT .00 NOT THIS YR. by self - prev	Count		3413	1560	707	207	5887
	% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12		77.7%	73.4%	68.0%	66.3%	74.8%
100.00	Count		982	565	333	105	1985
	% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12		22.3%	26.6%	32.0%	33.7%	25.2%
Total	Count		4395	2125	1040	312	7872
	% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	58.657 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	57.112	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	57.616	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	7872		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 78.67.

ctaspp ASSAULT SEVERE by prtnr - prev * vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12 Crosstabulation

			vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12				Total
			1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Strongly Agree	
ctaspp ASSAULT SEVERE by prtnr - prev	.00 NOT THIS YR.	Count	4110	1905	898	264	7177
		% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12	94.0%	90.5%	86.8%	85.4%	91.8%
	100.00	Count	264	199	136	45	644
		% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12	6.0%	9.5%	13.2%	14.6%	8.2%
Total		Count	4374	2104	1034	309	7821
		% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	81.636 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	76.641	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	80.479	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	7821		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.44.

ctasp ASSAULT TOT by self - prev * vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12 Crosstabulation

			vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12				Total
			1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Strongly Agree	
ctasp ASSAULT TOT by self - prev	.00 NOT THIS YR.	Count	3413	1560	707	207	5887
		% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12	77.7%	73.4%	68.0%	66.3%	74.8%
	100.00	Count	982	565	333	105	1985
		% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12	22.3%	26.6%	32.0%	33.7%	25.2%
Total		Count	4395	2125	1040	312	7872
		% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

ctaspp ASSAULT SEVERE by prtnr - prev * vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12 Crosstabulation

			vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12				Total
			1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Strongly Agree	
ctaspp ASSAULT SEVERE by prtnr - prev	.00 NOT THIS YR.	Count	4110	1905	898	264	7177
		% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12	94.0%	90.5%	86.8%	85.4%	91.8%
	100.00	Count	264	199	136	45	644
		% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12	6.0%	9.5%	13.2%	14.6%	8.2%
Total		Count	4374	2104	1034	309	7821
		% within vs01 105 HIT A LOT BY PARENT <12	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

COMPARE THE RELATION OF CP TO TOTAL AND SEVERE ASSAULTS

• DISCUSSION SECTION

➤ IF THE PERCENT DOES NOT INCREASE, WHY COULD BE THE REASON?

- Small sample and chance variation
- Sample has special characteristics – not a representative sample
- There really is no relationship
- The measures are not accurate – not valid
- Other explanation

~~• IF THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP, HOW CLOSE IS IT?~~

➤ (answer either or both)

- What processes could produces this relationship?
- What do the results suggest concerning social policy?

➤ WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE MEASURES OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND OF VIOLENCE?

WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED FROM THIS LAB?

RESULTS

- The prevalence of corporal punishment for UNH students
- The prevalence of violence against dating by UNH students
- Whether corporal punishment as a child is related to violence against a dating partner by students at UNH
- The above for students in other nations

METHODS

- How to formulate a hypothesis for sociological research
- Use of cross-tabulation to test a hypothesis based on a theory
- Use of data on individual students to test a theory
- An understanding of the following research tools:
 - Why use percentages
 - Test of significance
- An experience with evaluating data and interpreting results

MATERIALS NEEDED FOR THIS LAB

Answer sheets for this and a previous class

Power point hand out

Cross-tab form

Lab report forms

Instructions for lab reports (if not distributed earlier)