

## Abstract

Adolescent to parent violence (APV) has received little attention in the social work literature, although it is known to be a factor in families whose children are at risk of entry to care. The behaviour patterns that characterise APV include coercive control, domination and intimidation. Crucially, parental behaviours are compromised by fear of violence.

This article discusses the unexpected findings from two recent adoption studies of previously looked after children in England and Wales. The studies exposed the prevalence of APV in the lives of families who had experienced an adoption disruption and those who were finding parenting very challenging. Two main APV patterns emerged: early onset (pre-puberty) that escalated during adolescence, and late onset that surfaced during puberty and rapidly escalated.

The stigma and shame associated with APV delayed help-seeking. The response from services was often to blame the adoptive parents and to instigate child protection procedures. There is an urgent need for a greater professional recognition of APV and for interventions to be evaluated with children who have been maltreated and showing symptoms of trauma.

## **Adolescent to parent violence in adoptive families**

There has been a silence in the social work literature and in UK government policy on young people who are the instigators of violent behaviours in the home (Gallagher, 2008; Holt, 2012a). These behaviours are known as child to parent violence (CPV), adolescent to parent violence (APV) or mother abuse (Hunter *et al.*, 2010). There is not one specific behaviour that marks out APV, but a pattern of habitual coercive behaviours that reverse the usual parent/child power dynamic (Wilcox, 2012). Even though the behaviours that mark out APV are familiar to social workers (and are often referred to as 'challenging behaviour'), the CPV/APV behaviour patterns have gone unrecognised (Nixon, 2012). Consequently, interventions are often inappropriate or inadequate and are implemented in the absence of policy and practice guidelines (Kennair and Mellor, 2007; Holt and Retford, 2013).

The silence may be because it creates difficulties for social workers who are used to working with children who are the victims of violence and not the instigators. Raising the topic of APV is difficult for a profession that seeks to counteract the demonization of young people and does not fit easily into the gendered/power theories and interventions (Wilcox, 2012) that underpin much of the work on intimate partner violence (IPV).

Most of the APV literature has been published in the last ten years and comes from academics working in the criminal justice field (e.g. Holt, 2012a) or from practitioners outside the UK (e.g. Gallagher, 2008; O'Connor, 2007). There is surprisingly little UK social work literature: Biehal (2012) being an exception. In an emerging field of study, there is a lack of consensus on every aspect of APV including definitions, terminology, causes and interventions.

In this article, we focus on our own unexpected discovery of APV when researching adoptions that had disrupted or were in difficulty. Our study found that APV was responsible for most of the adoption disruptions.

## Background

Whilst there is a growing literature (Helen Bonnick has usefully collated the available evidence on her website [www.holesinthewall.co.uk](http://www.holesinthewall.co.uk)), APV remains an under-theorised and under-researched area of family violence (Gallagher, 2008; Wilcox, 2012; Holt, 2012a). It has been described as, the last taboo about violence in the home (Condry and Miles, 2014). There is no agreed APV definition, as it describes a wide variety of physical and psychological behaviours designed to *control, coerce and dominate the parent and family members*. In this article (and in our analyses of interview data) we applied Paterson and colleagues' definition of APV, as it not only highlights behavioural patterns but also the impact on parenting and places the behaviours within the context of relationships. They described APV as:

*Behaviour considered to be violent if others in the family feel threatened, intimidated or controlled by it and [our emphasis] if they believe that they must adjust their own behaviour to accommodate threats or anticipation of violence. (Paterson et al., 2002 p92)*

The lack of an agreed definition has resulted in the estimates of APV varying between 3% and 27% (Gallagher, 2008; Holt, 2012a). In the UK, Parentline Plus (renamed Family Lives) reported that 17% of the 30,000 telephone calls to their help line in 2008 were from parents concerned about their adolescents' verbal aggression and a further 8% were concerned about physical aggression. Inevitably, surveys that ask about any violent incidents in the past six

months produce high prevalence rates whilst research that has focused on patterns of controlling habitual behaviours produce much lower rates (Holt, 2012b). Some surveys count any type of violence in the family whereas others exclude sibling violence. Prevalence rates are also affected by parents' unwillingness to report APV. This form of family violence carries multiple stigmas and shame. It stigmatises a parent as a 'bad parent' and usually this means mother blaming (Downey, 1997; Edenborough *et al.*, 2008).

The evidence is very mixed on the socio-demographics of instigators and their victims (see reviews Cottrell and Monk, 2004; Kennair and Mellor, 2007; Walsh and Krienert, 2007; Hong *et al.*, 2012; Holt, 2012a). General population surveys tend to find no significant difference by the gender of the instigator, while studies that have used police reports do find a gendered phenomenon. For example, Condry and Miles (2014) using Metropolitan Police reports of 2,336 APV incidents between April 2009 and March 2010 found that 87% of instigators were sons and 77% of victims were female and usually mothers. While this reflects the gendered profiles seen in IPV, there is a lack of research on whether: mothers are more likely to reports assaults than are fathers, girls are more likely to use other forms of control and if the police take more seriously the assaults by boys on their mothers.

### Causes

There is a recognition that APV is more likely to occur in families where children have been exposed to IPV (Cottrell and Monk, 2004; Hunter *et al.*, 2010). Not all children exposed to IPV go on to become violent and theories of the 'cycle of violence' have been heavily critiqued for being too deterministic (Baker, 2012). Nevertheless, most studies of APV show an association between children who are aggressive and exposure to IPV, but the mechanisms are unclear. It may be that children learn that controlling behaviours are the way to deal with conflict,

they may idealise the perpetrator of the violence and copy the behaviours, or absorb the messages that aggression is an acceptable way to treat women or be angry with the mother for not protecting herself or the children (Nixon 2012; Cottrell and Monk, 2004). In much of the literature, there is an assumption that by changing the family environment (i.e. removal of the violent partner) the problem of APV will diminish. Some writers view APV as another form of domestic violence and state that its gendered nature should be recognised and referred to as 'mother abuse' (Hunter *et al.*, 2010).

Specific parenting styles have also been examined. There is some evidence that aggression is transmitted across generations and that harsh paternal parenting has a stronger effect on children's levels of aggression than does harsh maternal parenting (e.g. Marler *et al.*, 2005). Other writers (e.g. Gallagher 2008; Kotch *et al.*, 2008) have linked aggression with laissez faire or neglectful parenting styles resulting in young people growing up with an exaggerated sense of entitlement.

Early difficulties in the relationship between the child and their primary attachment figure have also been associated with the development of violence. Tremblay (2000) describes how children's physical aggression peaks at around two years of age: commonly known as the terrible twos. Children learn to control aggression and impulsivity and develop the capacity to recognise and reflect on emotions and behaviours in themselves and others through their parents' sensitive and attuned responses to their behaviours. It is these capacities often referred to as mentalization that are thought to inhibit aggression. Fonagy (2004, 2012) argues that it is the failure of normal developmental processes to control aggression that signals violence and that violence happens in the absence of mentalization.

The development of aggressive behaviour has also been associated with child maltreatment and the subsequent stress experienced by children. There is evidence that chronic stress biologically alters the stress response resulting in hyper-vigilance, changes to normal cortisol pattern, alterations to reward processing and errors in identifying emotions correctly (e.g. McCrory et al., 2012; Jaffe and Christian, 2014). Others (e.g. Zeanah, 2009; Corriveau et al., 2009) have focused on the impact of maltreatment on the child/parent relationship and the development of insecure avoidant styles of relating, resulting in children who fear intimacy, lack trust in adults and whose focus turns away from relationships to controlling their environments. From a different perspective, Kids Company (2009) through its extensive work with abused children and concern at rising levels of violence have proposed a new clinical concept of a 'violence adapting syndrome' characterised by abused children in persistent states of hyper-arousal.

The focus of much of the research has been on the development of aggression and violence and developmental models have rarely been applied to the problem of APV (see Cottrell and Monk, 2004; Hong *et al.*, 2012). It is likely that multiple factors increase the risk of CPV/APV behaviours. Children who are adopted from care are likely to carry all or most of the identified risks and we now turn to our research findings to consider aggression and APV in the context of adoptive family life.

### **The research studies**

Two studies on adoption disruption were recently completed: one funded by the Department for Education (Selwyn *et al.*, 2015) and the other funded by the Welsh Government (Selwyn and Meakings 2015). Adoption disruption was defined as, a child who had been adopted out of care and who had left their adoptive family under the age of 18 years old. The aims of both

studies, using similar methodology, were to: calculate the rate of adoption disruption in England and in Wales and to explore the experiences of those involved in or at risk of disruption. Ethical permission was obtained from the School for Policy Studies ethics committee at the University of Bristol.

Using national data, we found that the post order adoption disruption rate was very low: only 3.2% over a 12-year period in England and 2.6 % over an eleven-year period in Wales. Adoption disruption is not a common event. Nevertheless, an adoption disruption is a traumatic event and so to understand more about the experience of disruption a sample of adoptive parents was recruited. Detailed methodology can be found at [www.bristol.ac.uk/hadley](http://www.bristol.ac.uk/hadley) In brief, a survey was sent out by 13 English local authorities to parents who had adopted a child between April 1<sup>st</sup> 2002 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004. Parents were asked how the adoption was faring and if the child was still living at home. The same survey was replicated on the Adoption UK website and could be completed by any parent who had adopted a child from care. Surveys were returned by 390 parents caring for 689 adopted children. A quarter of the parents whose child was still living at home stated that they were finding parenting very challenging and were struggling. From the 390 survey responses, all the parents (n=35) who had experienced an adoption disruption and 35 parents who described parenting a child living at home as very challenging were selected to form the English interview sample. In addition, 20 Welsh families (10 disruptions and 10 who were currently finding parenting challenging) were recruited using information from local authorities and snowballing techniques. Face-to-face interviews (average length of interview three hours) were completed with 90 adoptive families: 45 parents who had experienced a disruption (the 'Left home' group) and 45 parents who were finding parenting challenging

(the 'At home' group). Numerical data were analysed in SPSS using non-parametric tests. Qualitative data were analysed using a framework approach (Ritchie and Spencer 1993) with the themes, concepts, and ideas identified prior to data collection. Analysis used five key stages of familiarisation with the data and the context, identification of themes, indexing, mapping and interpretation.

At the time of the interview in 2013/14, the children whose adoptions had disrupted were on average 17 years old (SD 2.93) and those living at home were on average 15 years old (SD 2.43). Most (87%) of the disruptions had occurred during the young people's teenage years. The majority (n=73) of the parents were part of a couple, including two same-sex couples, and 17 were single adoptive parents. Thirteen households contained no children but most (85%) had other adopted children or birth children (range 0-4 children) still living at home.

It was during the analysis of the interview data that CPV/APV emerged as the main reason adoptions had disrupted and prevalent in the families who described parenting as very challenging. APV was a factor in 38 of the 45 adoption disruptions. Before exploring the behaviours that challenged the parents it is important to consider what was known, by the parents, about their child's pre adoption history.

### The adopted children

All of the 90 adopted children (48 boys and 42 girls) were carrying risks of poor developmental outcomes, as they entered care. The children whose adoptions later disrupted were carrying even greater risks. Table 1 highlights the older age of the 'Left home' group at key time points in the adoption process. Children whose adoptions



disrupted were, on average, three times older at entry to care compared to the average age (14 months old) of most adopted children (Selwyn *et al.*, 2015)

TABLE 1 about here

Age at entry to care usually reflects the length of exposure to maltreatment and most of the children had entered care because of abuse and neglect (Table 2). Many children had suffered multiple forms of abuse. Maternal alcohol and /or drug misuse (55%) was common, resulting in eleven children being removed by Children's Services at birth. Often, little was known about birth fathers apart from the violence they had inflicted on their partners and children. Over a third (34%) of birth fathers had served a prison sentence for crimes involving violence.

TABLE 2 about here

The children had also faced additional adversities pre-adoption: 61 (68%) had experienced more than one move in foster care (range 0-13 moves) and 42 (46%) of the adoptive parents had concerns about the quality of the foster care shown to their child with adopters expressing concern at 'cold', 'clinical' or 'professional' foster care. Nearly one in four (23%) of the children had experienced poorly managed introductions and a difficult transition into the adoptive family. It was also apparent from adoptive parents' accounts that many of the children had not been well prepared and did not understand why they were being adopted.

The children whose adoptions had disrupted had faced more adversities in the birth family and whilst they were looked after compared with the children who were still at home. They were statistically more likely to have experienced domestic violence (Fisher's exact= 0.05), sexual abuse (Fisher's exact 0.00) and to have had longer exposure to these adversities (Mann-Whitney  $U$  279.00,  $z$ -2.458  $p$ <.014). They were also five times more likely to have

had two or more moves in foster care prior to joining their adoptive family in comparison with the children in the 'At home' group. (Fisher's exact=0.001).

Violent, controlling and coercive behaviours (n=62)

Parents were asked about the nature of the difficulties they had faced in adoptive family life. Seventy-five of the 90 parents stated that children's physically aggressive behaviour had been or was very challenging and of these 62 parents described sustained patterns of behaviours that met Paterson's definition of APV. All but seven of the 45 families who had experienced a disruption involved APV, as did 17 of the 45 families who were currently finding parenting very challenging.

Parents were also asked when serious difficulties first began. The majority of parents (80%) described an early onset of aggressive and controlling behaviours shown by their child whilst still in primary education. While children were young, parents could manage outbursts by physically removing children to prevent harm but even so, some of the parents had been hurt (e.g. broken nose). During puberty, the power balance shifted. Adolescents were more independent and their physical maturity meant that parents could no longer remove the adolescent or escape themselves. It was this shift that tipped the aggression into APV. For example parents said,

*He trapped me in his room. He took the mattress off his bed and pushed the mattress up against me. I was rammed against the wall. He pinned my shoulders against the wall and was snorting and growling at me ... I was really under threat, and I was really scared. I got out of there and I thought, 'I shouldn't have gone in his room. I shouldn't have let him get me in this position'. (At home)*

*She's physically attacked me ... When she was smaller, I could pick her up and put her in a room. I've not been able to do that since she was 9 or 10 ... She's verbally aggressive, destroys things ... made allegations against my brother. What she's done is sabotaged all my support networks as well ... She just wants to control me ... She really bullies me, stops me going into her room, puts her foot in the door, finger in my face, telling me to f\*\*\* off and laughs because I can't do anything about it, because she's so much physically bigger.*

Not all aggressive and controlling behaviours were evident from early on. Twenty per cent of parents described a sudden onset of APV associated with puberty. Parents often likened the onset of difficulties to a switch being flicked, with young people's behaviour changing suddenly and accompanied by a very rapid escalation of severe violence. One parent explained:

*He just turned from this lovely little kid into this very angry person ... it was like a switch. (Left home)*

All of the families where there had been late onset APV had disrupted whereas 54% of the early onset children were still living at home.

Parents described being assaulted, intimidated, threatened, locked in rooms, money stolen, mobile phones hidden, property damaged and even taken hostage in their home. Weapons were used by some young people: knives most frequently but also scissors or other implements that came to hand. Most (n= 38) of the violent controlling behaviour was sons to their mothers, but 24 girls also engaged in these behaviours and fathers and siblings had been

attacked, as had pets and grandparents. The following interview extract illustrates the different behaviours intended to control and intimidate:

*From the minute he got up to the minute he went to bed he just terrorised us ... threatening us with knives ... throwing stones at us, throwing buckets of water at us, squirting us with bleach...the TV was locked in his bedroom...You would be walking along and he would suddenly just punch you in the back for no reason...You couldn't even leave the dogs with him. If they were laying in here and Freddie [study child] walked in they would leave and I've known one of them to wet herself [in fear]. [Husband] was beaten round the head with a broom. I can remember one night...we went to bed and lay there and I can remember crying...He came in and he punched me in the back and he said, "Yes, you cry you bitch". (Left home)*

Parents gave graphic accounts of the violence they endured and frequently spoke of how they had had to change their parenting behaviour to protect themselves and their other children. For example, parents said that they had to put locks on bedroom doors to prevent attacks whilst they were asleep. Some couples had split parenting tasks-one parent parenting the adolescent who was the instigator of the violence and the other parent focusing on the other children in the household. Mothers especially were afraid of being left alone with their child and parental patterns of work and leisure were altered to ensure that this did not occur.

*If he goes to school in the morning and he's angry, as much as I love him, I dread him coming home ... it's got to the point where I've said to [husband] that he's not to go out down the gym [and leave me alone with child]. (At home)*

Parents said they felt helpless and defeated because young people refused to acknowledge or accept parental authority. Yet, most spoke of their love for the child and wished help could have been found.

In some families, the violence was predictable and would erupt if the adolescents' wishes were not immediately met e.g. asking the young person to come home at a certain time. Parents were fearful and avoided confrontations. For example, one mother said:

*I would never have been surprised if she had stabbed me in my sleep, never. I had to change lots of things ... back down on things for fear that she would trash the house and break everything. (Left home)*

In other families, parents could not predict when the intimidation and violence would surface. Parents spoke of 'walking on eggshells' and 'psychological warfare', as they discovered knives and other weapons hidden around the house, believing that they were intended to be found. Parents felt intimidated and for example said:

*If I thought he was going to go off into a mood I'd turn around and walk away, but he would follow. He wouldn't let me walk away ... He liked to invade your personal space, get up really close and intimidate... He would grab me round the throat. I was really quite scared ... I didn't know if he was going to stop or not. (Left home)*

Fathers who were the focus of the violence felt particularly shamed at being over-powered or controlled by their child. Some fathers had retreated to avoid conflict. For example, one father avoided contact with his son by going to bed at 8.00pm every night when he came home from work. One mother described the attacks:

*Then he started turning on my husband at the age of 15 ... It was physical violence and intimidation.... My husband's been in the corner of the kitchen on the floor, trapped, crying, physically crying, he's so scared. (Left home)*

More frequently, fathers expressed fears for their wives or for other children's safety and felt that they were reneging on their duty to protect their family. They wondered what was happening at home while they were out at work and struggled to talk about these fears to the often young female social worker who visited the family.

Having a child who was controlling and violent was very shameful and especially so, for adoptive parents who felt they had failed, were inadequate and felt total hopeless about the situation. Many parents had become isolated, as either friends had stopped visiting because of what they witnessed in the household or the adoptive parents felt such shame that they had stopped inviting. Home was a not a safe place, as one mother explained:

*I'm not safe in my own house. I can't breathe, I can't relax. (At home)*

Feelings of failure were exacerbated by the response from the agencies that adopters turned to for help. Previous research on APV (Holt and Retford, 2013; Nixon, 2012) has consistently found a very poor response from services with some interventions making the problem worse and this was also the case for the adoptive families. The shame and stigma of living with violence in the home meant that many of the parents did not ask for help until they were desperate but most parents received a poor response. Parents reported that they were often told that either the local authority (LA) or Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) did not provide services for adopted children or the behaviours did not fit the criteria for services. In quite a few cases, parents were told by social workers to ring the police

if they needed support. Three-quarters of the families had had some police involvement and some parents described police officers as being like their social worker and their best source of support.

A quarter of the families did rate social workers as their best source of support. Good support to adoptive families was provided by LAs who were able to provide multi-disciplinary support. Parents appreciated LA interventions that were provided by a 'team around the family.' These teams comprised social workers, psychologists, mentors and occasionally educational psychologists and occupational therapists. A few parents also received good support from CAMHS that had an adoption specialism.

Rather than receiving a responsive service, parents felt that social workers often blamed them for the child's behaviour. Indeed, most of the blame was heaped on adoptive mothers who said that they were made to feel as though they had 'failed' and had 'let down' the child. Professionals did not recognise APV, but instead framed the difficulties in the context of poor [adoptive] parenting and/or saw the child behaviours as a problem of anger management. For the most part the controlling elements of the behaviours went unrecognised, as did the battle for the 'parental space'. Here, we are using the term 'parental space' to refer to the parents' position within the family and in particular nurturing and controlling roles. By the time, agencies were involved many parents had given up that space and it was occupied by the young person. Attempts to regain the space, by trying to insist on boundaries were thwarted by some young people who made allegations of abuse that led onto child protection investigations. Most of the parents vehemently refuted the allegations although a few parents (both fathers and mothers) admitting to having "lost it" or having fought back in self-defence. For example, a mother said:

*She beat her dad up. She just started punching and kicking and punching him, absolutely going berserk, I mean unhinged berserk. He's a very gentle giant, never ever laid a finger on her ... he wouldn't do, it's what she wanted. She always used to bully him quite a lot and something inside me just snapped .... and I just got in the middle and I slapped her round the face, which I regret, but I did slap her. (Left home)*

Other child protection investigations were begun by children's social workers as a response to the difficulties in the family. Several parents, who reported symptoms associated with secondary trauma described how they were investigated when social workers suggested that they were not showing their child sufficient emotional warmth. None of the children were removed because of Section 47 investigations but the process of the investigation left the parents feeling undermined and traumatised. Parents thought it left the young person in a more powerful position, as parents were fearful of doing anything that might result in another allegation with the real possibility that they might lose their jobs (about half of the parents worked in health, education, and social care). Allegations also often created splits and conflicts between children and adopters' social workers, with adoption workers being accused of colluding with the adoptive parents and the children's social workers accused of not understanding the adoption context. The aftermath of an investigation left workers feeling metaphorically bruised and parents unsupported and did not result in meaningful support for the young person or the family. Parents whose child had 'Left home' were statistically more likely to say they felt blamed by professionals in comparison with parents whose child was still at home (Fisher's exact=.001).

The pattern of professionals failing to recognise controlling behaviours and support parents continued for the families whose children re-entered care. Young people usually insisted that



their parents should be kept in the dark and excluded from case conferences or reviews. Generally, social workers went along with these demands and parents described how professionals had seemed to take sides with the child, thus exacerbating the dysfunctional power dynamics within the adoptive family. Parents were frustrated that they had been excluded from decision-making, despite their child being accommodated under a Section 20 arrangement.

At the time of the interview, some young people had returned, of their own accord, to live with or near their adoptive family. Other young people were being parented at a distance with parents acting as financial guarantors on flats, doing their washing/cooking or being at the end of a phone when help was needed. Only two adoptive parents were no longer in touch with their child.

Parents wanted social workers to recognise that the adoptive family was likely to offer the best hope and resource for the young person, as they moved into adulthood. They wanted to be treated with kindness and compassion and for their parenting to be supported, even if that had to be at a distance. Most of the parents in this study did not have that experience.

## **Discussion**

There is a body of evidence that demonstrates adopted children's substantial developmental recovery after maltreatment (e.g. Van IJzendoorn, and Juffer, (2006); Lloyd and Barth, 2011). The focus of this study though was not on the majority of adoptions, but on when adoptive families had faced great difficulties. Forty-five parents who had experienced a disruption and 45 parents who were currently finding parenting very challenging were interviewed in England and in Wales. We were surprised to find that APV was a factor in all but seven of the disruptions and was present in 17 of the 45 families where the parents were struggling. It was

also surprising to find an absence of discussion about APV in the social work literature, although social workers are very familiar with the behaviours and have much to contribute to the debates. Perhaps the term 'challenging behaviour' has disguised the behaviours that mark out APV and a generic term has been an obstacle to developing a deeper understanding of the difficulties.

The 90 children in this study were carrying many risks to healthy development as they moved into their adoptive families such as abuse and neglect by the birth family. They were older at entry to care than most other children who go on to be adopted and a significant proportion had accumulated more risks through poor experiences whilst they were looked after. As in other studies of APV, domestic violence was prevalent in the study children's birth families. However, the presence of APV in adoptive families challenges the view that if the child is no longer living in direct contact with domestic violence, aggressive behaviours will reduce. The different patterns of onset suggest that resolution is not simply a matter of changing the environment.

Two patterns of APV emerged: early onset (pre-pubescent) with the severity gradually escalating into adolescence and late onset (puberty onwards) with a sudden appearance of aggressive controlling behaviours with the frequency and intensity increasing rapidly. Findings from this study would suggest that aggressive controlling early behaviours are unlikely to go away and social workers need to recognise the patterns and ensure there is early intervention.

The second late onset pattern was much more difficult to predict and highlights how adoption support plans made at the time of the placement need to be flexible enough to take account of changing circumstances. Despite parents, reporting early happy memories the late onset

APV families had *all* disrupted in comparison with 43% of the early onset families. The APV late onset pattern did not follow the patterns identified in studies of the development of aggression. In those studies (e.g. Patterson, 1982) early starters were at greater risk of long-term anti-social behaviour than later starters. Late onset APV had a different trajectory of severe rapidly escalating violence inside and outside the family.

As an emerging area of study, there is much to learn about the relationship between APV and violence. Violence is commonly defined as aggression intended to cause extreme physical harm (e.g. Baron and Richardson, 1994). In this study, the intention behind violent acts did not seem to be primarily about physical harm, but as a means to control and dominate. There was also an element of young people gaining pleasure or reward from the domination. However, it was the *threat* of violence as well as its expression that made many parents fearful. Indeed, all the parents experiencing APV talked about “living in fear” and this element should be added to definitions of APV to differentiate it from one-off acts of aggression. Much more work is needed to understand the different APV patterns, as the routes and causes may differ. This study was unable to explore whether the birth mother’s substance misuse during pregnancy or if genetic vulnerabilities/epigenetic changes were factors.

In the course of family assessments, we would urge all professionals working with adoptive families to *ask* if the parents are experiencing CPV/APV. Parents are unlikely to volunteer the information unless asked directly. CPV/APV carries multiple stigmas - parenting a badly behaved child and experiencing violence by a child in the home. For adoptive parents there is further shame, as they feel they have been assessed and approved as adoptive parents and entrusted with a child. They felt failures and this view was often reinforced by the response

from professionals who told parents they had let the child and them down, blaming parents for the child's behaviour and using terms such as 'failed placement'.

One of the difficulties with APV is that adults and professionals outside the family may struggle to understand how it is possible for a young person to exert such control. Children and adolescents are not usually in a powerful position. So, what kind of power was being exploited by adoptive children? We would suggest that children exploited the very characteristics that are sought by agencies in their adoptive parents such as commitment and investment. In addition, adoptive parents often bring to the parent/child relationship two other characteristics. First, parents have often experienced unsuccessful fertility treatment and do not want to be thought of as 'failing' again. Second, parents are acutely aware of their responsibility and the trust placed in them by social workers. These latter characteristics ensure that parents often do not ask for help until the situation is desperate.

We were surprised to find allegations being used by some children to threaten their adoptive parents and exert control. A similar finding was found in a US study of APV in the general population (Eckstein, 2004). Allegations made by adopted children raise very difficult practice issues. At a time when social workers are under intense media scrutiny and accused of not listening to children, the challenge for professionals is to listen to the voice of the child and to understand the control issues that underlie APV. Evidence from this study would suggest that investigations should preferably be joint worked (children's and adoption social worker), and that parents are fully informed of the allegations and enabled to participate in the process. Social workers need to consider the impact on the whole family (including siblings) of child protection procedures.

The Home Office definition of the perpetrators of family violence has been expanded to include young people aged 16 years or older (Home Office, 2012). The reduction in the criminal age assumes that, from 16 years of age, young people can make choices about their actions and be prosecuted for family violence. Yet, an early history of maltreatment and trauma can place children's emotional development far behind their chronological age. One of the main differences between APV and IPV is that in APV the instigator usually continues to live at home and parents have to go on parenting. In this study, parents were sometimes asked by the police if they wished to prosecute following violent assaults, but none wanted to give their child a criminal record. Parents wanted help.

Timely interventions are urgently needed, as the behaviours had not stopped post disruption. Fourteen of the 45 young people who had left home had committed serious violent and/or sexual offences including for example, aggravated burglary, actual bodily harm, and rape; 35 young people had had multiple foster care/residential placements with moves occurring because of assaults on carers or staff and others were taking the behaviours into their adult relationships. The link between APV and later IPV has been noted (LaPorte *et al.*, 2009) and the pathways into adulthood for most of the young people who had left their families was concerning. Parents feared that their child's behaviour would result in a prison sentence or an early death.

There are a number of interventions for APV, but none to our knowledge has been evaluated with traumatised or maltreated children. Programmes such as Break4change (Ministry of Justice, 2009), e-imagination and restorative justice (Sherman and Strang 2007; Fonagy 2012); Non Violent Resistance (Omer, 2004; Jakob, 2010; Newman *et al.*, 2014) Step-up (Anderson *et al.*, 2004) and Who's in Charge (O'Connor, 2007) are used. We need to test out these

approaches with looked after and adopted children, as CPV/APV is not just an issue for some adoptive families but is also responsible for placement instability in foster and residential care.

It has long been recognised that the impact of maltreatment and trauma does not disappear simply because a child is adopted. However, that recognition has not been matched with appropriate, evidence based support services for adoptive families. It is time for that situation to change.

Anderson, L. and Routt, G. (2004) *Step-up: a curriculum for teens who are violent at home*, <http://www.mincava.umn.edu/documents/stepup/intro/stepupintroduction.html>

Baker, H. (2012) 'Problematizing the Relationship between Teenage Boys and Parent Abuse: Constructions of Masculinity and Violence', *Social Policy and Society*, **11**(2) pp. 265-76.

Baron, R. A., and Richardson, D. R. (1994) *Human aggression (2nd ed.)*, New York: Plenum Press.

Biehal, N. (2012) 'Parent abuse by young people on the edge of care: A child welfare perspective', *Social Policy and Society*, **11**(2), pp. 251-63.

Condry, R. and Miles, C. (2014) 'Adolescent to Parent Violence: Framing and Mapping a Hidden Problem,' *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, **14**(3), pp. 257-75.

Corriveau K., Harris P., Meins E., Fernyhough C., Arnott B., Elliott L., Liddle B., Hearn, A. and Vittorini, L. (2009) 'Young children's trust in their mother's claims: longitudinal links with attachment security in infancy', *Child Development*, **80** (3), pp. 750-61.

Cottrell, B. and Monk, P. (2004) 'Adolescent-to-parent abuse: a qualitative overview of common themes', *Journal of Family Issues*, **25**(8), pp. 1072–95.

Downey, L. (1997) 'Adolescent violence: a systematic and feminist perspective', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, **18**(2), pp. 70–9.

Edenborough, M.D., Wilkes, L.M., Jackson, D. and Mannix, J. (2008) 'Living in the red zone: the experience of child –to-mother violence', *Child and Family Social Work*, **13**, pp. 464-73.

Eckstein, N.J. (2004) 'Emergent issues in families experiencing adolescent-to-parent abuse', *Western Journal of Communication*, **68**(4), pp. 365-88.

Fonagy, P. (2004) 'Early-Life Trauma and the Psychogenesis and Prevention of Violence', *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.* **1036**, pp. 181–200.

Fonagy, P. (2012) 'The neuroscience of prevention', *J R Soc Med*, **105**, pp. 97-100.

Gallagher, E. (2008) *Children's violence to parents: A critical literature review*. Available at:  
<http://www.eddiegallagher.id.au/>

Holt, A. (2012a) *Adolescent-to-Parent Abuse: Current Understandings in Research, Policy and Practice*, Bristol, Policy Press.

Holt, A. (2012b) 'Researching Parent Abuse: A Critical Review of the Methods', *Social Policy and Society*, **11**(2) pp. 289-98.

Holt, A. and Retford, S. (2013) 'Practitioner accounts of responding to parent abuse – a case study in *ad hoc* delivery, perverse outcomes and a policy silence', *Child and Family Social Work*, **18**, pp. 365–74.

Home Office (March 2013) *Information for Local Areas on the change to the Definition of Domestic Violence and Abuse*,  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/142701/guide-on-definition-of-dv.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/142701/guide-on-definition-of-dv.pdf)



Hong, J.S., Kral, M.J., Espelage, D.L. and Allen-Meares, P. (2012) 'The social ecology of adolescent-initiated parent abuse: a review of the literature', *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, **43**, pp.431-54.

Hunter, C., Nixon, J., and Parr, S., (2010) 'Mother abuse: a matter of youth justice, child welfare or domestic violence', *Journal of Law and Society*, **37**:2(2), pp. 264-84.

Jakob, P. (2010) *Re-connecting Parents and Young People with Serious Behaviour Problems – Child-Focused Practice and Reconciliation Work in Non Violent Resistance Therapy*  
[http://www.newauthority.net/data/cntfiles/146\\_.pdf](http://www.newauthority.net/data/cntfiles/146_.pdf)

Jaffe, S. and Christian, C. (2014) 'The biological embedding of child abuse and neglect', *Social Policy Report*, **28**(1)

Kennair, N. and Mellor, D. (2007) 'Parent abuse: a review', *Child Psychiatry Human Development*, **38**, pp.203–34.

Kids Company (2009) *Christmas Newsletter*.

[http://www.kidsco.org.uk/images/KidsCompany\\_Newsletter\\_Christmas09\\_email.pdf](http://www.kidsco.org.uk/images/KidsCompany_Newsletter_Christmas09_email.pdf)

Kotch, J.B., Lewis, T., Hussey, J.M., English, D., Thompson, R., *et al.*, (2008) 'The Importance of Early Neglect for Childhood Aggression', *Pediatrics*, **121**, pp. 725-31.

Laporte, L., Jiang, D., Pepler, D.J. and Chamberland, C. (2009) 'The relationship between adolescents' experience of family violence and dating violence', *Youth and Society*, **43**(1), pp. 3–27.

Lloyd, E.C., and Barth, R.P. (2011) 'Developmental outcomes after five years for foster children returned home, remaining in care, or adopted', *Children and Youth Services Review*, **33**, pp. 1383-91.

Marler, C., Tranor, B. and Davis, E. (2005) 'Paternal behaviour and off-spring aggression', *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, **14**(3) pp. 163-66.

McCrory E., Da Brito, S. and Viding, E. (2012) 'The link between child abuse and psychopathology: a review of neurobiological and genetic research', *J R Soc Med*, **105**, pp. 151–6

Ministry of Justice (2009) *Break4Change project reports*, <https://www.justice.gov.uk/youth-justice/effective-practice-library/break-4-change>

Newman, M., Fagan, C. and Webb, R. (2014) 'Innovations in Practice: the efficacy of nonviolent resistance groups in treating aggressive and controlling children and young people: a preliminary analysis of pilot NVR groups in Kent', *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, **19**(2) pp. 138-41.

Nixon, J. (2012) 'Practitioners' Constructions of Parent Abuse', *Social Policy and Society*, **11**, pp. 229-39.

O'Connor, R. (2007) *Who's in charge evaluation report*, [www.southernjunction.org.au/services/familysupport/Who's%20in%20Charge%20Evaluation%20Report.pdf](http://www.southernjunction.org.au/services/familysupport/Who's%20in%20Charge%20Evaluation%20Report.pdf)

Omer, H. (2004) *Nonviolent Resistance – A New Approach to Violent and Self-Destructive Children*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Patterson, G. R. (1982) *Coercive family process*. Eugene, Castalia Press.

Paterson, R., Luntz, H., Perlesz, A. and Cotton, S. (2002) 'Adolescent violence towards parents: Maintaining family connections when the going gets tough', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 23(2), pp. 90-100

Parentline Plus (2008) *When Family Life Hurts: Family experience of aggression*. Available at <http://familylives.org.uk/sites/default/files/Aggressive%20behaviour%20in%20children%202008.pdf>

Ritchie, J. and Spencer, L. (1993) Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In *Analysing Qualitative Data* (Eds A. Bryman and R. Burgess), pp 173–194. Routledge, London.

Selwyn J., Meakings, S. and Wijedasa D (2015a) *Beyond the Adoption Order: challenges, interventions and disruption*, London BAAF

Selwyn, J. and Meakings, S. (2015b) *Beyond the Adoption Order (Wales): discord and disruption*, Report to the Welsh government.

Sherman, L, and Strang, H. (2007) *Restorative Justice the evidence*, London, Smith Institute.

Tremblay, RE. (2000) 'The origins of violence', *Isuma* (Autumn) pp. 19-24.

Van IJzendoorn, M. H., and Juffer, F. (2006) The Emanuel Miller Memorial Lecture 2006: Adoption as intervention. Meta-analytic evidence for massive catch-up and plasticity in physical, socio-emotional, and cognitive development, *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, **47**(12), pp.1228-1245.

Walsh, J. A. and Krienert, J. L. (2007) 'Child-Parent Violence: An Empirical Analysis of Offender, Victim, and Event Characteristics in a National Sample of Reported Incidents', *Journal of Family Violence*, **22**, pp. 563-74.

Wilcox, P. (2012) 'Is Parent Abuse a Form of Domestic Violence?' *Social Policy and Society*, **11**(2), pp. 277-88.

Zeanah, C. H. (2009) 'The Importance of Early Experiences: Clinical, Research, and Policy Perspectives', *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, **14**(4), 266-79.