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Abstract

Incidence of Abuse and Neglect in the Population at the Utah State Industrial School

by

Jeff Clark, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1976

Major Professor: James Christiansen
Department: Special Education

There has been some speculation that abuse/neglect may lead to later antisocial behavior by the abused/neglected child. It was the purpose of this project to determine the frequency of abuse/neglect in the population at the State Industrial School and to compare the types of crimes committed by abused/neglected delinquents with those delinquents not abused/neglected.

The subjects consisted of all the adolescents committed to the State Industrial School. During the research project, 159 adolescents were at the State Industrial School. Of those, 63 had data in their files indicating some form of abuse or neglect.

The findings of the study showed that significantly more abused/neglected delinquents commit authority protest crimes than other categories of crimes. Also, significantly more abused/neglected adolescents are found at the State Industrial School than those not abused/neglected.

(70 pages)
Problem

Introduction

The identification of abused children can be related to the advances of medical science. In 1946, Dr. John Caffey, a Pediatric Radiologist, published his findings that fractures of the longbones and subdural hematoma often occur together in infants. It was not until 1953, however, that parents were cited as a possible source of these injuries (Silverman, 1953). Eight years later, child abuse received considerable attention when five physicians, in a presentation to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, used the term "battered child syndrome" (Kempe, Silverman, Steele, Droegemuller & Silver, 1962). Two significant outcomes of this presentation were increased public concern and child abuse legislation. The Children's Bureau proposed laws covering reporting of child abuse, which by 1968 had been enacted in all 50 states (Gil & Noble, 1967). In 1973, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act was passed (S. 1191, 93rd Congress, First Session) which provided financing for prevention and treatment programs.

The incidence of child abuse is not known. One author (Gil, 1969) has reported that less than 7,000 cases occur annually, while Light (1973) presented a figure of 1,175,000. The major reasons for the wide differences are the lack of accepted criteria for identification of
child abuse and the fact that many cases are not reported. Fraser (1974), a staff attorney for the National Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Child Abuse and Neglect, has indicated that every state defines child abuse differently in some respect. Reporting rates have been shown to increase dramatically following a Public Education Campaign (Mohler, 1975).

Evidence of problems faced by the abused child has been presented in the literature. Some authors (Avery, 1973; Galdston, 1971) report the presence of emotional problems in abused children. The physical and psychological trauma incurred by the abused child have been related to a high frequency of educational and psychological needs (Kline & Christiansen, 1975). A correlation between abuse and mental retardation has also been reported (Elmer & Gregg, 1967).

There has been some speculation that child abuse may result in future violence by the child. As Curtis (1963) has stated:

It is important that the psychological implications of such extreme treatment of children be kept in mind. One might expect that the sequelae would be varied and difficult to study if one should attempt to trace out all their ramifications. However, it may be useful to re-emphasize one possible consequence which is overt, obvious, and of great public concern and social consequence in its own right; namely, the probable tendency of children so treated to become tomorrow's murderers and perpetrators of other crimes of violence, if they survive. (p. 386)

Similarly, looking at the environmental causes of violence, Ilfeld (1970) said: "Physical punishment by parents does not inhibit violence and most likely encourages it" (p. 81).

Research supporting this viewpoint has been presented by some authors. Duncan, Frazier, Litin, Johnson, Barron (1958) found that four of six prisoners convicted of first-degree
murder had been subjected to remorseless physical brutality
during childhood and adolescence at the hands of their parents. Easson
and Steinhilber (1961) also found that out of eight boys who had made
murderous assaults, two had a clear history of habitual brutal beatings
by their parents. Recently (Howard, 1976), the New
York State Assembly Select Committee on Child Abuse has presented pre­
liminary findings which show a high correlation between families with
reported abuse/neglect problems and subsequent antisocial behavior on
the part of the abused child or another family member. Others (Jackson,
1970; and Silver, Dublin & Lourie, 1969) have also reported an associ­
ation between child abuse and juvenile delinquency.

Statement of the Problem

Although research has been conducted on many characteristics and
needs of the abused child, there is a lack of research directed at the
relationship between child abuse and the occurrence of juvenile de­
linquency.

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between the type of crime
committed by the abused/neglected juvenile delinquent and the type of
crime committed by a juvenile delinquent not judged abused/neglected.

2. There is no significant difference between the frequency of
abused/neglected adolescents in the State Industrial School and the
frequency of abused/neglected adolescents in the State of Utah.
Delimitations

The sample used in this study comes from a very select population. The portion of the general population that is adjudicated as juvenile delinquent is very small. Also, there is some data in the literature which suggests that juveniles receive differential treatment with regard to their delinquent behavior. Such things as socioeconomic status, ethnic origin and stability of the home influence law enforcement agencies and courts decisions on how to handle the case.

Similarly, those that are identified as abused represent a sample from a population that is difficult to define. Many different definitions of abuse/neglect can be found in the literature. Thus, the determination of abuse/neglect would depend on the definition used. For the purposes of this study, a definition developed by Kline and Hopper (1975) was used to classify children abused/neglected or non-abused/neglected. Another consideration is that abused juvenile delinquents may not be representative of abused children in general. Any generalization of this data should be made in the light of the above delimitations.
Review of Literature

Introduction

Many researchers in the area of child abuse have expressed concern that abused/neglected children are likely to become abusive/neglectful parents. Researchers, in their attempts to understand the problem, have mainly focused on three major areas: Psychological characteristics of abusing parents, socioeconomic factors and environmental factors. Although most researchers have studied variables that relate to only one of these areas, some authors (Gil, 1975; and Lystad, 1975) have concluded that all three factors must be considered in any theory of child abuse.

Likewise, many studies have been conducted which attempt to discover variables related to juvenile delinquency. Some of the variables that have been studied are: disrupted family patterns, child rearing habits and personality characteristics of the parents of juvenile delinquents. There is some evidence to suggest that parents of juvenile delinquents more often use physical punishment than do other parents (Glueck & Glueck, 1950; and McCord, McCord, & Howard, 1961).

The way both groups of parents interact with their children may have similar consequences. The use of physical punishment by the parents of juvenile delinquents is a characteristic that is very similar to the way abusive parents deal with their children. Another similarity is a lack of structure that both groups of parents provide for
their children. In the case of abusive parents, this has been called neglect and with parents of juvenile delinquents, it has been called lax disciplinary attitudes.

The effects of these child rearing practices on the child have not received adequate attention. Some authors have speculated that parents who abuse their children are producing children that are themselves more aggressive. Punishment frustrates the child and provides him with an aggressive model (Curtis, 1963; Ilfeld, 1970; and Silver, Dublin & Lourie, 1969). There is not a great deal of evidence to show whether or not the learned aggressive behavior of the abused child leads to juvenile delinquency. Perhaps just as significant, no research was identified which attempts to discover the later consequences of neglect on the child and his social or antisocial behavior.

The following review, then, was organized to present studies of abusive families and families with delinquent children in order that a comparison might be made.

Modeling of Aggression

There is some evidence to suggest that parents who abuse their children were themselves abused by their parents. One author (Oliver & Taylor, 1971) traced the occurrence of child abuse back five generations in one family. In another study (Oliver & Cox, 1973) abuse was traced back for three generations. Scott (1973) found that 19 of 29 fathers charged with killing their child had come from punitive backgrounds. Twelve of the men could remember parental violence toward them. Harsh punishment (Green, Gaines & Sandgrund, 1975), emotional
or psychological abandonment (Wasserman, 1967), and unsatisfying experiences with parents (Brown & Daniels, 1968) have also been reported in the literature as occurring in abusive families.

The way in which the parents discipline their children appears to be related to juvenile delinquency. In a study by Glueck and Glueck (1970) 611 fathers of delinquents were classified on the basis of disciplinary attitudes and practices into three groups. Twenty-five fathers' disciplinary attitudes and practices were classified as sound, 163 fathers' were classified as fair, and 423 fathers' practices were classified as unsound. The unsound practices were depicted as being either extremely lax or extremely rigid.

In another study (McCord, McCord & Howard, 1963), 255 boys between the ages of 10-15 were observed between 1939 and 1945. On the basis of these observations, which were conducted at home, school and during free time, the boys were categorized as highly aggressive, assertive, or nonaggressive. Ten years later court records were checked and 26 men who during adolescence had been identified as extremely aggressive had since been in prison. Twenty-five men who were highly aggressive during childhood, but did not have a prison record, were also located. A control group of 52 men was established from the group of men who were classified as nonaggressive during childhood. The home life of the aggressive group with a criminal record is enlightening. The parents of 87% of this group had used extreme threats in child rearing. Seventy-seven percent of their mothers rarely expressed, verbally or nonverbally, approval or pleasure in their children. This group had
also been subjected to a greater amount of parental punitiveness than either the control group of nonaggressive men or the aggressive men without a prison record. Physical punishment, ranging from spanking to brutal beatings, was considered punitive in this study.

Punitive parental control techniques may lead to delinquency by providing a model for the child to imitate. Bandura, Ross and Ross (1961, 1963) found that children are influenced by viewing aggressive behavior and become more aggressive themselves in other situations. The importance of these studies becomes apparent when it is shown that parents of delinquents more often use physical punishment than do other parents. Several authors (Glueck & Glueck, 1950; and McCord, McCord & Howard, 1961) have reported findings supporting this point of view.

Authors doing research in the area of juvenile delinquency have identified modeling of aggressive behavior as a variable influencing the child's behavior. Evidence in the area of child abuse is not as apparent. As has been pointed out, however, some authors have speculated about the relationship between the parents' abusive acts and the children's later aggressive behavior. The studies by Oliver and Taylor (1971), Oliver and Cox (1973), and Scott (1973) point to such a relationship. However, there is a lack of research evidence regarding the abused child's later actions towards societal institutions or people outside his immediate family.
Family and Personality Variables

In order to determine whether or not a relationship exists between abuse and delinquency, other possible intervening variables must be dealt with. There is an abundance of literature which attempts to determine the relationship between socioeconomic status and delinquency. Similarly, some authors have also attempted to determine if a relationship exists between abuse and socioeconomic status. If it was found that socioeconomic status was related to both abuse and delinquency, then it would be difficult to make a case that any observed relationship between abuse and delinquency was due to abuse and not socioeconomic class.

Likewise, other variables must be considered. As some authors have pointed out (Gil, 1975; and Lystad, 1972), child abuse is a multidimensional phenomena. In the following sections, the socioeconomic status, disruptive family patterns and personality characteristics of abusive parents and parents of delinquents are compared.

Socioeconomic factors. Numerous studies have identified the socioeconomic status of the parents to be a significant variable related to child abuse. Some authors (Galdston, 1972; Johnson & Morse, 1968; Lukianowicz, 1971; Sattin & Miller, 1971; and Smith, Hanson & Noble, 1973) have found a high incidence of abuse among families of lower and middle socioeconomic backgrounds. Perhaps the most significant study to concur with this point of view is Gil's nationwide survey completed in 1970. He found 39% of the mothers were in the labor force.
Of these, 32.1 percent were in service occupations, 16.4 percent did clerical work, 11.2 percent were operatives, 6.3 percent were private household workers, 3.2 percent were laborers, 4.7 percent were sales workers, 6 percent were professional, technical, or managerial workers, 0.9 percent were foremen, and 0.4 percent were students. The occupation was unknown for 18.3 percent.

However, other studies have not reported this relationship. Some authors have reported that parents come from all socioeconomic levels (Berlow, 1967; Cameron, 1972; Silver, 1968; and Zalba, 1971). One study (Giovannoni, 1971) reported parents coming from higher status positions. Thus evidence relating socioeconomic status to child abuse is inconclusive at this time.

The early findings by some authors that there is a higher incidence of juvenile delinquency among members of the lower socioeconomic class is currently being questioned. Gibbons (1970) has cautioned against comparing convicted juvenile delinquents with those not convicted because large numbers of cases are dealt with by agencies other than the court. Also, the court tends to deal with the severe cases only. Similarly, Pine (1965) has emphasized that research reporting a significant relationship between delinquent behavior and lower socioeconomic status has been characterized by a built-in bias. He points out that the use of official delinquency statistics do not reflect a considerable amount of delinquent behavior. As Eisner (1969) has written: "Delinquent activity by middle-class youths is grossly underreported in police and court records" (p. 97). Others (Developmental Psychology Today, 1971) indicate the delinquents come from all strata of society. They also point to the differential treatment of delinquents of differing socioeconomic classes by law enforcement agencies. It has also been
shown that differential treatment of delinquents by law enforcement officers occurs as a function of ethnic origin (Piliavin & Briar, 1964). Gold (1970) makes a distinction between juvenile delinquency and delinquent behavior because the former is based on adjudicated cases while delinquent behavior emphasizes the fact that many adolescents engage in delinquent acts without coming to the attention of authorities.

The earlier views relating juvenile delinquency to social class are being questioned. The evidence relating child abuse to socioeconomic status is also inconclusive at this time. A number of the studies on child abuse had samples from lower socioeconomic areas, thus biasing any inferences that can be made (Elmer, 1963; and Spinetta & Rigler, 1972). Another problem is the ability for higher or middle class people to obtain services from private doctors who are sometimes willing to let abuse go unreported, while lower-class persons must go to public hospitals that are required to make a report. Similarly, the literature that relates socioeconomic status to juvenile delinquency is being questioned because of sampling problems in some of the studies and differential treatment given to members of the middle and upper classes (Piliavin & Briar, 1965; and Pine, 1963). Due to the disparity among the studies it cannot be determined whether or not socioeconomic status is a significant intervening variable.

Disrupted homes. The family unit can become disrupted for a number of reasons. Death of a parent, divorce, separation, and long separation because of job commitments are among the major reasons. Chilton and Markle (1972) compared 5,376 disrupted families with families across
the United States and found that proportionately more children who come into contact with police agencies and juvenile courts live in disrupted families. Comparing 50 adjudicated male delinquents with 50 nonde- linquents Megargee and Rosenquist (1968) found a higher incidence of broken homes and marital instability among the parents of delinquent subjects. Koutrelakos (1971) found that children between three and six years of age are the most adversely affected by the loss of a parent. Father absence during early childhood has been shown to be related to antisocial behavior (Siegman, 1968).

While the effects of disrupted homes have been consistently identified as related to juvenile delinquency in white families, Eisner (1966) found black juveniles showed higher rates of delinquency when both parents were in the home. A reason given for this finding was that the parents might be providing a deviant model for the child to imitate. In a review of the literature dealing with fatherless homes, Herzog and Sudia (1968) traced 13 studies that dealt with father absence and juvenile delinquency. Of these studies, seven found results which indicated a positive relationship between delinquency and absence of father; the other six did not find a relationship. Some of the investigators who found a significant correlation questioned their findings because of evidence that apprehension and treatment of juveniles are influenced by the fact of a broken home.

The role mother-absence plays with regard to juvenile delinquency has not received adequate attention. Perhaps researchers concur with Becker, Peterson, Hellmer, Shoemaker and Quay's (1969) finding that the
role of the father is more important than that of the mother in the development of delinquent behavior.

The relationship between disrupted homes and recidivism has been studied by Monahan (1957). After analyzing 44,448 cases, of which 24,811 were first offenders Monahan (1957) stated:

For white boys the percentage of all cases in the recidivist class increases from 32 where both parents are married and living together, to 38 where the father is dead and the boy is with his mother, to 42 where both parents are dead and the child is with a surrogate family, to 46 percent where the parents are living apart and the child is with the mother, to 49 where the parents are divorced, to 55 where the boy is living with his unmarried mother. (p. 257)

Marital instability has been shown to be present in a large number of child abuse cases. Raffalli (1970) studied 115 cases involving 180 children and found that 40% of the parents were having marital difficulties. He also found that slightly less than 50% of the abused children had been conceived before the parents were married. Sexual promiscuity and marital conflict have been identified as contributing factors by others (Birrell & Birrell, 1966; Delsordo, 1963; Galdston, 1975; and Zalba, 1967).

Stress as a result of unemployment and other variables outside the family has been reported as being significant by some authors. Gil (1970) found that only 52.5% of the fathers in his sample of abusing parents were employed throughout the year. Others (Cameron, 1972; Light, 1973; and Scott, 1973) have also noted a high degree of unemployment in abusing families. Trouble with law enforcement agencies (Cameron, 1972; and Smith, 1973) and excessive use of alcohol (Galdston, 1975;
Lukianowicz, 1973; and Zalba, 1967) have been reported as occurring in abusing families. Criminal activity and excessive drinking has been reported as occurring together in abusing families by others (Cherry & Kuby, 1971; and Fontana, Donovan & Wong, 1963). Such families have also been characterized as having few community involvements (Fontana, et al., 1973; and Raffall, 1970).

In comparing variables associated with the disrupted homes of abused and delinquent children, a number of similarities exist. For instance, both groups have a high incidence of marital instability. A disproportionate incidence of children conceived out of wedlock and many were reported to have trouble with law enforcement agencies. There is general agreement in the literature associating disrupted homes with child abuse and juvenile delinquency. However, some researchers in the area of juvenile delinquency have cautioned against interpreting the results of studies in this manner. They argue that children from disrupted homes may be treated differently by law enforcement officers and courts than children in homes with both parents. Although a disrupted home was shown to be related to both child abuse and juvenile delinquency, it would be difficult to determine whether or not the disruption causes the abuse or delinquent behavior.

**Personality characteristics.** A number of researchers have devised typologies or clusters of personality characteristics to describe the abusing parent. Zalba (1967) describes six classifications. The first classification is called the psychotic parent. Abuse by these parents may be unpredictable, ritualistic, and can be violent. The second
classification is the pervasively angry and abusive parent. Abuse in this form is an expression of general rage and hostility which is part of the person's childhood determined personality and character. Third, the depressive, passive-aggressive parent who is characterized as being typically resentful and angry at having to meet the needs of others. Fourth, the cold, compulsive, disciplinarian parent who reacts violently to the child's need for closeness and affection. Fifth, the impulsive, but generally adequate parent with marital conflict who displaces the marital conflict onto the child. Sixth, the parent with an identity role crisis who displaces his anger at his inability to perform his role onto the child. Others have also developed typologies or personality characteristics of abusing parents (Bryant, Billingsley, Kerry, Leefman, Merrill, Sental, & Wals, 1963; Delsordo, 1963; Gil, 1970; Green et al., 1974; and Lord & Weisfeld, 1974). One source (Tracy & Clark, 1974) uses a social learning analysis that describes abusive adults in terms of skill deficits rather than in terms of psychopathology.

The dynamics of child abuse have been summed up this way by Galdston (1975):

The act of violence to the child proceeds through a sequence of psychic events that started with a denial of emotions past, to projection of unacceptable attributes onto the child, followed by provocation of the child to behave in a fashion that will be perceived as tangible confirmation of badness, for which the child is then abused. (p. 379)

Numerous studies have attempted to identify or define the psychic events and emotions that contribute to child abuse. This writer reviewed 22 articles that investigated 52 psychological variables and
found little agreement among the studies. Some of the variables are as follows: aggressive psychopathic personality (Lukianowicz, 1971), psychopathology (Galdston, 1965), defect in character structure (Cameron, Johnson & Camps, 1966), psychotic, mentally retarded and mentally disturbed (Johnson & Morse, 1968), and hostility and aggressiveness, passivity and dependence, rigidity, compulsiveness, and lack of warmth (Bryant et al., 1963). One source has stated (Lord et al., 1974):

The literature abounds with anecdotal material, subjective impressions, assumptions, inferences and generalizations based on studies of limited socioeconomic or other subgroups. A review of the literature reveals many serious contradictions in reported characteristics of parents who batter their children. (p. 72)

Spinetta and Rigler (1972) have also criticized the extant psychological literature. They cite sampling problems, and the fact that most articles are opinions as characterizing most of the literature. Gelles (1975) pointed out there is no objective behavior we can recognize as child abuse. He (Gelles, 1973) also emphasized getting away from the psychopathological model of child abuse and start planning interventions on the basis of sociological implications. Gil (1975) cautions against interpreting the dynamics of child abuse along single causal dimensions. Another point made by Gil is that the conventional dichotomy between individual and societal causation of social problems distorts the multidimensional reality of human phenomena. The trend today seems to be away from specific psychological characteristics that are unique to abusing parents. As Bell (1973) concluded "Abusing parents, however, form a heterogenous group which includes all types of personality disorders, neuroses and psychoses" (p. 227). Others
(Delsordo, 1963; Flynn, 1970) have reported cases where the parents were not mentally ill. Cameron (1972) has also emphasized that abusing parents do not necessarily have psychopathic or sociopathic personalities.

It has been demonstrated that the personalities of parents of juvenile delinquents are different than the personalities of parents of non-juvenile delinquents (as measured by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) (MMPI). One study (Orr & Cochran, 1969), found significant differences on six of the 10 scales between mothers of delinquent and nondelinquent sons. The fathers were different on only one of the scales. Another study (Anderson, 1969) found significant differences between the parents of aggressive, neurotic, and normal boys (as measured by the MMPI). Fathers of aggressive boys were characterized as having poor impulse control and an inability to tolerate meaningful close relationships.

It has been reported that the attitudes of the parent toward the child and the child's perceptions of these attitudes, contributes to juvenile delinquency. In a sample of 30 delinquent boys with a mean age of 15 and a control group of nondelinquent boys Medinnus (1965) found significant differences between the way both groups viewed their parents. The delinquent boys had a less favorable attitude toward their parents. They also pictured their fathers as being much more neglecting, demanding, rejecting and punishing than the control group. Others (Andry, 1950; and Bandura & Walters, 1959) have also reported these findings. Jenkins (1975) has also found aggressive children tend
to feel more rejected by their mother than nonaggressive children. High school dropouts have also characterized their homelife as unhappy and lacking in acceptance from other members of the family (Cervantes, 1965). Dinitz, Scarpitti, and Reckless (1962) studied 226 boys over a four year period. All of these boys were from high delinquency areas. The authors pointed to the unfavorable socialization in the families of the boys who later became delinquent as being a significant factor.

The comparison of the personality variables between both groups is difficult to make. The researchers have used different descriptors to describe their samples. Also, the literature on the personality characteristics of abusing parents does not present a unified pattern. It is apparent that some of these families are deviant, but they are not deviant in the same ways. Likewise, the literature on parents of juvenile delinquents is quite scanty. Although some researchers do report differences between parents of delinquent and normal children, the studies are few in number. Undoubtedly, deviancy plays a role to some extent, but one cannot conclude from the literature that it is a necessary or sufficient condition to cause juvenile delinquency or child abuse.

Summary

The review was organized to present variables that have been associated with the parents of abused and delinquent children. Modeling of aggression was shown to be a significant factor related to juvenile delinquency. Although some authors have speculated about its significance, the importance of modeling was not found to be so clearcut in the literature on child abuse.
The evidence relating child abuse to socioeconomic status is inconclusive. Sampling bias was an occurring problem in most of the studies. The research relating juvenile delinquency to socioeconomic status is also being questioned because of sampling problems and differential treatment given to groups from different social classes. Due to these problems it was not determined whether or not socioeconomic status is a significant intervening variable.

When comparing variables associated with the homes of abused and delinquent children, the following similarities were found: (1) a high incidence of marital instability, (2) disproportionate incidence of children conceived out of wedlock, and (3) trouble with law enforcement agencies. Although some authors have questioned their findings relating disrupted homes to juvenile delinquency, there is general agreement that it is related to juvenile delinquency and child abuse.

Researchers studying the personality characteristics have used different descriptors to describe their samples, thus making a comparison difficult. Deviancy may play a role to some extent, but it cannot be concluded from the literature that deviancy is a necessary or sufficient condition to cause juvenile delinquency or child abuse.

In light of the common factors that seem to be present in both child abuse/neglect and juvenile delinquency, the research questions posed in this study seem amply justified.
**Procedures**

In order to acquire and record pertinent abuse or neglect data on juvenile delinquents, the following steps were taken:

1. Permission to look at the records of each individual currently committed to the State Industrial School (SIS) was obtained.

2. Abuse/neglect and juvenile delinquency information was collected from the files of SIS.

3. A data collection checklist was used to insure accuracy of the data collection procedures.

4. The accuracy of the data collection was checked on two different occasions.

5. Permission to look at the records of the Division of Family Services (DFS) was obtained.

6. Specific abuse/neglect information was collected from the files at DFS.

7. The accuracy of the data collection was checked on two different occasions.

**Subjects**

All of the active student files (N=159, those currently committed to SIS) were drawn from the records of SIS in Ogden, Utah and were utilized in this study. There were 140 males and 19 females with ages ranging from 14 to 19 in this sample. The subjects were all referred to SIS by a judicial process. The comparison groups were all children
in the State of Utah identified as abused or neglected who are between
the ages of 14 to 19 and the total 14 to 19 year old population in the
State of Utah.

Abuse/Neglect and Delinquency Data

The procedures used to gain information on abuse/neglect and de­
linquency were as follows: (a) obtain permission from SIS to examine
the confidential files, (b) conduct a pilot study, (c) design a data
collection instrument, (d) utilize a data collection checklist, (e)
determine the accuracy of the data collection procedures, and (f) col­
lect required data from SIS.

Obtaining access to confidential files. The State Industrial School
administration offices were visited and the goals and procedures of the
proposed research project were presented. This was followed by a letter
which detailed the procedures to be followed in the proposed study (see
Appendix A). Permission to record data from the confidential files was
granted on December 30, 1975 (see Appendix B for letter received from
Claude Pratt, Superintendent).

Pilot study. After obtaining permission to record data, a pilot
study was conducted to determine if data on child abuse/neglect could
be found in the records of students at SIS. Twenty-four files were
read. Seventeen of the files contained data from judges and social
workers indicating some form of abuse or neglect. On the basis of
these findings, it was felt that sufficient information could be ex­
tracted from the records at SIS.
Data collection instrument. Besides the determination of the presence of abuse/neglect data in the files, the pilot study allowed the researcher an opportunity to field test the data collection instrument. The original instrument consisted of a 5 x 8 inch card with spaces for the following information.

1. Birthdate, age.
2. The number of siblings.
3. Subjects relationship to siblings (birth order).
4. Ethnic origin.
5. Marital status of parents.
6. Type of crime leading to placement at SIS and subject's age.
7. The number and type of previous crimes.
8. Police record of siblings.

It was found that this data collection instrument was too small to allow for comments to be copied on it. Therefore, the data collection instrument was enlarged to 8-1/2 x 11 inches (see Appendix C). In addition, it was decided that more information should be collected, so spaces for the child's and parents' names and address were provided.

Data collection checklist. In order to insure the accuracy of the data collection procedure, a data collection checklist was utilized by the researcher (see Appendix D). The checklist consisted of 11 data points that were checked against the data collection instrument after the researchers had read the file.
Accuracy of the data collection procedures. The procedure for collecting data was to read each file and record information on the collection instrument. To measure the accuracy of information gathered, the following procedures were used:

1. A graduate student, independent of the research project, was asked to determine the accuracy.

2. Accuracy was determined by reading the data on the collection instrument and verifying its accuracy by finding the data in the file.

Table 1
Data Collector Accuracy (First Check)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collector</th>
<th>Files N = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the conclusion of data collection from SIS, the researcher conducted a second accuracy check. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Data Collector Accuracy (Second Check)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collector</th>
<th>Files N = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collection procedure. The procedure used to collect information from the files was to read each file and record the data on the data collection instrument. Initially, the agreement with SIS was that no names would be taken from the files at SIS. However, based on the results of the pilot study, it was decided that a check on the findings at SIS could be accomplished by also reviewing the records at the Division of Family Services. This matter was discussed with Donald Tatton, Assistant Superintendent, and he agreed to let the researcher record the names and addresses of the students whenever abuse/neglect information was found in their file.

Description of the data collected. Abuse or neglect data was found in the files of 63 of the 159 files on students currently at SIS. Of the 63 subjects who were identified as abused/neglected 56 were males and 7 were females.

Abuse/Neglect Information

After all of the data had been collected at SIS, the next step was to get more specific abuse/neglect information from the records at the Division of Family Services (DFS). This was accomplished by the following procedures: (a) obtain permission to look at DFS files; (b) locate district office that file was in; (c) design a data collection instrument; (d) collect the data; (e) determine accuracy of data collection; and (f) establish procedures to maintain confidentiality.

Obtaining access to the Division of Family Services' confidential files. A meeting was held with Evan E. Jones, Division Director, to
explain the purpose and procedures of the research project. Permission to look at the files was received on June 7, 1976 (see Appendix F).

**Locating files.** To determine if DFS had files on the students at SIS, a list of the students' names and birthdates was sent to the main office of DFS in Salt Lake City, Utah. On June 17, 1976, a computer printout with the names and location of the file was received by the researcher from DFS.

In order to coordinate the research activities with DFS, a letter was sent to the district offices where the files were located (see Appendix E). In addition, each office was called to establish a time when the researcher could visit their office and read the files.

**Data collection instrument.** Because the data collected at DFS was on abuse/neglect only, a new collection instrument was designed for that purpose (see Appendix G). The instrument was based on Kline and Hopper's (1974) Concept Analysis of Child Abuse. A section for sexual molestation was also added. Front and rear drawings of a child were on the form so that the area of injury could be marked.

**Data collection procedures.** Each file was read and any abuse/neglect information was recorded on the instrument. For instance, there was data in some files of complaints made to DFS about the children running the streets at all hours of the day. This corresponds to the unsupervised physical item under the general category of neglectful injuries. The researcher would check this item on the collection instrument and then continue to read the file. After collecting the necessary information, the data collection instrument was stapled to the back of the SIS collection instrument.
Accuracy of data collection procedures. To insure that the data collected by the researcher were both accurate and complete, the following steps were taken:

1. A graduate student, independent of the research project, was asked to determine the accuracy.

2. After the researcher had read a file and marked the data collection instrument, the file was read by the graduate student and a separate collection instrument was marked by him. The two data collection sheets were then compared.

The first 10 files read by the researcher were also checked by the graduate student. The last six files read were also checked. The only discrepancy between the researcher and the graduate student occurred on the second file. The researcher made one error of omission.

Maintaining confidentiality. Maintaining the confidentiality of the information gathered was considered to be an important part of this research project. Precautions were taken to limit access to the data taken from SIS and DFS. A total of five people were authorized to look at the data. This included the researcher, one data collector, two graduate students who made accuracy checks, and the researcher's advising professor. The data were kept in a locked briefcase when research activities were not in progress.

Description of the data. Of the 63 subjects that were identified as abused/neglected from the files at SIS, 48 also had a file at DFS. The number of files read by the researcher was 32. The reasons for not looking at all of the files are as follows:
1. The researcher limited the search of records to Box Elder, Cache, Davis, Salt Lake, Utah and Weber Counties. Seven of the files were outside this geographical area.

2. Some files could not be located at DFS offices. A total of nine files could not be located. The reasons given were subjects moved to another area or the case was closed and file was sent to a storage facility.

**Design**

The research design utilized for this study has been labeled as causal-comparative, or ex-post facto research. The method consists of comparing subjects who display a particular trait with those in whom the trait is not present. In this study, abused juvenile delinquents were compared with juvenile delinquents that were not reported as abused. This study attempted to find out if abused delinquents are found in the State Industrial School at a greater frequency than those not identified as abused. Further, analysis was made to determine whether or not abuse is associated with the type of crime or offense committed.

There are some limitations associated with the causal-comparative design. It is often difficult or impossible to determine if a cause-effect relationship exists between the two variables selected. Variables heretofore unidentified may account for any observed relationships. For example, it may be the case that the children who are juvenile delinquents are also prone to abuse. Research designs which are typically used to discover causes require that two or more groups be compared before and after a variable has been introduced. In the case of
abuse, it would not be ethical or feasible to introduce abuse and neglect. A significant association between abuse and juvenile delinquency may provide a direction for other studies which are designed to provide answers to the question of cause and effect.

Measures Used

This study used Kline and Hopper's (1974) criteria for establishing child abuse and categories of offenses adapted from a classification scheme reported by Short, Tennyson and Howard (1963).

The specific list of the injury categories for child abuse are as follows: (a) Bruises, welts, scars; (b) burns; (c) central nervous system damage; (d) bone injuries; (e) visceral abdominal injuries; (f) neglectful injuries; and (g) sexual molestation.

The specific list of categories of offenses (Short, Tennyson & Howard, 1963) follows:

1. Conflict factor
   a. Individual fighting
   b. Group fighting
   c. Carrying a concealed weapon
   d. Assault
   e. Rape
   f. Indecent exposure
2. Stable corner factor
   a. Gambling
   b. Joy riding
   c. Truancy

3. Stable sex
   a. Statutory rape
   b. Use, buy and sell of alcohol
   c. Sexual intercourse

4. Retreatist
   a. Buying and selling narcotics and marijuana
   b. Suicide attempts
   c. Pimping
   d. Strong arm robbery
   e. Petty thefts
   f. Shoplifting

5. Authority protest
   a. Driving without a license
   b. Public nuisance
   c. Theft
   d. Auto theft
   e. Runaway
   f. Burglary
   g. Ungovernability
   h. Destruction of property
**Analysis**

A chi-square analysis was utilized to provide a measure of the statistical significance of the comparative data. The formula used was as follows:

\[ X^2 = \sum \frac{[(f_o - f_e)]^2}{f_e} \]

**hypothesis 1:** \( f_o = \) type of crime committed by abused juvenile delinquent and type of crime committed by juvenile delinquent not judged abused. \( f_e \) was determined by computing the marginal totals. The \( f_e \) was computed the same way for both hypotheses.

**hypotheses 2:** \( f_o = \) frequency of abused adolescents in the State Industrial School and frequency of abused adolescents in the State of Utah.

The degrees of freedom were calculated using the formula \((r-1)(c-1)\) where \( r = \) rows and \( c = \) columns. The Yates correction factor was used in all computations to adjust for possible low cell frequencies.
Results and Discussion

Introduction

The records on the population at the State Industrial School and the Division of Family Services were utilized for this study. There were 159 students at SIS when the study was conducted. Of these, 140 were males and 19 were females. Information indicative of abuse or neglect was found in 63 of the 159 files read at SIS.

After collecting the data at SIS, the Division of Family Services was contacted to determine if their offices also had additional records on the students identified as abused/neglected from the files at SIS. Records were located at DFS on 32 of the 63 students. Eleven of the files contained information indicating that these students had been adjudged abused or neglected.

Hypothesis 1

Results. The first hypothesis was stated as follows: There is no significant difference between the type of crime committed by an abused/neglected juvenile delinquent and a delinquent not judged abused/neglected.

In order to determine the significance of this hypothesis, the following steps were taken:

1. Each subject was classified as either abused/neglected or not abused/neglected.

2. The crimes committed by each subject were classified into one of the categories of offenses presented by Short, Tennyson and
Howard (1963). Some of the subjects had more than one crime listed as the cause for being committed. For instance, a subject had stolen a car and had also run away. Runaway belongs to the class of crimes known as status offenses. A status offense is only considered a crime when it is committed by an adolescent. Some of the more common status offenses are as follows: (2) truancy, (b) smoking, (c) curfew, (d) ungovernability, and (e) use of alcohol. In those cases where a subject had committed a status offense and a more serious type of crime, the more serious crime was used for classification.

3. Analysis was conducted on two groups identified as abused/neglected. The first group consisted of those students identified as abused/neglected from the records at SIS. The second group contained those students that had been judged abused/neglected by the Division of Family Services or the juvenile courts. Throughout the remainder of this chapter, the first group will be referred to as group 1 and the second group will be referred to as group 2.

4. A comparison of the crimes committed by abused juvenile delinquents with the crimes committed by neglected juvenile delinquents was made to determine if there were any differences between the two groups.
Table 3
Comparison of Crimes Committed by Abused and Neglected Delinquents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conflict factor</th>
<th>Stable corner</th>
<th>Stable sex</th>
<th>Retreatist</th>
<th>protest</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the chi-square analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Chi-square Values of Abuse and Neglect Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conflict factor</th>
<th>Stable corner</th>
<th>Stable sex</th>
<th>Retreatist</th>
<th>protest</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no significant differences between the abused and neglected students when they were compared by type of crime committed. Therefore, the two groups were combined.

The classification by category of crime for the abused/neglected and not abused/neglected is presented in Table 5.
### Table 5
Classification of Abused/Neglected and Not Abused/Neglected by Category of Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conflict factor</th>
<th>Stable corner</th>
<th>Stable sex</th>
<th>Retreatist</th>
<th>protest</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abused/ neglected</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not abused/ neglected</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the chi-square analysis are presented in Table 6.

### Table 6
Chi-square Analysis by Category of Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conflict factor</th>
<th>Stable corner</th>
<th>Stable sex</th>
<th>Retreatist</th>
<th>protest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square value</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>6.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p &gt; .01.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square value</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>No analysis</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion. There were no significant differences between group 2 and the nonabused/neglected subjects in terms of type of crime committed. The only significant difference occurred when group 1 was compared with the nonabused/neglected subjects. There were more abused/neglected students in the authority protest category than would be expected if chance factors were operating alone.

These results tend to support the findings in other authors (Glueck & Glueck, 1970; McCord, McCord & Howard, 1963). The disciplinary practices used by the parents are related to the child's later anti-social behavior. For abused/neglected children, the antisocial behavior takes on a similar pattern in terms of the type of delinquent acts they commit. Most of the abused/neglected students at SIS committed crimes that have been characterized as authority protest type offenses. This may be related to the significant authority figures in their lives and how they have been treated by them.

It may be that these delinquent adolescents have also learned how to act by modeling themselves after their parents. Modeling has been shown to be an effective way of teaching aggressive behavior (Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1961, 1963). In the case of abused/neglected children, an extreme form of behavior is learned. It may be inferred that when a child is abused or neglected, it is perceived as a negative experience. The trauma or pain is not easily forgotten. Some studies have shown that abused children become abusing adults (Oliver & Cox, 1973; Oliver & Taylor, 1971; Scott, 1973). Likewise, the treatment received by the abused/neglected delinquent may lead to antisocial behavior.
**Hypothesis 2**

**Results.** Hypothesis 2 was stated as follows: There is no significant difference between the number of abused/neglected adolescents of the State Industrial School and the number of abused/neglected adolescents in the state of Utah.

The comparison groups utilized for this analysis were the number of 13-19 year old people in the state of Utah and the number of abused/neglected individuals in the state. The number of 13-19 year olds was found in the 1974 and 1975 fall enrollment in the Utah public schools. The total number of 13-19 year olds is 164,599.

The number of abused/neglected persons between the ages of 13 and 19 could not be located. Therefore, a percentage figure was projected onto the 13-19 year old population. The 1974 Utah State Plan for the Developmentally Disabled reported that 2.5% of the 0-5 year old population was abused or neglected. Projecting this 2.5% figures onto the total 13-19 year old population in the state of Utah gives a total of 4,115 people who were possibly abused/neglected in that age range. The 4,115 figure, or 2.5%, was used for part of the analysis. However, the National Center for Child Abuse and Neglect has reported that 5% of the population under the age of 18 is abused or neglected in the United States. Since the 2.5% figure may have given spuriously high results in the analysis, the 5% national figure was also used to test the significance of the data. Five percent of the 13-19 year old population is 8,230. In addition to analyzing the data using the state and national figures, analysis was made with both group 1 and group 2. The results are presented in Table 7.
### Table 7
Chi-square Values Comparing Abused/Neglected in the State and Abused/Neglected at SIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>2.5% of population</th>
<th>5% of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square value</td>
<td>885.85*</td>
<td>394.38*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>2.5% of population</th>
<th>5% of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square value</td>
<td>11.02*</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .001.

**Discussion.** When both the state and national abuse/neglect figures are projected onto the 13-19 year olds in the state of Utah and compared with the incidence of abuse/neglect in group 1, a very high chi-square value is obtained. This value is well beyond the .001 significance level. From those results, the null hypothesis was rejected. There are significantly more abused/neglected individuals in the State Industrial School than would be expected from the abused/neglected population in the state.

The results of the analysis on the group 2 data were not as clear-cut. When the 2.5% figure was used, the chi-square value was beyond the .001 level of significance. When the 5% figure was used, there was no significant difference between the number of abused/neglected adolescents at SIS.
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

Much research effort has been focused on finding the causes of delinquent behavior. Findings from such research have shown that modeling, disrupted families and certain psychological factors tend to be associated with delinquent or antisocial behavior. A few authors have speculated that a possible outcome of child abuse is the child learning to react in aggressive or antisocial ways. There is some evidence to support this viewpoint. Some researchers have presented data on adults convicted of murder or making murderous assaults that show they were severely mistreated as children.

It was the purpose of this study to determine the frequency of abuse/neglect in a delinquent population. Further, analysis was made to determine whether or not abuse/neglect was related to certain types of crimes.

The subjects consisted of all adolescents currently committed to the Utah State Industrial School. There was a total of 159 students at SIS. Of these, 63 had data in their files indicating abuse or neglect. In addition to examining the files at SIS, the records at the Division of Family Services were utilized in this study.

Data collection was carried out by a two-person data collection team. The sources of the data were the confidential records at the Utah State Industrial School and the Division of Family Services.
The procedure used to collect the data was to read the file on a student and record the type of delinquent act committed and any abuse/neglect data in the file. The accuracy of the data collection procedure was checked on two occasions.

The findings showed that a significant number of the delinquents had been abused or neglected. It was also found that a significant number of the abused/neglected delinquents had committed authority protest (auto theft, burglary, driving without a license, public nuisance, runaway, theft, and ungovernability) crimes.

Conclusions

The findings of this study have shown that the frequency of abused/neglected adolescents at the State Industrial School is significantly greater than the population not abused/neglected. If the relationship between abuse/neglect and placement in SIS is causal, the cost to society for abuse/neglect is extremely high. The abused/neglected delinquent in a correctional institution incurs administrative, staff, and facility expenses which are paid for by the public.

It was also shown that abused/neglected delinquents commit a large number of authority protest crimes. Those crimes result in property loss. The cost of this must also be carried by the public.

Recommendations

Due to the fact that an association between abuse/neglect and juvenile delinquency does not mean a cause-effect relationship, it is important to find out if abuse/neglect causes delinquent behavior.
Therefore, studies should be conducted that investigate these causal relationships. To establish these causal relationships, it is recommended that a longitudinal study be made that follows a sample of abused/neglected children into adulthood. This study could determine if abuse/neglect or some other intervening variables cause aggressive or antisocial behavior. This study could also establish whether or not the pattern of crime shifts from crimes against property to crimes against people.

To facilitate the needed research, communication between agencies that collect abuse/neglect data and researchers should be encouraged. The analysis of data collected by those agencies could lead to the development of significant prevention programs for the abused/neglected child. In order to facilitate this research activity, the following recommendations are made:

1. A uniform system of record keeping and documentation of abuse/neglect cases should be established.

2. Access to confidential files containing abuse/neglect data has, in the past, been granted to researchers. This cooperation should be continued and encouraged.

3. The findings of subsequent studies should be made available not only to the agencies that are working with child abuse/neglect cases, but also to legislative leaders interested in improving child protective services, prevention programs in our schools, and improving treatment of the juvenile offender.
Recent research has shown that the consequences of abuse go far beyond the abusive act. Abuse has been related to psychological, educational, and social problems for the abused child. In order to create a climate that is favorable to continuing this research, the following recommendations are made:

1. Attempts should be made to make the general public aware of the consequences of abuse.

2. The cost of abuse/neglect in terms of human resources and financial burden to society needs to be made known to public officials and other members of society.

The findings of this study should be verified by conducting studies at other institutions. For instance, this study found no difference between the types of crimes committed by the abused and neglected delinquent. However, the abused comparison group was small. Other researchers comparing those groups may find differences.
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Appendices
Appendix A. Letter Sent to the State Industrial School
December 5, 1975

Mr. Claude Pratt, Superintendent
Utah State Industrial School
200 North Washington Blvd.
Ogden, Utah 84404

Dear Mr. Pratt:

I appreciated you taking the time to discuss the proposed research project.

We have recently completed some research in the area of child abuse and neglect which indicated that abused/neglected children frequently had educational problems. In order to complete that research, we were given access to Division of Family Services confidential files. We were also permitted access to educational records in ten Wasatch front school districts. I am enclosing a copy of our final report.

The purpose of the research we hope to carry out at the State Industrial School is to determine whether or not abuse/neglect is related to placement at your institution and whether there is a relationship between type of abuse/neglect and type of problem the child has. In order to accomplish the research, we plan to gather the required information from your confidential files.

In order to insure confidentiality, we will take the following steps:

1. Data gathering will be accomplished by a graduate student directly under the supervision of a faculty member.

2. At no time during the data collection procedures will the names of the residents of your institution be recorded on the data collection instrument.

It is our belief that the proposed research will result in significant new
knowledge about the residents in your institution. We appreciate your assistance in this effort. We will call you during the week of December 8.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeff Clark
Research Associate

James Christiansen
Assistant Professor
Appendix B. Letter Permitting Research at the State Industrial School
Mr. James Christiansen
Assistant Professor
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322

Dear Mr. Christiansen:

Your request to have graduate student, Mr. Clark, use our files on a research project is approved.

We will cooperate with you and Mr. Clark at any time.

Sincerely,

Claud H. Pratt
Superintendent

CHP:jg
Appendix C. Data Collection Instrument (SIS)
BIRTHDATE:  
AGE:  
SEX:  
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS:  
RELATIONSHIP TO SIBLINGS:  
ETHNIC ORIGIN:  
MARITAL STATUS OF PARENTS:  
PARENT'S NAME:  
PARENT'S ADDRESS:  
PARENT'S EMPLOYMENT:  

AGE AND TYPE OF CRIME LEADING TO PLACEMENT AT THE STATE INSTITUTE:  
AGE:  
ASSAULT [ ] BURGLARY [ ] ARMED ROBBERY [ ] DRUGS [ ] RUNAWAY [ ]  
CAR THEFT [ ] RAPE [ ] SHOPLIFTING [ ] OTHER [ ]  
THEFT [ ] TRUANCY [ ] UNGOVERNABILITY [ ] LARCENY [ ]  

NUMBER AND TYPE OF PREVIOUS CRIMES:  
ASSAULT [ ] BURGLARY [ ] ARMED ROBBERY [ ] DRUGS [ ] RUNAWAY [ ]  
CAR THEFT [ ] RAPE [ ] SHOPLIFTING [ ] OTHER [ ]  
THEFT [ ] TRUANCY [ ] UNGOVERNABILITY [ ] LARCENY [ ]  

POLICE RECORDS OF SIBLINGS:  
RECORDED ABUSE:  
CHILD'S NAME:  

COMMENTS:
Appendix D. Data Collection Checklist
Data Collection Checklist

1. Check for Accuracy:
   A. Birthdate and age.
   B. Sex.
   C. Number of siblings.
   D. Relationship to siblings.
   E. Ethnic origin.
   F. Parents' address and employment.
   G. Marital status of parents.

2. Delinquency Data:
   A. Check type of crime leading to placement.
   B. Check number and type of previous crimes.
   C. Check police record of siblings.

3. Abuse/Neglect Data:
   A. Check accuracy of quotes taken from file.
Appendix E. Letter Sent to Division of Family Services District Office
June 29, 1976

Sarnp

Sample

Dear Sir:

Thank you for allowing me to conduct my research at your facility.

The procedures I will use to maintain confidentiality are as follows:

1. No direct quotes will be taken from your files.
2. No identifying information or other demographic data will be copied from your files.
3. After collecting the data, in the presence of a member of your staff, I will cut off all identifying information on the data sheet from the State Industrial School. It will then be disposed of in any manner you desire.

Although I will collect all the data myself, one other person, a graduate student trained for the procedure will check some of the files so that the accuracy of my data collection can be checked. I cannot give you the precise number of files he will look at because that will not be determined until the number of subjects we are able to locate is known.

If you have any questions or feel uncomfortable with the above procedures, please don't hesitate to contact me. I am looking forward to meeting you. Thanks again for the cooperation you are giving me.

I will contact you by phone within a few days to arrange a convenient time to come to your facility.

Sincerely yours,

Jeff Clark
Graduate Student

Dr. James Christiansen
Assistant Professor

JC: sb
Enclosure
Appendix F. Letter Permitting Research at Division of Family Services
June 7, 1976

James L. Christiansen
Assistant Professor
Department of Special Education
Utah State University
Logan, Utah

Dear Jim:

You may use this letter as permission from this office to examine specified case records in Districts 1, 2-A, 2-B and 3, of the Division of Family Services.

Prior to entering any of the above Districts, please contact the Director to discuss your specific requirements and to arrange for a mutually convenient time and date for examining the records. You should also provide the Director, in advance of the visit, a copy of the instrument you intend to use during the examination, a list of cases you wish to examine, and the procedure you will follow to maintain strict confidentiality.

A list of our district offices is attached for your information. We wish you success in your project and will look forward to receiving a copy of the findings when you have it completed.

Sincerely,

DIVISION OF FAMILY SERVICES

Evan E. Jones, Jr., ACSW
Division Director
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cc William S. Ward
    William A. Low
    Glen Winslow
    Margo Horton
    Floy Taylor
    Sam N. Anton
Appendix G. Data Collection Instrument (DFS)
Directions: 1. Read file to determine category of abuse and exact location of injury.
2. Mark injury on the appropriate spot of drawing.
3. Place a check in boxes adjacent to descriptors.
4. In the presence of DFS staff, destroy identifying information on State Industrial School data collection sheet.

Note: Do not write names or any other identifying information on this sheet. Do not write direct quotes from file.

1. Bruises, welts and scars
   - multiple □
   - bi-lateral □
   - unilateral □
   - well-defined □
   - other (specify) □

2. Burns
   - different stages of healing
   - other (specify)

3. Central nervous system damage
   - retinal hemorrhage □
   - paralysis □
   - subdural hematoma □
   - toxic □
   - other (specify) □

4. Bone injuries
   - different stages of healing
   - multiple □
   - longbone □
   - spiral □
   - teeth □
   - chip □
   - concussion □
   - other (specify) □

5. Visceral abdominal injuries
   - gross exam □
   - swelling □
   - discoloration □
   - hemorrhage □
   - hematoma □
   - unconsciousness □
   - mesentery tears □

6. Neglectful injuries
   - unsupervised physical □
   - trauma □
   - marasmus □
   - malnutrition □
   - nonsupport (economic) □
   - isolation □
   - other (specify) □

7. Sexual molestation
   - father □
   - mother □
   - siblings □
   - other (specify) □
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