

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1998

Physically and Sexually Violent Juvenile Offenders: A Comparative Study of Victimization History Variables

Monique R. Frazier
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Frazier, Monique R., "Physically and Sexually Violent Juvenile Offenders: A Comparative Study of Victimization History Variables" (1998). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 6137.
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/6137>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



PHYSICALLY AND SEXUALLY VIOLENT JUVENILE OFFENDERS:

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF VICTIMIZATION

HISTORY VARIABLES

by

Monique R. Frazier

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1998

Copyright © Monique R. Frazier 1998

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Physically and Sexually Violent Juvenile Offenders:

A Comparative Study of Victimization

History Variables

by

Monique R. Frazier, Doctor of Philosophy

Utah State University, 1998

Major Professor: Dr. Frank R. Ascione
Department: Psychology

The primary purpose of this study was to examine and compare physically and sexually violent juvenile offenders (PVJOs and SVJOs) to determine whether specific factors in their abuse histories, if present, tend to be associated with the type of violent offense pattern they exhibit. The Youth Experiences and Behaviors Structured Interview (YEBSI)--an instrument which assesses for primary (victimization), secondary (witnessing), and perpetrated abuse of an emotional, physical, and sexual nature, by and/or toward family members, acquaintances, strangers, and animals--was developed by the primary researcher for use in

this study. Thirty-six PVJOs and 30 SVJOs were interviewed. Results indicated that the YEBSI demonstrated high levels of internal consistency reliability and a very high level of interrater reliability. Various descriptive statistical, scale, and subscale correlations for the YEBSI were provided.

Very high percentages of both groups reported experiencing and witnessing all types of abuse. In all cases, a similar or larger percentage of SVJOs reported histories of primary and secondary abuse. SVJOs reported more severe levels of emotional abuse, similar severity levels of physical abuse, and less extremely severe levels of sexual abuse than did PVJOs. Family members and acquaintances (as compared to strangers) tended to be far more frequently reported as perpetrators by respondents. Composite primary and secondary abuse scores were moderately correlated with abuse perpetration scores for SVJOs and strongly correlated with abuse perpetration scores for PVJOs. For emotional, family, acquaintance, and stranger abuse, reported primary-secondary abuse scores were found to be most highly correlated with abuse perpetration scores of the same nature (e.g., emotional abuse history-witness

scores best correlated with physical abuse perpetration scores and family abuse history-witness scores best correlated with perpetration scores against family members). Finally, the classification variables correctly predicted 75% of those in the physically violent group and 67% of those in the sexually violent group, with an overall "hit" rate of 71%. Examination of the discriminant function-variable correlations in this study indicates that it was primarily the emotional, family-perpetrated, and sexual abuse subscales that defined the function. Theoretical interpretations and implications for these results are provided.

(195 pages)

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my husband and best friend, Lance, who has patiently and lovingly supported me in this endeavor. His encouragement and listening ear have greatly helped me to conquer each hurdle this project has presented. Moreover, his love, patience, devotion, wisdom, kindness, and respect for others are a wonderful example to me as I strive to become a better person.

I also give special thanks and love to my classmates and best of friends, Tracy Black, Benita Quakenbush, Mike Williams, and Chris Morris. I have been so privileged to have had the opportunity to get to know them over the past five years. They have been constant sources of support, kindness, fun, and inspiration, and will forever hold a very special place in my heart.

Monique R. Frazier

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Frank Ascione for his help and expertise throughout the writing of this document. Sincere thanks also to the other committee members: Dr. Ken Merrell, an exceptional advisor, for always taking the time to listen, encourage, and give unfailing advice; Dr. Xitao Fan, for his approachability and willingness to patiently share his expertise on statistical matters; Dr. Sue Crowley, for her unwavering support, genuine concern, and confidence in my abilities; and Dr. Gary Kiger, for his comfortable manner, knowledge, and refreshing perspectives. Thanks to all participating facilities--Mill Creek Youth Center, Michelle Gourley from the Birdseye Adolescent Sexual Accountability Program, Peggy Blackett and Jerry Groshart from Weber Human Services, Al Carlyle from Provo Canyon School, and Mark Hailes and Lee Alder from the Family Preservation Institute--for volunteering to take time out of their busy schedules to help advance research in this important area. I would also like to specially thank my research assistants, David Wood and Russ Vollmer, for their dedication and high quality of

work. Special thanks to Karen and Cathrun, who have not only provided invaluable assistance on this project, but have also been wonderful sources of support, help, and laughter throughout graduate school. Finally, I give my thanks and love to parents, who have made it possible for me to receive a good education and pursue a career that gives me great joy and fulfillment.

Monique R. Frazier

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
CHAPTER	
I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Research Questions	3
Operational Definitions	4
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
Current Statistics	6
Abuse-Delinquency Connection	11
Abuse-Violent Delinquency Connection	13
Abuse-Sexual Offense Connection	15
Differentiating Among Violent Offenders	20
Rationale and Calls for Offender-Specific Studies	24
III. METHODOLOGY	27
Subjects	27
Procedures	34
Measures	39
IV. RESULTS	51
Internal and Interrater Reliability	51
Descriptive Statistics	52

Correlational Statistics	70
Discriminant Analysis	83
V. CONCLUSIONS	89
YEBSI Internal Consistency and Interrater Reliability	89
Descriptive and Correlational Data	91
Discriminant Analysis	109
Implications for Intervention	113
Limitations	116
REFERENCES	119
APPENDICES	129
Appendix A: State Department Protection of Human Rights Review Committee Approval	130
Appendix B: USU Institutional Review Board Approval	132
Appendix C: Active Parent/Guardian Consent Form	134
Appendix D: Youth Consent Form	138
Appendix E: Youth Experiences and Behaviors Structured Interview Form (YEBSI)	141
Appendix F: YEBSI Cue Cards	162
CURRICULUM VITAE	171

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Description of Subjects	34
2 YEBSI Scoring Structure (Score Abbreviations Highlighted)	46
3 Internal Reliability of the YEBSI (Cronbach's Alpha)	53
4 Descriptive Statistics for YEBSI Scores (Mean, Median, Mode, SD, Min., and Max.) <u>N</u> = 66	54
5 Percentage of Physically Violent Respondents (PVJOs) Who Reported Primary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) <u>n</u> = 36	59
6 Percentage of Sexually Violent Respondents (SVJOs) Who Reported Primary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) <u>n</u> = 30	59
7 Percentage of Physically Violent Respondents (PVJOs) Who Reported Secondary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) <u>n</u> = 36	60
8 Percentage of Sexually Violent Respondents (SVJOs) Who Reported Secondary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) <u>n</u> = 30	60
9 Percentage of Physically Violent Respondents (PVJOs) Who Reported Perpetrating Abuse (By Category of Victim) <u>n</u> = 36	61
10 Percentage of Sexually Violent Respondents (SVJOs) Who Reported Perpetrating Abuse (By Category of Victim) <u>n</u> = 30	61

Table

11	YEBSI Correlations for Physically Violent Respondents (Perpetration Scale Score with: History and Witness Scale Scores; Emotional, Physical, and Sexual Subscale Scores; and Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger Subscale Scores) $n = 36$	72
12	YEBSI Correlations for Sexually Violent Respondents (Perpetration Scale Score with: History and Witness Scale Scores; Emotional, Physical, and Sexual Subscale Scores; and Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger Subscale Scores) $n = 30$	73
13	YEBSI Subscale Correlations for Physically Violent Offenders (Emotional, Physical, and Sexual History--Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores) $n = 36$	76
14	YEBSI Subscale Correlations for Sexually Violent Offenders (Emotional, Physical, and Sexual History--Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores) $n = 30$	77
15	YEBSI Subscale Correlations for Physically Violent Offenders (Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger History--Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores) $n = 36$	78
16	YEBSI Subscale Correlations for Sexually Violent Offenders (Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger History--Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores) $n = 30$	79
17	Means, Standard Deviations, Kurtosis, and Skewness for Discriminant Analysis Classification Variables	85
18	Classification Results of a Discriminant Function Analysis with the YEBSI	85

Table		Page
19	Discriminant Function Correlations and Standardized Discriminant Function Coefficients for YEBSI Classification Variables	88
20	History-Witness Subscale Means for Each Perpetrator Type with Corresponding Univariate F-ratios	88

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1 Distribution of physically violent juvenile offender subsample on the discriminant function	86
2 Distribution of sexually violent juvenile offender subsample on the discriminant function	86

CHAPTER I

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Recent statistics show an alarming trend regarding physically and sexually violent juvenile behavior. Indeed, the number and severity of such violent crimes perpetrated by today's youth are increasing steadily (Allen-Hagen, 1991). The juvenile justice system is struggling to deal with this problem as the number of violent delinquents flooding their facilities continues to increase (Utah Department of Human Services, 1992). The development of improved prevention and treatment programs is sorely needed --not only to help these troubled youth, but also to protect future victims.

To develop more effective prevention and treatment programs, information is needed on factors contributing to violent acts of delinquency. Great strides have been made toward this end through research. One established finding is the existence of a link between prior abuse and violent delinquency of all types (Bowers, 1990; Muster, 1992; Walsh, 1992; Watkins & Bentovim, 1992; Widom, 1989b; Worling, 1995). But while this finding is very important, it is only

a first step, and information of a more specific nature is still needed.

For instance, although the abuse-delinquency connection has been established, it is less clear whether physically violent offenders differ from sexually violent offenders in regard to the presence and type of abuse experienced as a child (Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Sandberg, 1986; Smith, 1988). As experts in the area are well aware, this differentiating information is vital to the construction of effective prevention and treatment programs and may also have important legislative implications. Noting the lack of and need for well designed studies distinguishing between various types of juvenile offenders according to their victimization histories, many researchers have called for further work (Blaske, Borduin, Henggeler, & Mann, 1989; Bowers, 1990; Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Ford & Linney, 1995; Friedman & Rosenbaum, 1988).

The three purposes of this research were first, to assess the level of internal consistency and interrater reliability for the abuse interview instrument--the Youth Experiences and Behaviors Structured Interview (YEBSI)--developed by the author for this research; second, to

describe victimization and perpetration patterns among physically and sexually violent juveniles; and third, to take the abuse-delinquency question a step further and compare physically and sexually violent juvenile offenders to determine whether specific factors in their abuse histories, if present, tend to be associated with the type of violent offense pattern they exhibit.

Research Questions

The current study was organized around the following research questions:

1. What is the YEBSI's level of internal consistency reliability as determined by Cronbach's coefficient alpha?
2. What is the YEBSI's level of interrater reliability?
3. What descriptive statistical (e.g., means, medians, modes, standard deviations, ranges, minimum and maximum values, variances, and percentages), scale, and subscale correlations are generated from this sample of physically and sexually violent juvenile delinquents regarding their abuse histories and perpetration patterns?

4. Do the examined victimization history variables reliably discriminate between the subgroups of physically violent and sexually violent juvenile offenders?

Operational Definitions

In order to address the research questions in an objective and precise manner, the following operational definitions were specified.

Physically violent juvenile offender (PVJO)--persons whose YEBSI physical abuse perpetration subscale score was greater than zero and whose sexual abuse perpetration subscale score was ten or lower. The majority of PVJOs had been subject to juvenile court jurisdiction as defined by state law, convicted in a juvenile justice court of being guilty of committing felonies and/or misdemeanors primarily of a physically violent (use of force or coercion) nature against another person/s. Typical crimes committed by PVJOs included murder, attempted murder, nonnegligent manslaughter, involuntary manslaughter or reckless homicide, robbery, robbery and burglary with injury, aggravated assault, assault and battery, battery with injury, and simple assault.

Sexually violent juvenile offender (SVJO)--persons whose YEBSI sexual abuse perpetration subscale score was greater than ten. The majority of SVJOs had been subject to juvenile court jurisdiction as defined by state law, convicted in a juvenile justice court as being guilty of committing adjudicated offenses primarily of a sexually violent (use of force or coercion) nature against another person/animal. Typical crimes committed by SVJOs included forcible rape, sexual assault, sodomy, and bestiality.

Sex offenders who acknowledged some perpetration of physical violence were also included in this group. While some studies exclude participants who are not deemed "pure" physical or sexual offenders (e.g., Blaske et al., 1989; Ford & Linney, 1995), researchers have found that juvenile sexual offenders tend to have prior histories of violent nonsexual behavior (Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus, 1979) and have also acknowledged the impossibility of attaining complete homogeneity and mutual exclusivity of groups (Blaske et al., 1989). Including these participants, therefore, seems to better reflect the reality of offender characteristics as well as lend to greater generalizability of results.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The following review of the literature will summarize the major research findings regarding violent juvenile offenders in connection with the presence and nature of their history of abuse. Evidence explicating the nature and importance of the problem underlying the study will be provided. Through a critique of the current research, a rationale for how the study was conducted as outlined in the problem statement will also be provided. This rationale will explain how the work extended, built, differed from, and improved upon previous work in this area.

Current Statistics

As previously stated, recent statistics reflect an alarming trend toward increasing numbers of violent criminal offenses committed by juveniles. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) reported that in 1989, the number of juveniles held in public facilities for violent personal offenses increased for the first time since 1983. Between 1987 and 1989, there was an 8% increase in

the number of juveniles held for committing offenses against persons such as murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, manslaughter, simple assault, and sexual assault (Allen-Hagen, 1991). In 1990, persons under 18 were involved in 14% of murder and nonnegligent manslaughter arrests, 15% of forcible rape arrests, 24% of robbery arrests, and 14% of aggravated assault arrests. From 1989 to 1990, youths arrested for the Violent Crime Index offenses listed above increased by 16% (Snyder, 1992). From 1983 to 1992, juveniles were accountable for more than 25% of the increase in murders, forcible rapes, and robberies. More specifically, they were responsible for 17% of the growth in aggravated assaults, 27% of robberies, 27% of forcible rapes, 28% of murders, and 19% of the total increase in the Violent Crime Index (Snyder, 1994). From 1985 to 1994, the percentage increase in arrests continued to be greater for juveniles than adults (Snyder, Sickmund, & Poe-Yamagata, 1996).

From 1985 to 1994, the percentage increase in juvenile acts classified under the Federal Bureau of Investigation Violent Crime Index were 150% for murder, 6% for forcible rape, 57% for robbery, and 97% for aggravated assault.

These statistics led to the OJJDP's statement that "after more than a decade of relative stability, the juvenile violent crime arrest rate soared between 1988 and 1994" (Snyder et al., 1996, p. 14). Specifically, juveniles accounted for 19% of all violent crime arrests and 14% of all violent crimes cleared by law enforcement. The same report warned that "if trends continue as they have over the past ten years, juvenile arrests for violent crime will more than double by the year 2010" (p. 15).

According to a study on the conditions of confinement for juvenile offenders (Parent, 1993), admissions to juvenile facilities have risen since 1984 and reached a record high of nearly 690,000 in 1990. More recently, the OJJDP reported that between 1983 and 1991, admissions to detention facilities rose 33%. The one-day count custody rates for juveniles increased from 290 to 357 per 100,000 youth (peaking in 1989 at 367) during the same period (DeComo et al., 1995). Parent (1993) reported that the percentage of juveniles incarcerated for crimes against persons rose from 21% to 28% between 1987 and 1991.

In the state of Utah (Utah Department of Human Services, 1992), admissions to secure facilities increased

15% from 1991 to 1992. Over the same year, the number of serious youth offenders confined and treated in secure facilities also rose to 185. This represented an increase of 22% from the 1991 total. In 1995, the state of Utah reported that on average, 566 youth were in Division custody, including 60% in nonsecure community alternatives, home placement, or observation and assessment programs, 23% in locked facilities or secure detention, 8.5% in jail, or out-of-state placements, and 8.5% absent without leave (Utah Department of Human Services, 1995).

This wave of crime is flooding juvenile justice facilities with violent delinquents. A report by the OJJDP stated that in 1991, the average daily population of juveniles confined increased 14% from 1985 (Allen-Hagen, 1991). This increase was accompanied by a slight decrease (.6% from 1987 to 1989) in the number of juvenile facilities, making clear the extent to which these facilities are being taxed.

According to the Division of Youth Corrections (Utah Department of Human Services, 1992), as of 1992, the pressure on secure facilities in Utah hit an all-time high. More current statistics from the 1995 report explain that

the average nightly bed count for the year was 194, more than an 8% increase above that of fiscal year 1994, and about 24% over the system's total bed capacity of 156 (Utah Department of Human Services, 1995).

Clearly, efforts aimed at prevention and treatment are sorely needed. Statistics indicate that men charged with offenses before the age of 15 have a 78% chance of being charged again by the age of 33 (Kolvin, Miller, Fleeting, & Kolvin, 1988). Several experts in the field have also purported juvenile sexual offenders to be at risk for becoming adult child molesters (Engel, 1989; Forward & Buck, 1978; Straus, 1988). Other statistics (Kolvin et al., 1988) indicate that nearly half of those charged after age 15 had already been charged before that age. Additionally, several authors have claimed that many adult sex offenders initiate their patterns during or prior to adolescence (Abel, Becker, & Skinner, 1987; Groth, Longo, & McFadin, 1982). These findings testify to the need for more effective prevention, early intervention, and treatment efforts. Such measures are necessary, not only to help these troubled youth, but also to protect future victims.

For such measures to be most effective, however, they must be built upon a solid knowledge base of detailed information about young perpetrators. Much work has been done toward meeting this goal in the research arena. Many studies have been conducted on violent juvenile offenders that give us various pieces of information (described in the following sections) needed to construct and implement successful prevention and treatment programs.

Abuse-Delinquency Connection

Although not all abused and neglected children go on to become abusers or violent criminal offenders (Finkelhor, 1986a; Widom, 1989b), most researchers in the area agree that a link appears to exist between those with histories of abuse and victimization and later delinquent behavior. (For exceptions to this general rule, see Henggeler, McKee, & Bourduin [1989].)

Indeed, several authors have examined the abuse-delinquency connection directly. For example, Bowers (1990) concluded in his review that the traumas of physical and/or sexual abuse may be precipitating events to delinquency, especially for children who lack the environmental resources

to reveal and end the victimization. Additionally, some studies have reported that more than half of incarcerated juvenile offenders had been victims of childhood physical and/or sexual abuse (Deisher, Wenet, Paperny, Clark, & Fehrenbeach, 1981, cited in Burgess, Hartman, McCormack, & Grant, 1988; Groth & Lored, 1981).

Some research findings have gone so far as to imply causality from prior abuse to delinquency. One such study (Lewis & Shanok, 1977) found that child abuse occurred prior to delinquency. Garbarino (1981) also supported the likelihood of a cause-and-effect relationship between child abuse and juvenile delinquency.

The above studies, while giving us very important information, lack specificity as to what type of crimes these delinquents are committing. Rather than categorizing various types of perpetrators, delinquent offenders are analyzed as being members of one broad homogenous group. "Delinquency" can mean various things, however, and researchers now need to become more specific in defining and differentiating specific offense patterns.

Abuse-Violent Delinquency Connection

Several authors have examined the more specific abuse-violent delinquency connection. Alfaro (1983), for example, concluded that children who are abused and neglected tend to commit crimes of a more violent nature than those not abused and neglected.

Investigators in the field have depicted families of violent adolescents as having high rates of abuse, neglect, aversive behavior, and parental deviance and low rates of positive communication (Fagan & Wexler, 1987; Loeber, Weissman, & Reid, 1983).

Lewis, Shanok, Pincus, and Glaser (1979) found that a history of abuse by parents or parent substitutes strongly distinguished a more violent group of children from a less violent group. The more and less violent groups also differed significantly in their exposure to violence--78.6% of the more violent versus 20% of the less violent group witnessed extreme violence directed at others.

Widom (1991) implied a causal link from prior abuse to later arrests and violent delinquency in her examination of placement experiences of juveniles. She found that, with

few exceptions, delinquent placements occurred after initial placements for abuse/neglect. She also noted that children with no placements and those with abuse or neglect placements were three times less likely to be violent than those children placed for abuse or neglect plus delinquency. In this study, criminality types were categorized into juvenile arrests, adult arrests, juvenile and adult arrests, and violent arrests. The violent arrest category consisted of both physically and sexually violent crimes, namely robbery, assault, assault and battery, battery with injury, aggravated assault, manslaughter/involuntary manslaughter or reckless homicide, murder/attempted murder, rape, sodomy, and robbery and burglary with injury.

Recently, Walsh (1992), in his study of genetic and environmental factors contributing to juvenile violence, explored the effects of love deprivation (as measured by indices of parental abuse and neglect) on violent delinquency. He reported that love deprivation explained 28.8% of the variance in violent delinquency in disadvantaged environments. Subjects of this study included physically and sexually violent offenders of homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, assault, and battery. Although

this type of specificity is a step above the simple abuse-delinquency connection, research now needs to be taken one step further.

Note that Alfaro (1983), Widom (1991), and Walsh (1992) made no distinctions between the types of offenders within the category of violent perpetrators. Rather, they analyzed violent delinquent offenders as a homogenous group and made no distinctions between specific criminal patterns. A clear danger exists here, in that by lumping all violent juvenile offenders together, specific differences between subgroups and various contributors to their behavior could be overlooked. Walsh himself claimed that "to report only main effects leads to generalizations from the data that are misleading or incorrect" (p. 197). Indeed, an aggregate model can grossly understate the effects of variables within offender-type specific groups. This observation strongly suggests that different types of violence require specific offender-type explanations.

Abuse-Sexual Offense Connection

One specific type of offender that has been of particular interest to researchers in the past decade is the

juvenile sexual offender (Finkelhor, 1986b). Pointing to the abuse-sexual perpetration connection, Burgess et al. (1988) noted that repetition seems to characterize early sexual offending behavior. In fact, several clinicians and researchers have suggested that early childhood victimization is likely one contributing factor to juvenile offenses of a sexual nature (Groth, 1979; Samson, 1980; Seghorn, Prentky, & Boucher, 1986).

Finkelhor (1984) noted that perpetrators of child sexual abuse are often adolescents who themselves were victims of child molestation. Other researchers have supported the belief that juvenile sexual offenders are typically victims of sex offenses, often at an early age, and usually by family members or acquaintances (Muster, 1992; Ryan, Lane, Davis, & Isaac, 1987, as cited in Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Seghorn, Boucher, & Prentky, 1984, as cited in Fagan & Wexler, 1988).

Investigators in the field have suggested that the families of adolescent sexual offenders typically have high rates of conflict, disorganization, and dysfunction (Blaske et al., 1989; Fehrenbach, Smith, Monastersky, & Deisher, 1986). Witnessing or experiencing violence in the home has

also been associated with the aggressive and assaultive behavior of juvenile sex offenders (Lewis et al., 1979; Smith, 1988).

In a recent review on the sexual abuse of male children and adolescents, Watkins and Bentovim (1992, p. 221) stated that "current evidence supports the conclusion that the sexual abuse of boys in childhood is an important contributory, but not a necessary, factor in the development of a perpetrator." They cited the following three common reactions more or less unique to boys who have been victims of sexual abuse (as described by Rogers & Terry, 1984): (a) confusion/anxiety over sexual identity, (b) inappropriate attempts to reassert masculinity, and (c) recapitulation of the victimizing experience.

Inappropriate attempts to reassert masculinity are proposed to be the most common behavioral reaction to sexual abuse and are seen in post-abuse acts of aggression such as picking fights, destructiveness, and confrontive attitudes.

Recapitulation in the form of sexually perpetrating against someone, although thought to be less common than aggressing, is another reaction seen among sexually abused boys. Estimates as to the percentage of boys who have been

sexually abused and who go on to sexually perpetrate against others range from 2% to 50% (Conte & Schuerman, 1988; Sansonnett-Hayden, Haley, Marriage, & Fine, 1987, respectively, as cited in Watkins & Bentovim, 1992). Watkins and Bentovim identified eight studies supporting the notion that boys commonly respond to sexual abuse with sexualization. They were unable to identify any studies that did not support this notion.

When considering the prevalence of sexual abuse in the histories of established sexual offenders, widely divergent rates have been reported ranging from 0% to 61% (Gruber & Timbers, 1981; Katz, 1990, respectively, cited in Watkins & Bentovim, 1992). These figures can be compared to disclosed rates of sexual abuse in noncriminal, nonclinical control groups of approximately 4% to 24% (Fromuth & Burkhart, 1989; Milner, Robertson, & Rogers, 1990; Violato & Genuis, 1993). Prevalence rates in both populations tend to be underestimates due to reluctance to disclose sexual abuse. In their review of the literature, Watkins and Bentovim (1992) identified 14 studies that support the notion that male child/adolescent/adult sexual perpetrators have a

frequent history of previous sexual abuse whereas only two studies were identified that did not support this notion.

Worling (1995) found that the incidence of sexual abuse histories in adolescent sex offenders varied as a function of victim age and gender. After analyzing the sexual abuse histories of 87 sex offenders, he found that approximately 75% of adolescent offenders who ever assaulted one male child reported sexual abuse as opposed to only about 25% of those who assaulted female children, peers, or adults.

According to Freeman-Longo (1986) and Friedrich, Beilke, and Urquiza (1988), the probability of becoming a perpetrator is increased by repeated abuse of long duration or abuse by multiple abusers. Russell and Finkelhor (1984) linked the risk with more severe, more unusual, and more disturbing abuse. Wyatt and Powell (1988) have more specifically concluded that the most negative consequences for children are connected with abuse by fathers, genital contact, and the use of force.

Other variables related to primary and secondary abuse histories that have been proposed to differentiate outcomes between those victims of sexual abuse who go on to become sexually abusive and those who do not include social

isolation, history of physical abuse, parents engaging in coercive sexual or physical behavior towards each other, societal support of coercive sexual behavior, and peer group antisocial behavior (Becker, 1988).

Differentiating Among Violent Offenders

Some studies have begun to differentiate between various types of violent offenders. This body of research has investigated whether specific types of crime and specific victimization patterns may be related. Findings have been mixed.

Some researchers dispute the fact that a significant relation exists between specific types of abuse and later delinquency. For example, Sandberg (1986) found no significant relation between specific types of abuse and later delinquency. Also, while a study conducted by Alfaro (1981, cited in Sandberg, 1986) found a high incidence of abuse and neglect among delinquent populations, no linkage was found between specific types of abuse and subsequent delinquency. Both of these studies, however, failed to catalogue all juvenile offenses of the subjects. For this

reason, Sandberg admitted to being "left with an uncomfortable feeling" (p. 218) about the finding.

In a study comparing deprived and nondeprived children, Kolvin et al. (1988) found that different types of deprivation were not associated with a distinctive offender profile. The deprivation factors, however, did not include abuse histories.

Ageton (1983, cited in Fagan & Wexler, 1988) also asserted that the reasons adolescents commit sexual assault are not generally different from those for other types of illegal behavior committed by adolescents.

Fagan and Wexler, however, in their 1988 study, cited evidence to the contrary, and labeled juvenile sexual offenders as a "hidden population," distinct from violent chronic offenders. They pointed out that the juvenile sexual offenders more often came from families with spousal violence, child abuse and child sexual molestation. They also found that nonsexual offenders reported more parental violence as opposed to sexual offenders, who reported more severe forms of child abuse and more molestation. Additionally, in comparison to chronic violent offenders, juvenile sex offenders' official records showed more

histories of physical and sexual abuse and more child abuse experienced by their siblings. Juvenile sex offenders also self-reported more witnessing of violence between their parents, child sexual abuse, and child battery.

In another study, Blaske et al. (1989) examined the individual functioning, family relations, and peer relations of four groups of male adolescents--sex offenders (at least one arrest for a serious sexual offense and no arrests for aggressive or violent nonsexual crimes), assaultive offenders (at least one arrest for assault and no history of sexual offenses), nonviolent offenders (at least one arrest for either theft or burglary and no arrests for violent or sexual crimes), and nondelinquent controls. In family relations, positive communication and conflict-hostility factors (includes aggressive mother-adolescent statements, interruptions, simultaneous speech and dyadic conflict) accounted for 68% of the variance between groups. In peer relations, emotional bonding, aggression, and acceptance factors accounted for more than 65% of the between-group variance. Results showed that assaultive offenders' peer relations were characterized by high levels of aggression and family relations by rigidity and low cohesion. Sex

offenders, on the other hand, showed peer relations characterized by low levels of emotional bonding and family relations by neurotic symptoms.

Recently, Ford and Linney (1995) conducted a study that compared juvenile sexual offenders (juvenile rapists and child molesters), violent nonsexual offenders, and status offenders on levels of intrafamily violence, abuse histories, and early childhood memories (among other nonabuse history related variables). They reported that juvenile child molesters and violent nonsexual offenders experienced more parental use of violence than did rapists and status offenders. Child molesters also seemed to experience more total family violence than the other groups. They also had statistically significantly higher rates of prior total abuse and more specifically, sexual abuse (57% vs. 17% for violent nonsex offenders and rapists, and 13% for status offenders) than the other three offender groups. Early childhood memories of rapists involved less positive family interaction and more personal injury and loss (e.g., abandonment, relative killing a pet). Child molesters recalled more victimization from abuse and involvement in destructive activities (e.g., cruelty to animals, self-

abuse). Violent nonsex offenders were unique in their recollections of being shot or seeing another person shot or killed (approximately 25% reported seeing a shooting or killing).

Rationale and Calls for Offender- Specific Studies

These studies are among the very few linking specific offense patterns to specific victimization histories. The dearth of information has been noted in the research and several calls have been made for further studies of this nature. Friedman and Rosenbaum (1988), who studied crimes directed toward persons versus property note that "rarely is consideration given to whether the causes of crime differ for distinct types of criminal activity" (p. 363). Fagan and Wexler (1988) have also pointed out that few studies have investigated whether the causes and correlates of juvenile sexual offending overlap with other violent behaviors or derive from independent etiological paths. They have pointed to the need for further study to differentiate sexual violence from other forms of delinquency.

Blaske et al. (1989) noted that very few controlled studies have been conducted with sexual offenders and violent offenders and those that have are marked by relatively serious methodological problems.

Bowers (1990) has called for additional studies to ascertain whether the pattern of delinquent behavior reveals the nature of the primary abuse trauma. Widom (1991), too, has stressed the clear need for continued research to unravel the linkages among childhood victimization and later violent criminal behavior. Ford and Linney (1995) have pointed to the limited number of studies on juvenile offenders and the flaw of not including comparison groups or recognizing offender subtypes. Others doing research in the area have pointed out the need for more specific research as well (Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Flowers, 1986; Rosenbaum, 1989).

In response to the mixed findings and lack of research of this type, this study examined both physically and sexually violent offenders (as defined in Chapter I), and analyzed their victimization histories for variables differentiating between the two. This differentiating information is vital to the construction of more effective

prevention and treatment programs. Without such information, key issues unique to each type of offender could be overlooked. For example, identification of the specific types of factors associated with later physically and sexually violent delinquency is a necessary first step towards interfering with the chain of events that can lead to violence. This information is also needed to best match offenders to treatment plans so that their issues will be addressed and their needs met. For example, if a history of sexual abuse precedes sexual perpetration, proper treatment includes addressing both victim and perpetrator issues (Muster, 1992). An approach of this nature places the emphasis on trying to find out "what works for whom and under what conditions" (Binder, 1977, cited in Binder, 1988) rather than finding a global treatment plan for all violent juvenile offenders.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The target population for the present research included physically and sexually violent male juvenile offenders (ages 11 to 18) in treatment and/or criminal facilities. The accessible population consisted of youth residing at the following facilities in Utah: (a) Mill Creek Youth Center, (b) Provo Canyon School, (c) Family Preservation Institute-- Pathways Program, (d) Heritage Youth Services Birdseye/ Adolescent Sexual Accountability Program (A.S.A.P.!), and (e) Weber Human Services, Mental Health Department.

External Validity

The purpose of this section is to provide a rationale as to why the sample can generally be considered representative of the accessible population as well as largely representative of the target population given that it is not random in nature.

In making generalizations to broader populations, it is important to note that research has demonstrated the

existence of a partiality (based on some noncriminal background characteristics such as gender, socioeconomic status, ethnic make-up, etc.) in the selection process for violent offenders placed in juvenile facilities (Binder, 1988; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Kolvin et al., 1988). Since, however, this partiality is of a consistent nature, it serves to maximize demographic similarity and increase external validity to the accessible population as well as to all physically and sexually violent juvenile offenders.

Some caution in interpretation and generalization to other geographic areas should be taken, however, as disparities in patrolling, arrest, charging, sentencing, and parole procedures in different geographical regions exist (Reinarman & Fagan, 1988). Generalization of the findings made beyond the time period in which the data were collected should also be made with caution. Although it is possible that factors differentiating physically violent from sexually violent juvenile offenders remain consistent over time, offender typologies may change over time along with changes in the societal environment.

Finally, it should be emphasized that those who participated in the study did so on a voluntary basis and

with the permission of their parents/legal guardians. There may be differences between those youth along with their parents who consented to participate in the study and youth who, themselves or whose parents, were unwilling to participate.

Participant Description

(The following information regarding study facilities and participants was received from facility staff members as well as from facility advertising brochures.)

Twenty-three participants came from Mill Creek Youth Center in Ogden, Utah. Ninety-six percent of these participants were categorized as physically violent juvenile offenders (PVJOs) and 4% as sexually violent juvenile offenders (SVJOs). Mill Creek is a secure facility for the confinement of the most seriously delinquent youth who also have the most extensive history of previous interventions and placements in the juvenile justice system. Youth admitted in 1992 had an average of 26.7 convictions and 42% had one or more life-endangering felonies. Ages of the confined youth range from 13 to 18. About 58% of those committed are Caucasian, 31% Hispanic, 7% Black, 3% Asian or

other, and 1% Native American (Utah Department of Human Services, 1992). Participants from Mill Creek were interviewed by two undergraduate psychology research assistants with one and 1.5 and 4 years of experience in clinical settings.

Seven participants came from Provo Canyon School in Utah. One hundred percent of these participants were categorized as PVJOs. Provo Canyon School is a residential treatment facility for teenagers (ages 12-18) with behavioral and emotional problems that preclude effective functioning in the home, school, and community. Boys residing at Provo Canyon School typically experience emotional adjustment reaction to childhood or adolescence, severely disruptive behavior tendencies, hyperactivity, depression, or problems with drugs or alcohol. Students are generally of average to well-above-average intelligence. The program at Provo Canyon School includes group, individual, and family therapy, a structured therapeutic living environment, a fully accredited academic program, and an accredited drug and alcohol program. Adolescents at Provo Canyon School are from a variety of backgrounds. Referrals come from private practitioners, hospital

programs, school counselors and educational consultants, alumni families, state agencies, employee assistance programs, and managed care professionals. Many are placed following discharge from psychiatric or addictive disease hospitals for continuing treatment on an extended-care basis. Participants from Provo Canyon School were interviewed by a PhD psychologist with about 30 years of clinical experience.

Eight participants came from the Family Preservation Institute in Brigham City and Logan, Utah. Twelve percent of these subjects were categorized as PVJOs, and 88% as SVJOs. Pathways, an adolescent (ages 12-18) impulse disorders treatment program from the Family Preservation Institute, works with boys who are at risk of offending in their homes, have sufficient dysfunction to preclude functioning at home or school, and for whom outpatient therapy has proven insufficient. Each of their three facilities has its own structured day treatment program that encourages individuals to take responsibility for their sexually reactive behavior. The program includes psychotherapy, recreational therapy, specialty academics, psychiatric, and nursing care. Clients may be referred by

Division of Family Services, Youth Corrections, family members, clergy, outpatient therapists, Mental Health, or other health care providers. Participants from the Family Preservation Institute were interviewed by a psychology undergraduate research assistant employed by the FPI and by the program director, a marriage and family therapist with an MMPT degree and 5 years of clinical experience.

Eleven participants came from Heritage Youth Services Birdseye/A.S.A.P.! Adolescent Sexual Accountability Program in Birdseye, Utah. Nine percent of these subjects were categorized as PVJOs, and 91% as SVJOs. Birdseye/A.S.A.P.! is a long-term, staff-secure, intensive supervision, residential treatment program for males, ages 12 to 19, who have committed adjudicated sexual offenses. Birdseye/A.S.A.P.! provides a comprehensive sex offender specific treatment approach that utilizes group therapy, individual therapy, family forum, relapse prevention planning, life skills training, personal development and learning, recreation therapy, academic education, and aftercare and follow-up to treat sexually violent youth. Participants from Birdseye/A.S.A.P.! were interviewed by a staff

counselor experienced in working with sexual abuse perpetrators.

Seventeen participants came from Weber Human Services Mental Health Department in Ogden, Utah. Twenty-nine percent of these subjects were categorized as PVJOs, and 71% as SVJOs. Weber Human Services is a residential treatment program for youth adjudicated on various sexual crimes. Most residents are Caucasian. The majority of the residents are of low socioeconomic status, have histories of previous failures in other treatment programs, and have been extensively involved with the juvenile court. Most residents are repeat offenders considered to be at moderate to high risk for recidivism. Participants from Weber Human Services were interviewed by two facility therapists, one with a BS in psychology/social work and another with a LCSW, MCW degree, both with about 15 years of clinical experience.

The research incorporated data collected at these facilities from November 1994 through February 1997. The total sample for the present research consisted of 66 violent male juveniles. Table 1 presents basic demographic data for the sample.

Table 1

Description of Subjects

Variable	Mean	SD
Mean age	15.7	(1.3)
Mean years of education	9.8	(1.4)
Ethnicity	Percentage of sample	
Caucasian	77.3	
Black	3.0	
Hispanic	10.6	
Asian	0.0	
American Indian	4.5	
Other/Missing	4.5	

Procedures

Sample Selection Procedures

After gaining approval from the State Department's Protection of Human Rights Review Committee and the Utah State University Institutional Review Board (Appendices A and B), appropriate personnel were contacted at the above-listed facilities and their permission was sought to conduct the study.

Next, informed consent from the parents/guardians of the youth was obtained. The active parent/guardian consent forms (in Appendix C) were obtained by the participating facilities by either mailing them to parents/ guardians, presenting them to parents/guardians at their initial meetings with facility staff, or distributing them to parents/guardians at facility meetings or family therapy. If parents/legal guardians consented to their child's participation in the study, youth were approached by facility counselors and asked if they were interested in participating. If the youth expressed interest (see Youth Consent Form in Appendix D), an interview was scheduled at which time written consent was obtained. If either the parent/legal guardian or the youth did not consent to participating in the study, the youth was not included.

The final sample, then, consisted of (a) youth whose parents gave voluntary written informed consent for their child's participation in the study, and (b) youth who gave voluntary written informed consent to participate and followed through by completing the interview.

Data Collection

The appropriate approvals (state and university) were obtained and data collection was conducted according to the American Psychological Association's ethical guidelines for research with human subjects.

Interviewer Training

Interviewers included counselors/therapists at the facilities as well as three undergraduate psychology research assistants. All interviewers were trained by the primary researcher and/or research assistants in the proper administration of the structured interview. The researchers provided detailed instructions for gaining parental and youth informed consent as well as interviewing format. The researchers also explained how to complete each structured interview form. The counselors practiced these skills by role playing with the researchers. This training served to maximize the standardization of the interview procedure and the reliability of the data collected.

Confidentiality

Coded informed parent and youth consent forms and structured interview forms were provided for the

interviewers. The only documents with information identifying participants were the parent and youth informed consent forms. The researchers did not see identifiable information on these consent forms, which were collected and kept in the facilities by a staff member. This procedure insured participants' complete anonymity and confidentiality (unless any of the confidentiality exceptions listed in the informed consent forms applied, e.g., danger to self or others, court order for records). If participants disclosed past abuse not previously reported, the facility staff made a report to the appropriate authorities in a manner consistent with the law and facility procedures. Cases of suspected or real danger to the participant or others were also handled by the counselors according to the law and facility procedures.

Audiotaping Procedures

For the purpose of obtaining interrater reliability coefficients for the structured interview instrument, approximately 10% of interviews (7 of 66) were randomly selected for audiotaping. A table of random numbers was used to select participant code numbers whose interview was

to be audiotaped. The interview and consent forms with the selected code numbers were marked with instructions for interviewers to audiotape the interview. This procedure was used to reduce the possibility of researcher or interviewer selection of audiotaped interviews and potential biasing of the interrater reliability coefficients. Because several interviewers did not audiotape the marked interviews, only two interviews were audiotaped (3% of the total).

The tapes included no identifying information, only a code number. Those participants whose interviews were to be audiotaped were informed of this fact during the informed consent process. The primary researcher scored the audiotaped interviews.

Debriefing

In order to minimize any risk of psychological harm to respondents, all respondents were asked how they felt after the interview was completed and were offered an opportunity to discuss any issues that had come up during the interview with their counselor.

Data Entry and Analysis

After the interview forms were complete, data were entered into the computer using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Next, the data set was analyzed and interpretations were made. As will be described in detail in the Results chapter, the study used a multivariate correlational design and discriminant analysis to analyze the data.

Measures

Youth Experiences and Behaviors Structured Interview

The Youth Experiences and Behaviors Structured Interview (YEBSI; Appendix E) is a 145-item structured interview designed by the author to assess the level of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse an individual has experienced (been the victim of), witnessed, and perpetrated.

The first section of the YEBSI consists of general information (subject number, date, interviewer, interviewer's years of clinical experience) and demographic questions (age, gender, education level, and ethnicity).

This information was used in attending to sample homogeneity and representativeness as recommended by Porter and Critelli (1992) in their critical review of self-reported methods of measuring sexual aggression.

The YEBSI continues with general instructions for the interviewer to read to the participant and the following four main sections: (a) abuse history, (b) global disclosure response scale, (c) abuse witnessed, and (d) abuse perpetrated. The first, third, and fourth sections contain subsections addressing emotional, physical, and sexual hurt. Each subsection is further divided into perpetrator/victim categories of family members, acquaintances, strangers, and animals (where appropriate). Due to recent empirical findings regarding the relationship between cruelty to animals and later antisocial behavior and the implications of cruelty to animals in regard to child abuse and wife battering (Ascione, 1993), respondents were asked to consider witnessed and perpetrated abuse toward animals as well as toward people in their responses.

Widom (1989a) has stressed that the outcome of suffering abuse as a child may depend on a variety of factors such as the type and severity of abuse sustained and

the characteristics of the abuser. The YEBSI was designed to tease out these and other important factors. By asking participants a detailed series of questions, a more extensive picture of abuse patterns is obtained.

The structured interview is organized in a 3 x 3 x 3-4 design--abuse experienced, witnessed, and perpetrated x emotional, physical, and sexual abuse x family members, acquaintances, strangers, and animals (animal questions apply to the physical and sexual perpetration sections only).

Respondents are asked five questions in each of 29 specific category groups (e.g., emotional abuse experienced at the hands of a family member, sexual abuse perpetrated against a stranger). They are asked to indicate the presence or absence, frequency, and severity levels of abuse as well as the number of, gender of, and relationship to their abusers/victims.

For example, the first question in one category group presented to participants reads, "Were you ever emotionally hurt by a family member/s?" If the respondent indicates no, the interviewer skips to the next category group (emotional hurt by acquaintances). If the respondent indicates yes, he

is then asked to identify how many family members have hurt him emotionally, and to rate the frequency and severity of the hurt. This "broad funnel" type of protocol in which participants first respond to a broad question and then branch into a more detailed evaluation of their experiences follows the recommendations of Fromuth and Burkhart (1987). The final question in each category group asks the respondent to indicate the relationship type and gender of the person who perpetrated the abuse or who they abused (e.g., mother, friend--male). Note that for secondary abuse, no differentiation is made between witnessed domestic violence (or adult abuse) and witnessed child abuse (e.g., a father perpetrator could have abused a sibling or the mother of the respondent). Specificity was compromised here in order to make the interview "manageable" in terms of time and complexity.

The YEBSI utilizes a 3-point scale to assess the frequency and severity of abuse experienced or perpetrated. Three supplementary cue cards (E for emotional, P for physical, and S for sexual) for rating frequency and severity were included with each structured interview form. On the back of each of these cue cards, directions were

included for interviewers to read to respondents to help them rate the frequency and severity of the specified type of abuse (experienced, witnessed, or perpetrated). Each scale has operational definitions for ratings of "1," "2," and "3." For example, the physical abuse frequency scale defines a "1" as "the hurt happened less than once each month," a "2" as "the hurt happened more than once each month, but less than weekly," and a "3" as "the hurt happened at least once each week." In rating frequency and severity, respondents were asked to think of the most frequent and most severe incidents of abuse they have suffered. This method (patterned after that of Briere & Runtz, 1990) was used to maximize clarity and standardization by ensuring that all respondents rate their most harsh experiences. To further assist respondents in making their ratings, the front sides of the cue cards contained pictures representative of the three levels of frequency and severity (see Appendix F).

Further support for the inclusion of these variables comes from a meta-analysis of 45 studies of sexual abuse (Kendall-Tackett, Williams, & Finkelhor, 1993). The authors illustrated that penetration, abuse frequency, level of

force, the relationship of the perpetrator to the child, and maternal support were all found to affect the degree of symptomatology observed. Victimization history variables were selected after reviewing similar instruments used in juvenile offender studies (Graves, 1993; Guarino, 1985; Stein & Lewis, 1992). An informal content validation process of consulting facility personnel and experts in this area of research was also conducted prior to final construction of the YEBSI. The content of the YEBSI was discussed with members from the State Department's Protection of Human Rights Review Committee, professionals with extensive experience with physically and sexually violent juvenile offenders, and faculty members with research and clinical experience in this area.

In section 2, the global disclosure response section, interviewers ask participants to think about how people responded when they were told or when they found out that the participant had been hurt. If participants' abuse experiences were disclosed or discovered by others, participants rated, on a 5-point scale, the level of support and protection they received. This 5-point scale ranges from a "1" or "2" if all or most people did not believe the

respondent was being hurt, did not do anything to stop the hurt, or did not do anything to protect/support the respondent, to a "4" or "5" if most people believed the respondent was being hurt, did something to stop the hurt, or protected/supports the respondent. A "3" rating applied if about half the responses were positive and half negative.

The YEBSI consists of 4 scale scores, 19 subscale scores, and 29 category scores (highlighted in Table 2 below). The scale scores include the global disclosure response score (GDR; range 0-5), an abuse history score (H; range 0-81), an abuse witness score (W; range 0-81), and an abuse perpetrate score (P; range 0-99). The final 3 scale scores include all types of abuse (emotional, physical, and sexual) and all categories of perpetrator/victim (family, acquaintance, stranger, and animal).

The subscale scores range from 0-27 with the exception of three perpetration scores--PHP (physical), SXP (sexual), and PAP (pet/animal-directed). PHP and SXP range from 0-36 and PAP ranges from 0-18. Subscale scores break down the scale scores by type of abuse (emotional, physical, and sexual) and category of perpetrator or victim (family member, acquaintance, stranger, and animal). The first nine

subscale scores include an emotional abuse history score (EMH), a physical abuse history score (PHH), and a sexual

Table 2

YEBSI Scoring Structure (Score Abbreviations Highlighted)

4 Scale scores (range)	19 Subscale scores (range = 0-27 for each score unless otherwise noted)	29 Category scores (range = 0-9 for each score)			
History (0-81)	EMotional History	efh	eah	esh	
	PHysical History	pfh	pah	psh	
	SeXual History	sfh	sah	ssh	
Witness (0-81)	EMotional Witness	efw	eaw	esw	
	PHysical Witness	pfw	paw	psw	
	SeXual Witness	sfw	saw	ssw	
Perpetrate (0-99)	EMotional Perpetrate	efp	eap	esp	
	PHysical Perpetrate (0-36)	pfp	pap	psp ppp	
	SeXual Perpetrate (0-36)	sfp	sap	ssp spp	
	FaMily History	efh	pfh	sfh	
	FaMily Witness	efw	pfw	sfw	
	FaMily Perpetrate	efp	pfp	sfp	
	ACquaintance History	eah	pah	sfh	
	ACquaintance Witness	efw	pfw	sfw	
	ACquaintance Perpetrate	efp	pfp	sfp	
	STranger History	eah	pah	saw	
	STranger Witness	eaw	paw	saw	
	STranger Perpetrate	eap	pap	sap	
	Pet/Animal Perpetrate (0-18)	ppp	spp		
	Global Disclosure Response (0-5)	n/a	n/a		

abuse history score (SXH); an emotional abuse witness score (EMW), a physical abuse witness score (PHW), and a sexual abuse witness score (SXW); and an emotional abuse perpetration score (EMP), a physical abuse perpetration score (PHP), and a sexual abuse perpetration score (SXP). These nine subscale scores subsume all categories of perpetrator and victim. The first three subscale scores (EMH, PHH, and SXH) are summed to derive the abuse history scale score (H). The second three subscale scores (EMW, PHW, and SXW) are summed to derive the abuse witness scale score (W). The third three subscale scores (EMP, PHP, and SXP) are summed to derive the abuse perpetrate scale score (P).

The last 10 subscale scores include a family history score (FMH), a family witness score (FMW), and a family perpetrate score (FMP); an acquaintance history score (ACH), an acquaintance witness score (ACW), and an acquaintance perpetrate score (ACP); a stranger history score (STH), a stranger witness score (STW), and a stranger perpetrate score (STP); and a pet/animal perpetrate score (PAP). These 10 subscale scores subsume emotional, physical, and sexual

abuse (with the exception of the pet/animal score, which only considers physical and sexual abuse against animals).

Finally, the category scores break down the subscale scores by the category of perpetrator or victim (for the first nine subscale scores), or by the type of abuse (for the last ten subscale scores). For example, the physical abuse witness subscale score (PHW; participants' acknowledgement of abuse witnessed) is computed by adding the three category scores of the physical family witness score (pfw), the physical acquaintance witness score (paw), and the physical stranger witness score (psw). Likewise, the family abuse perpetrate subscale score (FMP; participants' acknowledgement of abuse perpetrated against family members) is computed by adding the three category scores of the emotional family perpetrate score (efp), the physical family perpetrate score (pfp), and the sexual family perpetrate score (sfp).

Each category score ranges from 0 to 9. If the specified type of abuse was not experienced, the score was zero. If the specified type of abuse was experienced, the score ranged from 3 to 9, depending on the number of specified individuals abusing/being abused (1-3 points), the

frequency of the abuse (1-3 points), and the severity of the abuse (1-3 points). All subscale and scale scores (the more general abuse scores) originate from the category scores (the most specific abuse scores).

Reliability and Validity Information

Since the YEBSI was only recently developed for use in this study, no reliability or validity data are available. One purpose of the current study was to assess the internal consistency reliability of the YEBSI as well as its interrater reliability. Readers are directed to the Results section for specific reliability figures. Because the YEBSI was developed using the same format as the Youth Behaviors and Experiences Questionnaire (YEBQ; Frazier, 1996)--another abuse measure--its reliability and validity coefficients may be of interest. The YEBQ's internal consistency reliability was found to be very high (.93 for the entire instrument). Its concurrent validity with somewhat similar constructs from the Conflict Tactics Scale, Form A (CTS; Straus, 1979) ranged from a small magnitude of .03 (between a YEBQ family abuse perpetration score and a CTS intrafamilial abuse perpetration score) to a moderate magnitude of .46 (between

a YEBQ acquaintance and stranger abuse perpetration score and a CTS extrafamilial abuse perpetration score). The YEBQ's discriminant validity magnitudes with differing constructs from the CTS were near-zero ($-.003$ to $-.036$), showing almost no relationship between dissimilar constructs from the two instruments. The specific constructs used in determining the discriminant validity were (a) a YEBQ family abuse history score and a CTS intrafamilial reasoning score, (b) a YEBQ family abuse witness score and a CTS parental reasoning score, and (c) a YEBQ family abuse perpetrate score and a CTS respondent reasoning score.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The presentation of results is divided into the following four sections: (a) internal consistency reliability and interrater reliability of the YEBSI, (b) YEBSI sample and subsample (physically and sexually violent offenders; PVJOs and SVJOs) descriptive statistics , (c) YEBSI subsample correlational data, and (d) discriminant analysis, using six composite abuse history-witness variables to predict subsample group membership.

Internal and Interrater Reliability

Cronbach's coefficient alpha was used to estimate the internal consistency of the YEBSI. Coefficients were computed for (a) the entire 145-item YEBSI, (b) the abuse history, witness, and perpetrate scales, (c) the family subscale, (d) the acquaintance subscale, and (e) the stranger subscale. The family subscale consists of items that assess the direct experiencing, witnessing, and perpetration of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse by and toward family members. The acquaintance and stranger

subscales consist of items that assess the same phenomena by and toward acquaintances and strangers, respectively. Table 3 shows the results of this analysis for the entire sample of 66 subjects.

A very high level of reliability .90 was observed for the entire measure. A relatively high consistency level of .87 was found for the abuse history, witness, and perpetrate scales. Acceptable levels of reliability were found for the family, acquaintance and stranger subscales, ranging from .73 to .86.

Interrater reliability was also computed for the YEBSI. Due to interviewer noncompliance, only 3% (rather than the assigned 10%) of the interviews were audiotaped and rescored by the primary researcher. Identically scored variables were divided by the total number of YEBSI variables and averaged, yielding an interrater agreement level of 99.7%.

Descriptive Statistics

In order to clearly describe the characteristics of the entire sample, the means, medians, modes, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values, and variances for

Table 3

Internal Reliability of the YEBSI (Cronbach's Alpha)

Scale and subscales	<u>N</u> = 66
YEBSI (all items)	.90
Abuse History, Witness, and Perpetrate Scales	.87
Family Abuse Subscale	.86
Acquaintance Abuse Subscale	.81
Stranger Abuse Subscale	.73

YEBSI scale and subscale scores are provided in Table 4.

To aid in the interpretation of the variable abbreviations, note that all scale scores (except GDR, the global disclosure response scale score) are represented by one- or two-letter abbreviations indicating the context of the abuse ("H" for history, "W" for witness, "P" for perpetrate, and "HW" for history plus witness). As noted in Chapter III, the H and W scale scores range from 0 to 81 and indicate respondents' levels (frequency, severity, and number of perpetrators) of primary and secondary abuse, respectively. The P scale score ranges from 0 to 99 and indicates the respondents' levels (frequency, severity, and

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for YEBSI Scores (Mean, Median, Mode, SD, Min., and Max.; N = 66)

Variable	Mean	Med.	Mode	SD	Min.	Max.
Scale Scores						
H history	29.0	28.0	28	13.6	0	66
W witness	29.1	28.0	36	15.0	10	69
HW history-witness	58.1	55.0	43	26.8	0	135
P perpetrate	36.5	36.0	24	18.7	10	76
GDR global disclosure response	3.2	3.0	3	1.3	1	5
Abuse History Subscale Scores						
EMH emotional	11.9	12.0	12	6.0	0	25
PHH physical	12.1	12.0	14	6.2	0	25
SXH sexual	5.0	5.0	0	5.0	0	20
Abuse Witness Subscale Scores						
EMW emotional	11.8	12.0	0	7.1	0	27
PHW physical	13.6	14.0	14	6.7	0	25
SXW sexual	3.7	0.0	0	5.7	0	22
Abuse Perpetrate Subscale Scores						
EMP emotional	12.2	12.5	11	5.7	0	23
PHP physical	14.9	14.0	4	8.5	0	31
SXP sexual	9.4	7.0	0	9.4	0	31
Family Abuse Subscale Scores						
FMH history	12.0	12.0	13	6.3	0	26
FMW witness	10.0	10.0	0	6.5	0	25
FMP perpetrate	13.3	13.0	5	7.5	0	27
Acquaintance Abuse Subscale Scores						
ACH history	12.9	13.0	15	6.8	0	27
ACW witness	12.5	13.0	0	6.7	0	27
ACP perpetrate	13.8	14.0	0	7.1	0	24
Stranger Abuse Subscale Scores						
STH history	4.0	3.0	0	4.9	0	18
STW witness	6.7	6.0	0	5.8	0	20
STP perpetrate	5.0	4.0	0	5.6	0	19

(table continues)

Variable	Mean	Med.	Mode	<u>SD</u>	Min.	Max.
Pet/Animal Abuse Subscale Scores						
PAP perpetrate	4.5	4.0	0	4.2	0	14
Composite History-Witness Subscale Scores						
EMHW emotional history-witness	23.7	23.0	23	12.0	3	49
PHHW physical history-witness	25.7	27.0	28	11.8	0	50
SXHW sexual history-witness	8.8	6.0	0	9.5	0	42
FMHW family history-witness	22.1	21.0	13	12.1	0	51
ACHW acquaintance history-witness	25.4	25.5	26	11.9	0	53
STHW stranger history-witness	10.7	8.0	0	9.3	0	36

number of victims) of perpetrated abuse. The GDR scale score ranges from 0 (little or no support or help from others upon disclosure or discovery of the abuse) to 5 (a high level of support or help upon disclosure or discovery).

Both the abuse history and abuse witness scale score means are high (29.0 and 29.1, respectively; ceilings of 81). The abuse perpetrate mean of 36.6 (ceiling of 99) is also high, but not surprisingly so, given the nature of the facilities from which participants were selected.

The global disclosure rating mean of 3.2 suggests that there was about an equal amount of supportive and unsupportive responses from others who learned of the participants' abuse. Over one fourth of respondents

indicated that no one or few people who knew about the abuse did anything to stop it, protect them, or support them. Just over 40% indicated that most or all people who knew about the abuse did something to stop it, protected, or supported them. Over 30% indicated that some people acted to stop the abuse, or protect, or support them.

Subscale scores are represented by three or four-letter abbreviations. The first two letters indicate the type of abuse ("EM" for emotional, "PH" for physical, and "SX" for sexual) or the perpetrator/victim category ("FM" for family member, "AC" for acquaintance, "ST" for stranger, and "PA" for pet/animal). The second one or two letters indicate the context of the abuse ("H" for abuse history, "W" for abuse witness, "P" for abuse perpetrate, and "HW" for composite abuse history-witness). All three-letter subscale scores except for PHP, SXP, and PAP, range from 0-27, with 0 indicating no abuse, 3-9 indicating moderate levels of abuse, frequency, and severity, 10-18 indicating severe levels, and 19-27 indicating extremely severe reported levels. The PHP and SXP subscales range from 0-36, with abuse frequency and severity level breakdowns of 3-9 indicating moderate levels, 10-18 indicating moderately

severe, 19-27 indicating severe, and 28-36 indicating extremely severe reported abuse. The PAP subscale score ranges from 0-18, with 3-6 indicating moderate abuse levels, 7-12 indicating severe levels, and 13-18 indicating extremely severe reported levels. All four-letter subscale scores (HW composites) range from 0-54, with 3-18 indicating moderate levels of total (primary and secondary) abuse, 19-36 indicating severe levels, and 37-54 indicating extremely severe levels of reported abuse.

In examining the abuse type (emotional, physical, and sexual) subscale scores, at least some respondents reached or approached ceiling levels (maximum possible scores) on many of the variables. Respondents indicated that witnessing physical abuse was their most common experience, followed by experiencing physical abuse, experiencing and witnessing emotional abuse, and experiencing and witnessing sexual abuse. In regard to their perpetration, perpetrating physical abuse was most common, followed by perpetrating emotional, then sexual abuse.

In examining the victim/perpetrator type subscale scores, some respondents reached or approached the ceiling levels for the family member and acquaintance subscales, but

did not reach ceiling levels for stranger or pet abuse.

Respondents indicated that being abused by acquaintances was their most common experience, followed by witnessing abusive acquaintances, being abused by family members, witnessing abusive family members and strangers, and being abused by strangers. In regard to their perpetration, perpetrating against acquaintances was most common, followed by family members and strangers.

The percentages of respondents who reported various types of abuse (and the relative frequency and severity of the abuse) were computed separately for the PVJOs and the SVJOs. Tables 5 through 10 list the subsample percentages of experienced, witnessed, and perpetrated abuse. Each group acknowledging abuse is grouped according to the number of perpetrators/victims involved and the frequency and severity of the abuse. "Moderate" (Mod) are those who reported the least number of perpetrators/victims and/or a more moderate level of severity and frequency of abuse (composite scores of 3-9 on these variables). It should be noted that even these "moderate" levels of abuse are very

Table 5

Percentage of Physically Violent Respondents (PVJOs) Who
Reported Primary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) n = 36

Abuse history								
Emotional 91.7			Physical 86.1			Sexual 41.7		
mod	sev	ext sev	mod	sev	ext sev	mod	sev	ext sev
52	39	9	29	52	19	73	20	7
fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str
88	73	18	87	90	58	47	67	20

Table 6

Percentage of Sexually Violent Respondents (SVJOs) Who
Reported Primary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) n = 30

Abuse history								
Emotional 100.0			Physical 100.0			Sexual 90.0		
mod	sev	ext sev	mod	sev	ext sev	mod	sev	ext sev
13	67	20	30	50	20	67	33	0
fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str
93	97	37	97	87	37	56	74	11

Table 7

Percentage of Physically Violent Respondents (PVJOs) Who
Reported Secondary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) n = 36

Abuse witnessed								
Emotional 91.7			Physical 91.7			Sexual 22.2		
mod	sev	ext sev	mod	sev	ext sev	mod	sev	ext sev
46	39	15	24	46	30	50	13	37
fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str
79	73	42	76	91	61	38	88	63

Table 8

Percentage of Sexually Violent Respondents (SVJOs) Who
Reported Secondary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) n = 30

Abuse witnessed								
Emotional 90.0			Physical 93.3			Sexual 56.7		
mod	sev	ext sev	mod	sev	ext sev	mod	sev	ext sev
19	51	30	18	50	32	65	35	0
fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str
96	93	59	82	93	61	82	47	18

Table 9

Percentage of Physically Violent Respondents (PVJOs) Who
Reported Perpetrating Abuse (By Category of Victim) n = 36

Abuse perpetrated											
Emotional 94.4			Physical 97.2				Sexual 25.0				
mod	sev	ext sev	mod	mod sev	sev	ext sev	mod	mod sev	sev	ext sev	
41	47	12	40	31	23	6	100	0	0	0	
fam	acq	str	fam	acq	str	pet	fam	acq	str	pet	
91	68	38	60	80	51	40	33	67	0	0	

Table 10

Percentage of Sexually Violent Respondents (SVJOs) Who
Reported Perpetrating Abuse (By Category of Victim) n = 30

Abuse perpetrated											
Emotional 96.7			Physical 100.0				Sexual 100.0				
mod	sev	ext sev	mod	mod sev	sev	ext sev	mod	mod sev	sev	ext sev	
7	76	17	20	33	30	17	0	50	47	3	
fam	acq	str	fam	acq	str	pet	fam	acq	str	pet	
100	100	38	83	77	30	90	100	100	23	37	

serious and potentially damaging to children. "Severe" (Sev) perpetrators/victims and/or a higher level of severity and frequency of abuse (composite scores of 10-18). "Extremely severe" (Ext Sev) are those who reported the greatest number of perpetrators/victims and/or an extremely high level of severity and frequency of abuse (composite scores of 19-27). Also, for each group acknowledging abuse, the percentage who were victimized by or perpetrated against family members, acquaintances, strangers, and pets/animals is indicated.

Table 5 lists the percentages of PVJOs who directly experienced the three types of abuse. Over 91% of physically violent respondents indicated having experienced emotional abuse. Of this group, 52% reported having experienced moderate levels of emotional abuse, 39% severe levels, and 9% extremely severe levels. Of this same group, 88% identified family members, 73% identified acquaintances, and 18% identified strangers as among their perpetrators. Over 86% indicated having experienced physical abuse. Of these respondents, 29% indicated having experienced moderate levels of physical abuse, 52% severe levels, and 19% extremely severe levels. Of these same respondents, 87%

reported being abused by family members, 90% by acquaintances, and 58% by strangers. Over 41% indicated having experienced sexual abuse. Of this group, 73% reported having experienced moderate levels of sexual abuse, 20% severe levels, and 7% extremely severe levels. Of this group, 47% identified family members, 67% identified acquaintances, and 20% identified strangers as the perpetrators. In regard to the perpetrator number and abuse frequency and severity, respondents who were physically abused generally tended to report having experienced more severe and extremely severe levels, whereas those who were emotionally and sexually abused generally tended to report having experienced more moderate levels. Family members and acquaintances were reported as having perpetrated a majority of all types of abuse. Additionally, strangers were among the reported perpetrators for over one half of physically abused respondents.

Table 6 lists the percentages of sexually violent respondents who directly experienced various types of abuse. One hundred percent of sexually violent respondents indicated having experienced emotional abuse. Of this group, 13% reported having experienced moderate levels of

emotional abuse, 67% severe levels, and 20% extremely severe levels. Of this same group, 93% identified family members, 97% identified acquaintances, and 37% identified strangers as among their perpetrators. One hundred percent of sexually violent respondents also indicated having experienced physical abuse. Of these respondents, 30% indicated having experienced moderate levels of physical abuse, 50% severe levels, and 20% extremely severe levels. Of these same respondents, 97% reported being abused by family members, 87% by acquaintances, and 37% by strangers. Over 90% of the subsample indicated having experienced sexual abuse. Of this group, 67% reported having experienced moderate levels of sexual abuse, 33% severe levels, and 0% extremely severe levels. Of this group, 56% identified family members, 74% identified acquaintances, and 11% identified strangers as the perpetrators. In regard to the number of perpetrators and the frequency and severity of abuse, respondents who were emotionally and physically abused tended to report having experienced more severe levels, whereas those who were sexually abused tended to report having experienced more moderate levels. Once again, family members and acquaintances made up the largest

percentage of reported perpetrators with strangers comprising a much smaller group.

Table 7 lists the percentages of physically violent respondents who witnessed various types of abuse. Over 91%, 91%, and 22% of respondents indicated that at some point in their lives, they were a firsthand witness to emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, respectively. Of those who witnessed emotional abuse, 46% witnessed a moderate level, 39% a severe level, and 15% an extremely severe level. Of these witnesses of emotional abuse, 79% identified family members, 73% identified acquaintances, and 42% identified strangers as perpetrators. Of those who witnessed physical abuse, 24% witnessed a moderate level, 46% a severe level, and 30% an extremely severe level. Of these witnesses of physical abuse, 76% reported family members, 91% reported acquaintances, and 61% reported strangers as abusers. Of those who witnessed sexual abuse, 50% witnessed a moderate level, 13% a severe level, and 37% an extremely severe level. Of these witnesses of sexual abuse, 38% identified family members, 88% identified acquaintances, and 63% identified strangers as perpetrators. In regard to the number of perpetrators and the frequency and severity of

abuse witnessed, respondents who were physically abused tended to report having experienced more severe and extremely severe levels, respondents who were sexually abused tended to report having experienced more moderate and extremely severe levels, and respondents who were emotionally abused tended to report having experienced more moderate and severe levels. While family members and acquaintances were the most frequently reported perpetrators of emotional and physical abuse witnessed by respondents, strangers and acquaintances were the most frequently reported perpetrators of witnessed sexual abuse.

Table 8 lists the percentages of sexually violent respondents who witnessed various types of abuse. Over 90%, 93%, and 56% of sexually violent respondents indicated that at some point in their lives, they were a firsthand witness to emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, respectively. Of those who witnessed emotional abuse, 19% witnessed a moderate level of frequency and severity, 51% a severe level, and 30% an extremely severe level. Of these witnesses of emotional abuse, 96% identified family members, 93% identified acquaintances, and 59% identified strangers as perpetrators. Of those who witnessed physical abuse, 18%

witnessed a moderate level, 50% a severe level, and 32% an extremely severe level. Of these physical abuse witnesses, 82% reported family members, 93% reported acquaintances, and 61% reported strangers as abusers. Of those who witnessed sexual abuse, 65% witnessed a moderate level, 35% a severe level, and 0% an extremely severe level. Of these witnesses of sexual abuse, 82% identified family members, 47% identified acquaintances, and 18% identified strangers as perpetrators. In regard to the number of perpetrators, and the frequency and severity of abuse witnessed, respondents who were emotionally and physically abused tended to report having experienced more severe and extremely severe levels, whereas respondents who were sexually abused tended to report having experienced more moderate and severe levels. Family members and acquaintances comprised the largest group of reported perpetrators for all types of witnessed abuse.

Table 9 lists the percentages of physically violent respondents who engaged in various types of abuse. Over 94%, 97%, and 25% of physically violent respondents indicated that they committed acts of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, respectively. Of those respondents who

acknowledged having been emotionally abusive, 41% indicated that their abusiveness was of a moderate level, 47% a severe level, and 12% an extremely severe level. Of these perpetrators of emotional abuse, 91% reportedly abused family members, 68% reportedly abused acquaintances, and 38% reportedly abused strangers. Of those who acknowledged having committed acts of physical abuse, 40% indicated that they were abusive at a moderate level, 31% at a moderately severe level, 23% at a severe level, and 6% at an extremely severe level. Of these perpetrators of physical abuse, 60% targeted family members, 80% targeted acquaintances, 51% who targeted strangers, and 40% who targeted pets or animals. One hundred percent of those respondents who disclosed acts of sexual abuse stated that they perpetrated at moderate levels of frequency and severity. Of those who acknowledged perpetrating sexual abuse, 33% reportedly abused family members, 67% acquaintances, and 0% strangers, pets, or animals. Most of the abuse perpetrated by respondents was reported to be of a moderate level of frequency and severity, some was reported at a severe level, and very little was reported at an extremely severe level. The majority of the victims of the respondents' abuse were

reported to be family members and acquaintances; however, victims of physical abuse reportedly included a high number of strangers and pets or animals.

Table 10 lists the percentages of sexually violent respondents who engaged in various types of abuse. One hundred percent of these respondents indicated that they committed acts of physical and sexual abuse, respectively, and over 96% acknowledged having committed acts of emotional abuse. Of those respondents who acknowledged having been emotionally abusive, 7% indicated that their abusiveness was of a moderate level, 76% a severe level, and 17% an extremely severe level. Of these perpetrators of emotional abuse, all reportedly abused family members and acquaintances, and 38% also reportedly abused strangers. Of those who acknowledged having committed acts of physical abuse, 20% indicated that they were abusive at a moderate level, 33% at a moderately severe level, 30% at a severe level, and 17% at an extremely severe level. Of these perpetrators of physical abuse, 83% targeted family members, 77% targeted acquaintances, 30% targeted strangers, and 90% targeted pets or animals. Of those who acknowledged having committed acts of sexual abuse, 0% indicated that they were

abusive at a moderate level, 50% at a moderately severe level, 47% at a severe level, and 3% at an extremely severe level. Of those who acknowledged having perpetrated sexual abuse, 100% reportedly abused family members and acquaintances, 23% also strangers, and 37% also abused pets or animals. Most of the abuse perpetrated by these sexually violent respondents was reported to be of a severe level of frequency and severity, some was reported at an extremely severe level, and less was reported at a moderate level. Family members and acquaintances were the most frequently reported victims of respondents' emotional, physical, and sexual abuse. A high number of pets were also reported as physical abuse victims.

Correlational Statistics

The next section addresses correlations between various scale and subscale scores from the YEBSI for both the physically and sexually violent subsamples. Pearson product-moment correlations are used throughout. As an aid in the interpretation of the variable abbreviations, note that subscale scores are represented by three- or four-letter abbreviations. The first two letters indicate the

type of abuse ("EM" for emotional, "PH" for physical, and "SX" for sexual) or the perpetrator/victim category ("FM" for family member, "AC" for acquaintance, "ST" for stranger, and "PA" for pet/animal). The second one or two letters indicate the context of the abuse ("H" for abuse history, "W" for abuse witness, "P" for abuse perpetrate, and "HW" for abuse history plus abuse witness).

Tables 11 and 12 list correlation coefficients for each subsample's total abuse perpetrate scale score and various scale and subscale scores for primary and secondary abuse.

In the first row segment of Table 11 for physically violent respondents, correlations between the total abuse perpetrate scale score and abuse history, abuse witness, and abuse history-witness scores are of a strong magnitude, ranging from .70 to .76. In the second and third row segments, correlations between abuse perpetrated and primary and secondary abuse according to abuse type (emotional, physical, or sexual) are mostly of moderate to strong magnitude, ranging from .29 to .76. The highest correlations with abuse perpetration are seen in the physical abuse realm (.73, .69, and .76), followed by

Table 11

YEBSI Correlations for Physically Violent Respondents (Perpetration Scale Score with: History and Witness Scale Scores; Emotional, Physical, and Sexual Subscale Scores; and Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger Subscale Scores) n = 36

		Abuse experienced					
		Scale scores					
A b u s e	P e r p e t r a t e d	H	W			HW	
				.75*		.70*	
		Abuse history			Abuse witnessed		
		EMH	PHH	SXH	EMW	PHW	SXW
		.61*	.73*	.34*	.62*	.69*	.29
		History and witnessed					
		EMHW		PHHW		SXHW	
		.68*		.76*		.34*	
		Abuse history			Abuse witnessed		
		FMH	ACH	STH	FMW	ACW	STW
		.67*	.60*	.46*	.66*	.55*	.48*
		History and witnessed					
		FMHW		ACHW		STHW	
		.71*		.64*		.55*	

*p < .05.

Approved by management
 reviewed and signed
 85 CMU
 5/20/2019

Table 12

YEBSI Correlations for Sexually Violent Respondents (Perpetration Scale Score with: History and Witness Scale Scores; Emotional, Physical, and Sexual Subscale Scores; and Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger Subscale Scores) n = 30

		Abuse experienced					
		Scale scores					
A b u s e	p e r p e t r a t e d	H	W			HW	
				.57*	.65*		
		Abuse history			Abuse witnessed		
		EMH	PHH	SXH	EMW	PHW	SXW
		.52*	.62*	.14	.65*	.54*	.18
		History and witnessed					
		EMHW		PHHW		SXHW	
		.66*		.66*		.20	
		Abuse history			Abuse witnessed		
		FMH	ACH	STH	FMW	ACW	STW
		.43*	.40*	.35	.66*	.39*	.42*
		History and witnessed					
		FMHW		ACHW		STHW	
		.58*		.47*		.44*	

*p < .05.

emotional abuse (.61, .62, and .68), and sexual abuse (.34, .29, and .34). Row segments 4 and 5 show moderate to strong correlations (.46 to .71) between abuse perpetrated, and primary and secondary abuse according to category of Perpetrator (family member, acquaintance, or stranger). Overall, the strongest relationship with total abuse perpetrated can be seen in correlations with abuse by family members (.67, .66, and .71), followed by abuse by acquaintances (.60, .55, and .64), and abuse by strangers (.46, .48, and .55). All correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level except for the sexual abuse witness subscale.

In the first row segment of Table 12 for sexually violent respondents, correlations between the total abuse perpetrate scale score and abuse history, abuse witness, and abuse history-witness scores are of a moderately high magnitude, ranging from .57 to .67. In the second and third row segments, correlations between abuse perpetrated and primary and secondary abuse according to abuse type (emotional, physical, or sexual) are mostly of moderate magnitude, ranging from .14 to .66. Moderate correlations with abuse perpetration are seen in the emotional (.52, .65,

and .66) and physical abuse realms (.62, .54, and .66), whereas weak correlations with abuse perpetration are seen in the sexual abuse realm (.14, .18, and .20). Row segments 4 and 5 show moderate correlations (.35 to .66) between abuse perpetrated, and primary and secondary abuse according to category of perpetrator (family member, acquaintance, or stranger). Overall, the strongest relationship with total abuse perpetrated can be seen in correlations with abuse by family members (.43, .66, and .58), followed by abuse by acquaintances (.40, .39, and .47), and abuse by strangers (.35, .42, and .44). All correlations were statistically significant at the .05 level, except for the sexual abuse history, sexual abuse witness, sexual abuse history-witness, and stranger history subscales.

Tables 13 through 16 all show the correlation coefficients between the same seven abuse perpetration subscale scores--emotional, physical, sexual, family, acquaintance, stranger, and pet abuse perpetration--and various abuse history and witness subscale scores. Tables 13 and 14 break down primary and secondary abuse by abuse type (emotional, physical, and sexual), while Tables 15 and 16 break down primary and secondary abuse by perpetrator

Table 13

YEBSI Subscale Correlations for Physically Violent Offenders
(Emotional, Physical, and Sexual History-Witness Subscale
Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores) n = 36

Perp. type	Abuse type (history and witness)		
	EMHW emotional	PHHW physical	SXHW sexual
EMP emotional	.69*	.77*	.37*
PHP physical	.49*	.73*	.14
SXP sexual	.51*	.14	.48*
FMP family	.50*	.37*	.38*
ACP acquaintances	.71*	.67*	.43*
STP strangers	.24	.69*	.02
PAP animals/pets	.43*	.31	.03

* $p < .05$.

category (family member, acquaintance, and stranger). All four tables use the composite abuse history-witness variables.

Tables 13 and 14 show the correlations between the abuse perpetration subscale scores and the composite history-witness subscale scores for emotional, physical, and sexual abuse. In Table 13, correlations between sexual abuse

Table 14

YEBSI Subscale Correlations for Sexually Violent Offenders
(Emotional, Physical, and Sexual History-Witness Subscale
Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores) n = 30

Perp. type	Abuse type (history and witness)		
	EMHW emotional	PHHW physical	SXHW sexual
EMP emotional	.73*	.71*	.01
PHP physical	.61*	.70*	.32
SXP sexual	.04	-.09	-.03
FMP family	.54*	.56*	.20
ACP acquaintances	.55*	.46*	.04
STP strangers	.40*	.57*	.11
PAP animals/pets	.38*	.20	.24

* $p < .05$.

experiences and abuse perpetration are of low to moderate magnitude (.02 to .48), and correlate least strongly with the perpetration subscales. Reported physical and emotional abuse experiences have mostly moderate to high correlation coefficient ranges with the perpetration subscales, ranging from .14 to .77 for physical abuse, and from .24 to .71 for emotional abuse. For the abuse-type subscales, the highest

Table 15

YEBSI Subscale Correlations for Physically Violent Offenders
(Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger History-Witness Subscale
Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores) n = 36

Perp. type	Abuse type (history and witness)		
	FMHW family	ACHW acquaintance	STHW stranger
EMP emotional	.65*	.66*	.63*
PHP physical	.64*	.42*	.42*
SXP sexual	.32	.54*	.20
FMP family	.64*	.39*	.22
ACP acquaintance	.60*	.76*	.50*
STP stranger	.37*	.23	.54*
PAP animal	.35*	.28	.17

* $p < .05$.

correlations are between the emotional perpetration subscale and the physical history-witness subscale (.77), and between the physical perpetration subscale and the physical history-witness subscale (.73). For the perpetrator-category, the highest correlations are between the acquaintance perpetration subscale and the emotional (.71) and physical (.67) history-witness subscales, and between the stranger

Table 16

YEBSI Subscale Correlations for Sexually Violent Offenders
(Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger History--Witness
Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores) n = 30

Perp. type	Abuse type (history and witness)		
	FMHW family	ACHW acquaintance	STHW stranger
EMP emotional	.58*	.48*	.43*
PHP physical	.46*	.60*	.54*
SXP sexual	.24	-.21	-.13
FMP family	.68*	.35	.21
ACP acquaintance	.37*	.43*	.27
STP stranger	.26	.33	.50*
PAP animal	.40*	.19	.18

*p < .05.

perpetration subscale and the physical history-witness subscale (.69).

In Table 14, correlations between sexual abuse experiences and abuse perpetration are of low magnitude, ranging from .01 to .32, and of the three abuse types correlate least strongly with the perpetration subscales. Reported physical and emotional abuse experiences have

mostly moderate correlations with the perpetration subscales, with coefficients ranging from $-.09$ to $.71$ for physical abuse, and from $.04$ to $.73$ for emotional abuse. For the abuse-type subscales, the highest correlations are between the emotional perpetration subscale and the emotional ($.73$) and physical ($.71$) history-witness subscales, and between the physical perpetration subscale and the physical history-witness subscale ($.70$). For the perpetrator-category subscales, the highest correlations are between the family perpetration subscale and the emotional ($.54$) and physical ($.56$) history-witness subscales, between the acquaintance perpetration subscale and the emotional history-witness subscale ($.55$), and between the stranger perpetration subscale and the physical history-witness subscale ($.57$).

Table 15 shows the correlation between the abuse perpetration subscale scores and the composite history-witness subscale scores for family, acquaintance, and stranger abuse for the physically violent subsample. Correlations between stranger abuse experiences and abuse perpetration are of low to moderate magnitude ($.17$ to $.63$), and generally correlate least strongly with the perpetration

subscales (with the exception of the stranger perpetrate subscale). Family and acquaintance abuse experiences tend to correlate about equally strongly with the perpetration subscales and range in the moderate to strong magnitudes of .32 to .65 and .23 to .76, respectively. For the abuse-type subscales, the highest correlations are between the emotional perpetration subscale and the family, acquaintance, and stranger history-witness subscales (.65, .66, and .63, respectively), and between the physical perpetration subscale and the family history-witness subscale (.64). For the perpetrator-category subscales, the highest correlations are between the acquaintance perpetration subscale and the family acquaintance history-witness subscales (.60 and .76, respectively), and between the family perpetration subscale and the family history-witness subscale (.64).

Table 16 shows the correlations between the abuse perpetration subscale scores and the composite history-witness subscale scores for family, acquaintance, and stranger abuse for the sexually violent subsample. Correlations between stranger abuse experiences and abuse perpetration are of low to moderate magnitude (-.13 to .54),

and generally correlate least strongly with the perpetration subscales (with the exception of the stranger perpetrate subscale). Family and acquaintance abuse experiences tend to correlate about equally with the perpetration subscales and range in the moderate to strong magnitudes of .24 to .68 for family abuse, and .19 to .60, for acquaintance abuse. For the abuse-type subscales, the highest correlations are between the emotional perpetration subscale and the family history-witness subscale (.58), and between the physical perpetration subscale and the acquaintance and stranger history-witness subscales (.60 and .54, respectively). For the perpetrator-category subscales, the highest correlations are between the family perpetration subscale and the family history-witness subscale (.68), the acquaintance perpetration subscale and the acquaintance history-witness subscale (.43), the stranger perpetration subscale and the stranger history-witness subscale (.50), and the pet/animal perpetration subscale and the family history-witness subscale (.40).

Discriminant Analysis

This study also employed a discriminant function analysis to determine if scores from the YEBSI could be used to accurately classify subjects as either physically or sexually violent perpetrators. The following six composite history-witness abuse subscale scores were utilized as classification variables: (a) emotional (EMHW), (b) physical (PHHW), (c) sexual (SXHW), (d) family member-perpetrated (FMHW), (e) acquaintance-perpetrated (ACHW), and (f) stranger-perpetrated (STHW). These variables were chosen because they include respondents' primary and secondary abuse experiences and because they represent the six main abuse constructs assessed by the YEBSI. The criterion or grouping variable was membership in either the physically or sexually violent juvenile offender group (PERPTYPE).

According to Stevens (1992), when discriminant analysis is used to classify subjects, the following assumptions are made: (a) the two populations are multivariate normal and (b) the two populations have the same covariance matrix. In order to test the multivariate normality assumption, the means, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis of each of

the six classification variables were assessed (see Table 17). As can be seen, for all variables, the skewness and kurtosis levels were near-zero (-.1 to 1.3), thereby establishing multivariate normality. Secondly, results from the test of equality of group covariance matrices using Box's M established that the covariance matrices are not statistically significantly different (Box's M = 18.37, $p = .33$). Therefore, both assumptions for the use of discriminant analysis in classifying subjects were met.

The results from the discriminant analysis were statistically significant: Wilks' Lambda = .71, $p < .001$. As seen in Table 18, in terms of classification results, these six variables correctly predicted (e.g., "hit rate") 75% of those in the physically violent group and 67% of those in the sexually violent group. Overall, the percentage of cases correctly classified into one of the two groups was about 71%.

Evaluating the discriminant function at each group mean yielded values (centroids) of -.57 for PVJOs and .68 for SVJOS. Figures 1 and 2 show graphically how the two groups are distributed on the discriminant function, with the group

Table 17

Means, Standard Deviations, Kurtosis, and Skewness for
Discriminant Analysis Classification Variables

Variables	EMHW	PHHW	SXHW	FMHW	ACHW	STHW
Mean	23.7	25.7	8.8	22.1	25.4	10.7
SD	12.0	11.8	9.5	12.1	11.9	9.3
Kurt ^a	-.8	-.5	1.3	0.5	-.1	.6
Skew ^b	.2	-.3	1.2	.4	-.1	1.0

^astandard error of kurtosis = .58.

^bstandard error of skewness = .29.

Table 18

Classification Results of a Discriminant Function Analysis^a
with the YEBSI

Actual group	No. of cases	Predicted group membership	
		Physically violent	Sexually violent
Physically violent	36	27 (75%)	9 (25%)
Sexually violent	30	10 (33.3%)	25 (66.7%)

^apercentage of "grouped" cases classified correctly: 71.21%.

centroid marked for each group ("1" for PVJOs and "2" for SVJOs).

Correlations were computed between the discriminant function and the six classification variables. The results can be seen in Table 19 and show that the highest correlations were found with the EMHW, FMHW, SXHW, and ACHW (.54 to .66) variables, and the lowest were found with the PHHW and STHW (.06 to .09) variables. Table 19 also lists the standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients for the classification variables.

Table 20 lists the history-witness subscale means for each perpetrator type and gives the corresponding univariate F-ratio. As can be seen, statistically significant differences were found between the two groups for the emotional, sexual, family-perpetrated, and acquaintance-perpetrated variables.

Table 19

Discriminant Function Correlations and Standardized
Discriminant Function Coefficients for YEBSI
Classification Variables

Variable	EMHW	PHHW	SXHW	FMHW	ACHW	STHW
Corr.	.66	.09	.63	.66	.54	.06
Coef.	.47	-.90	N/A	.70	.60	-.21

Table 20

History-Witness Subscale Means for Each Perpetrator Type
with Corresponding Univariate F-ratios

Per	EMHW	PHHW	SXHW	FMHW	ACHW	STHW
Phy	19.5	25.1	5.6	17.9	21.9	10.3
Sx1	28.7	26.4	12.6	27.1	29.6	11.0
F	11.2*	.2	10.3*	11.0*	7.4*	.1

*p ≤ .01.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The three primary questions posed in the present research concerned (a) the internal consistency reliability and the interrater reliability of the YEBSI, (b) the descriptive and correlational statistics on this sample of physically and sexually violent juvenile offenders in regard to their abuse histories and perpetration patterns, and (c) the use of discriminant analysis to determine whether the examined victimization history-witness variables reliably discriminate between the subgroups of physically and sexually violent juvenile offenders. The following discussion will include a review and interpretation of the results as well as study limitations.

YEBSI Internal Consistency and

Interrater Reliability

By using Cronbach's coefficient alpha, the internal consistency reliability of the YEBSI was found to be very high (.73 to .90). The internal consistency reliability for the entire instrument was .90. Internal consistency

reliability for the abuse history (H), abuse witness (W), and abuse perpetrate (P) scales was found to be .87. The internal reliability of the victim/perpetrator category subscale scores ranged from .73 to .86. The lower reliability for the stranger subscale (.73) is not surprising given the greater instability of ratings in this arena and the restriction of range problem that results from the lower incidence of stranger abuse. Acquaintance and family subscale internal reliability coefficients, which are more likely to assess repeated abuse incidents by the same perpetrators across abuse types, were higher (.81 and .86).

The interrater agreement level of the YEBSI was found to be 99.7%, indicating that reliability between raters trained in YEBSI administration is very high. This finding must be viewed with caution given that only 3% (rather than the assigned 10%) of interviews were audiotaped. Nevertheless, the structure of the YEBSI lends to a high interrater agreement level as respondents are asked either yes/no questions or Likert-scale questions to which they respond with a number (from a range of numbers that have been clearly and operationally defined). This precludes the common problem of interrater subjectivity. The limitation

of this approach, however, is the uncertainty of whether the respondent understood or attended to the question as no explanation of the rating is required.

Descriptive and Correlational Data

Several interesting findings were discovered in the descriptive statistical analysis of the study. As was mentioned in Chapter IV, both the abuse history and abuse witness scale score means were high, indicating that the violent juveniles in this study acknowledged having experienced a considerable amount of primary and secondary abuse. Compared to a group of male university students assessed on these same variables in an earlier study by the same author (Frazier, 1996), these young offenders were exposed to much higher levels of abuse. Whereas the mean abuse history subscale score for violent juvenile offenders was 29.0 (out of a possible 81 points), the university students' mean was a much lower 12.7. The abuse history mean for violent offenders is 1.46 standard deviations above the abuse history mean for university students ($ES = 1.46$). From a t test comparing two independent means (Glass & Hopkins, 1984), it can be concluded that a difference of

this magnitude occurs less than 1% of the time due to chance alone ($\underline{t} = 9.82, \underline{p} < .001$). Similarly, comparing abuse witness subscale scores, violent offenders' mean score was 29.1 (out of a possible 81 points), whereas university students' mean score was 17.6. A difference of this magnitude also occurs less than 1% of the time due to chance alone ($\underline{t} = 5.58, \underline{p} < .001$). In terms of effect sizes, the violent offender mean is .83 standard deviations above the university student mean ($ES = .83$). This finding corresponds to the notion that the university screening process is likely to exclude many who have been severely abused, and as a result are not functioning at the level required to gain university admittance (Runtz & Briere, 1986). The abuse perpetrate scale score mean for this offender sample (36.6 out of a possible 99 points) was much higher than the perpetration mean for university students (13.1), as expected. This is a statistically significant ($\underline{t} = 11.63, \underline{p} < .001$) finding in which the violent offender perpetration mean is 1.73 standard deviations above that of the university students ($ES = 1.73$). In making these comparisons, it should be noted that violent juvenile offenders and university students represent opposing ends of

the violence (and to some degree, functioning) continuum for young males. On that note, ceiling effects may be present for this sample of violent offenders.

The global disclosure rating scale scores revealed interesting information. Almost 60% of participants indicated that all, most, or some people who knew about their abuse failed to intervene to stop the abuse, protect them, or support them. About 40% indicated that most or all people who knew about the abuse attempted to stop the abuse, protect them, or support them. Although this statistic appears more encouraging, note that even if most people are supportive and protective, but just one important individual (e.g., a parent, spouse) reacts negatively, the abused person may suffer further through revictimization (Bass & Davis, 1988; Watkins & Bentovim, 1992). Unfortunately, only about 20% indicated that everyone who knew of the abuse acted to stop it, protect, or support them. These findings mirror those found among abused university males (Frazier, 1996) and strongly attest to the need for public education on how to respond to abuse victims (especially males) in an understanding and caring manner that will assist them in their recovery (Bass & Davis, 1988; Fromuth & Burkhart,

1987; Hunter, 1990; Violato & Genuis, 1993). Physically violent offenders also reported higher percentages of negative responses to their abuse than did sexually violent offenders (32% vs. 20%, respectively). This may be connected with the potential for sex offenders to be viewed as "sick" and in need of treatment, whereas physical offenders are more likely to be viewed as "criminal" and in need of confinement. Indeed, it generally seems that juvenile sex offender facilities have tended to address perpetrators' own abuse issues more than have the typical penal facilities that house physically violent juveniles (Muster, 1992). In fact, many researchers have recognized this problem and advocated that delinquents should be viewed as victims of inadequate societal and family systems rather than being treated as criminals (Buikhuisen, 1989; Flowers, 1986).

In regard to abuse type, witnessing and experiencing physical abuse were found to be the most common phenomena (followed by emotional and sexual abuse). Physical abuse was also the most commonly reported type of perpetration (followed by emotional and sexual abuse). In regard to the perpetrator/victim category, experiencing and witnessing

abuse from acquaintances was most common (followed by family members and strangers). Conversely, acquaintances were the most commonly reported victims of respondents' abuse (followed by family members and strangers). These findings appear to reflect the growing magnitude of gang activity, which tends to involve abuse of a physical nature among acquaintances (Bell & Jenkins, 1993). They also confirm previous findings that abusers of boys tend more often to be extrafamilial (Faller, 1989; Rogers & Terry, 1984).

Abuse history patterns were analyzed separately for the physically and sexually violent offender subgroups. In regard to primary abuse, larger percentages of SVJOs reported having experienced emotional, physical, and sexual abuse as compared to PVJOs. One hundred percent and 90% of SVJOs reported having histories of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, respectively, as compared to 92%, 86%, and 42% of PVJOs. This finding coincides with that of Ford and Linney (1995), who found that juvenile child molesters had experienced more parental use of violence and were more often victims of physical and sexual abuse compared to violent nonsexual offenders and status offenders.

Whereas reported severity levels for those physically

and sexually abused tended to be similar, SVJOs tended to report more severe levels of emotional abuse than did PVJOs. Family members and acquaintances were by far the most commonly reported perpetrators for all types of primary abuse experienced in both groups. Notably, a higher percentage of abused SVJOs reported having experienced abuse by all perpetrator types (family members, acquaintances, and strangers) with the exception of acquaintance and stranger perpetrators in cases of physical abuse, and stranger perpetrators in cases of sexual abuse.

In regard to secondary abuse, about 90% of SVJOs and PVJOs reported having witnessed emotional and physical abuse, but a much larger percentage of SVJOs reported witnessing sexual abuse (57%) as compared to PVJOs (22%). This finding is interesting in light of the tendency among boys to recapitulate their sexual abuse with themselves in the role of perpetrator (Rogers & Terry, 1984). Recapitulation can be explained by various theoretical models; for example, Friedrich et al. (1988) explain recapitulate using the psychoanalytic concept of "identification with the aggressor," whereas Patterson and Dishion (1985) use the concept of "modeling" from social

learning theory. To determine whether recapitulation is as (or more) likely to occur when the boy is a victim of secondary (vs. primary) abuse, further research is needed.

Whereas reported severity levels (using standardized, objective, operationally defined levels of severity) for those who witnessed physical abuse tended to be similar, SVJOs tended to report witnessing more severe levels of emotional abuse than did PVJOs. And while fewer PVJOs than SVJOs reported witnessing sexual abuse, for those who did, a larger percentage reported witnessing more extremely severe sexual abuse (37% compared to 0% among SVJOs). One outcome of seeing such violence could well be an attitude of intolerance toward helplessness and reassertion of masculinity through physical violence (Rogers & Terry, 1984).

Family members and acquaintances were again the most commonly reported perpetrators for all types of secondary abuse experienced in both groups with one exception. Sixty-three percent of PVJO witnesses of sexual abuse reported that strangers were among the perpetrators, whereas only 38% reported that family members were among perpetrators. Notably, a higher percentage of SVJOs reported having

witnessed abuse by all perpetrator types with the exception of witnessing abusive acquaintances and strangers in cases of sexual abuse. Both these findings may be related to the association of PVJOs with violent gang activities where fellow or rival gang members are seen perpetrating sexual crimes. In contrast, SVJOs tend to be more isolated from peers with whom they report difficulty bonding (Blaske et al., 1989).

Although similarly high percentages of PVJOs and SVJOs reported having perpetrated emotional (94% and 97%) and physical abuse (97% and 100%), a much larger percentage of SVJOs reported perpetrating sexual abuse (100%) as compared to PVJOs (25%). SVJOs also reported perpetrating more severe levels of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse than did PVJOs. This was especially true in the case of sexual abuse where all SVJOs reported perpetrating above moderate levels and no PVJOs reported perpetrating above moderate levels. Although it seems logical that a higher percentage of SVJOs reported perpetrating sexual abuse at more severe levels than did PVJOs, it may be surprising that a higher percentage of SVJOs reported perpetrating physical abuse at more severe levels than did PVJOs. This finding correlates

with that of other researchers (Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus, 1979; Smith, 1988) who found consistently high levels of physical aggression in SVJOs' behaviors, whether or not sexual in nature. As Smith (1988) points out, this finding implies that an effective intervention should not be limited to reducing sexual aggression and exploitiveness, but should also be aimed at reducing the level of aggression displayed in other social relationships.

Family members and acquaintances were reported as victims for the largest percentages of respondents for all types of perpetrated abuse in both groups with one exception. Ninety percent of SVJOs (compared to 40% of PVJOs) reported that pets were among their victims of physical abuse, exceeding the percentages who reported having victimized family members (83%) and acquaintances (77%). Another notable difference found was that while 23% and 37% of SVJOs reported sexually abusing strangers and pets, respectively, 0% of PVJOs reported sexually abusing members of either of these two victim groups. These findings validate recent concerns over the prevalence of pet/animal abuse and its connection with other types of violent behavior (Ascione, 1993). Further research is

needed to clarify whether pet/animal abuse is more commonly associated with SVJOs, rather than PVJOs. Finally, a higher percentage of SVJOs reported having perpetrated against all victim types with the exception of acquaintance and stranger victimization in cases of physical abuse.

To summarize the main findings from the descriptive statistics then, violent juveniles in this study acknowledged having experienced an extraordinary amount of primary and secondary abuse. Almost 60% indicated that all, most, or some people who knew about their abuse failed to intervene to stop the abuse, protect them, or support them (with a higher percentage of PVJOs reporting negative responses). Physical abuse and acquaintance abuse were found to be the most frequently reported abuse and perpetrator/victim types for primary, secondary, and perpetrated abuse followed by emotional and sexual abuse and family member and stranger abuse, pointing to the alarming amount of gang-related violence in this age group. Overall, larger percentages of SVJOs reported having experienced primary and secondary emotional, physical, and sexual abuse at more severe levels for emotional abuse, similar levels for physical abuse, and less extremely severe levels for

sexual abuse as compared to PVJOs. Generally, higher percentages of abused SVJOs reported having experienced abuse by family members, acquaintances, and strangers. SVJOs also reported perpetrating more severe levels of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse than did PVJOs.

The next section of this chapter discusses the correlational findings from the YEBSI scale and subscale scores. Once again, correlations from the PVJOs subsample will be contrasted with correlations from the SVJOs subsample. The results described here provide information only about the nature of relations between YEBSI variables-- they do not attest to causality.

The first series of correlations between the abuse perpetrate scale score and various primary and secondary abuse scale and subscale scores gives us information as to the strength of the relation between the total reported amount of respondents' perpetrated abuse and variables indicative of their primary and secondary abuse experiences. Moderate to strong correlations between perpetrated abuse and primary, secondary, and primary plus secondary abuse were found, ranging from .57 to .76. Squaring the correlation coefficients yields proportion of predictable

variance scores (Glass & Hopkins, 1984). Accordingly, the common variance between abuse perpetrate scores and primary abuse scores is 32% for SVJOs and 56% for PVJOs; between abuse perpetrate scores and secondary abuse scores is 42% for SVJOs and 49% for PVJOs; and between primary plus secondary abuse scores is 45% for SVJOs and 58% for PVJOs. These findings support those of many researchers (Briere, 1987; Carroll, 1977; Koss & Dinero, 1988; Pfouts, Schopler, & Henley, 1982; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Stacey & Shupe, 1983; Violato & Genuis, 1993) who have found a connection between experiencing and witnessing abuse and later perpetration. As other researchers (Kaufman & Zigler, 1987; Widom, 1989a) have emphasized, however, these relations are correlational (not causal) in nature and by no means indicate that those who have experienced or witnessed abuse are "destined" to become abusers.

Also, the abuse history-perpetration correlations were noticeably stronger in the PVJO subsample (.70 to .76) than in the SVJO subsample (.57 to .67). One possible explanation for this result is that PVJOs (who often abuse those who have abused them, e.g., gang fights) tend to embrace the "hurt or be hurt" and revenge-oriented mentality

common in gang activity and community violence (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Osofsky, 1995) where the more abuse they experience, the more they perpetrate. In contrast, for SVJOs (who are more likely to abuse those who have not abused them), the exact levels of experienced abuse may be less of a factor in their perpetration patterns than the simple presence or absence of abuse.

Another finding that may be partially explained by the typical revenge-orientation of the PVJOs is that the perpetration-primary abuse correlation was found to be stronger than the perpetration-secondary abuse correlation in the PVJO subsample, whereas the perpetration-primary abuse correlation was found to be weaker than the perpetration-secondary abuse correlation in the SVJO subsample.

The fact that perpetration-secondary abuse correlations were strong in both groups, however, points to the possibility that victims who witness, but do not directly experience abuse, learn that the abusive behavior can result in the ability to control others and obtain some type of gain (e.g., material goods, feared "respect"). It is also more likely that the witnesses fail to realize the negative

impact abuse has because they do not directly experience victims' pain and likely receive explanations that victims deserve their abuse. These possibilities underline the need for education about the consequences of abuse and empathy training for child witnesses of abuse. One way this could be accomplished is by expanding programs for child witnesses of abuse in battered women's shelters and by educating these women on the effects witnessing violence has on their children.

When primary and secondary abuse were divided into emotional, physical, and sexual components, the highest correlations with abuse perpetrate scores were seen in the physical abuse realm with PVJOs ($r = .76$; 58% proportion of predictable variance) and both in the physical and emotional abuse realms with SVJOs ($r = .66$; 44% proportion of predictable variance). This PVJO finding is consistent with previous findings on the overlap between victims and offenders of physical abuse (e.g., Dennis, Kirk, & Knuckles, 1981, as cited in Bell & Jenkins, 1993) and attests to the importance of effective community mental health programs and gang prevention programs for children.

Sexual abuse history-witness scores showed weak

correlations with abuse perpetration scores for physically violent offenders and nonstatistically significant, low correlations for sexually violent offenders. This finding is somewhat surprising, especially for the SVJOS, but may in part reflect Hunter's (1990) theory that sexually abused males may associate their sexuality with fear, shame, and confusion, and limit its expression.

When primary and secondary abuse were divided into family, acquaintance, and stranger perpetrator components, family-perpetrated abuse scores consistently showed the highest correlations with total respondent abuse perpetrated and were moderately high in magnitude (.43 to .71). Acquaintance- (.47 and .64) then stranger-perpetrated (.44 and .55) abuse scores for SVJOs and PVJOs followed. These findings coincide with a review of 45 studies (Kendall-Tackett, Williams, & Finkelhor, 1993), which found that a perpetrator who had a close relationship with the victim caused more serious effects (including aggression, cruelty, delinquency, and inappropriate sexual behavior) than one who was less close. One possible contributing factor here may be that abuse victims whose perpetrators are known to them may struggle more with feelings of guilt and tend to make

personal, internal, and stable attributions (Grand Forks Abuse and Rape Crisis Center, 1990), which may complicate recovery and lead to negative outcomes.

To summarize, results indicate that scores reflecting a history of primary and secondary physical abuse, as well as abuse by family members, are most strongly associated with abuse perpetration scores on the YEBSI. Weaker correlations were seen between abuse perpetration scores and scores for sexual and stranger-perpetrated abuse.

The second series of correlations (see Tables 13-16) were computed between various abuse perpetration subscale scores and composite abuse history-witness subscale scores (emotional, physical, sexual, family, acquaintance, stranger, and animal). In following the recommendation of many researchers (Bowers, 1990; Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Friedman & Rosenbaum, 1988), this more detailed analysis helped determine whether the patterns of perpetrators' abusive behavior were correlated with the nature of the primary abuse trauma.

In fact, the principal finding from these analyses was the noted pattern that the strongest correlations were found between the same abuse types and victim/perpetrator

categories. For example, emotional abuse history-witness scores correlated more strongly with emotional abuse perpetration scores (.69 and .73) than they did with physical or sexual abuse perpetration scores in both subsamples. Likewise, family-, acquaintance-, and stranger-perpetrated abuse experience scores showed the strongest relationships with scores of abuse perpetrated against family members (.64 and .68), acquaintances (.76 and .43), and strangers (.54 and .50) in both PVJOs and SVJOs, respectively.

A previous study with university students (Frazier, 1996) found similarly high correlations between emotional, family, and acquaintance abuse history-witness and perpetration scores. Future studies will aid in empirically determining whether this study's findings of high correlations between stranger abuse history-witness and perpetration scores are stable. Meanwhile, these findings have important implications, not only for preventative treatment of abuse victims, but also for treatment of offenders. For example, one beneficial component of therapy would address offenders' primary and secondary abuse histories and their relation to current perpetration

patterns, which may in part be elicited or maintained by them. In his research on SVJOs, Smith (1988) agrees and recommends that therapists also thoroughly question family members for patterns of victimization and exploitation. Finally, the relation between family-perpetrated abuse and family-directed violence indicates that family systems strategies may be useful for reducing the occurrence of violent behavior, especially when it appears possible that the violent offending may be but one element in a constellation of disturbed family relations.

Physical abuse history-witness scores correlated strongly with both emotional abuse perpetration scores (.77 for PVJOs and .71 for SVJOs) and physical abuse perpetration scores (.73 for PVJOs and .70 for SVJOs). These results parallel those of Lewis et al. (1979), who found that 78.6% of a more violent group of offenders had witnessed extreme violence directed at others versus only 20% of the less violent group.

Curiously, correlations between sexual abuse history-witness scores and sexual abuse perpetration scores were moderate for the PVJO group (.48), but negative and near-zero for the SVJO group (-.03). This supports the notion

pointed out by Hunter (1990) that it is common for sexually abused males to associate their sexuality with fear, shame, and confusion, and limit its expression. It is also in line with results from a review by Watkins and Bentovim (1992), who concluded that sexual abuse of boys in childhood is an important contributory, but not necessary factor, in the development of a sexual perpetrator.

Finally, for both PVJOs and SVJOs, correlations between pet/animal perpetration scores were strongest with history-witness scores of emotional abuse (.43 and .38, respectively) and family abuse (.35 and .40, respectively). As noted by Ascione (1993), this connection between abuse histories and abuse directed at animals needs further investigation.

Discriminant Analysis

Use of discriminant analysis determined how well the chosen victimization variables discriminated between juvenile offenders belonging to the physically violent versus the sexually violent group. As previously indicated, use of the six classification variables (emotional, physical, sexual, family-, acquaintance-, and stranger-

perpetrated primary and secondary abuse) correctly predicted 75% of those in the physically violent group and 67% of those in the sexually violent group. The overall "hit rate" was 71%.

As noted in Stevens (1992), discriminant analysis is a mathematical maximization procedure in which there is a tremendous opportunity for capitalization on chance, especially with a smaller subject-to-variable ratio, as is the case in this study (11:1). Stevens (1992, p. 277) stated that unless the N (total sample size):p (number of variables) ratio is quite large (about 20:1), one should be very cautious in interpreting the results and assume an upward bias. Ideally, the classification rate reported for this sample should be validated using another sample (upon which the discriminant function was not established).

The hit rate of 75% for PVJOs is quite good, whereas the 67% hit rate for SVJOs is less so. Given that PVJOs tended to be a more "pure" group in terms of the nature of their violence (97.2% reported being physically abusive and only 25% reported being sexually abusive, whereas all SVJOs reported perpetrating sexual and physical abuse), it is understandable that they are more easily classified. The

overall hit rate of 71% is good, especially when considering the rather low cost (financially and safety- or health-wise) of misclassification. Because the purpose of trying to predict group membership would primarily relate to choice of preventative treatment type, a "miss" would be fairly low in cost. A "miss" would be more costly if, for example, group membership dictated whether a punitive (e.g., prison sentence) versus a compassionate (e.g., mandated therapy) consequence would be applied or if an individual were carelessly labeled (e.g., "sexually-violent prone offender" or "physically-violent prone offender"). Consequences such as these carry with them the potential for serious emotional harm or restriction in personal freedom that should be carefully considered.

As reported in Chapter IV, the means of the PVJO and SVJO groups (centroids) fell at $-.57$ and $.68$, respectively, on the discriminant function. According to Stevens (1992), this shows that the discriminant function effectively separates the physically violent (group 1) from the sexually violent (group 2) juvenile offenders.

Stevens (1992) also stated that discriminant functions can be interpreted by examining the discriminant function-

variable correlations and using them to name the discriminant functions. Examination of the correlations in this study indicates that it is primarily the emotional (.66), family-perpetrated (.66), and sexual (.63) abuse subscales that define the function with the acquaintance-perpetrated (.54) abuse subscale secondarily involved. Physical and stranger-perpetrated abuse subscale correlations were much lower (.09 and .06, respectively). The fact that the correlations for these variables are positive means that the groups that scored higher on the emotional, family-perpetrated, sexual, and acquaintance-perpetrated subscales scored higher on the discriminant function.

Analyses yielding statistically significant differences between the physically and sexually violent offender groups on the emotional, sexual, family-perpetrated, and acquaintance-perpetrated variables corroborate the above-described discriminant function results. Therefore, these four variables can be said to have contributed the most to predicting group membership (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Implications for Intervention

By way of summary then, the implications for intervention that followed from this exploratory study examining physically and sexually violent youth are as follows:

1. Since data suggest that institutionalized violent juveniles are very likely to have extensive abuse histories, it is imperative to gain detailed information about their victimization experiences after rapport and trust have been established. This is true for physical offenders as well as sexual offenders, who have traditionally received more therapy opportunities than physical offenders. The YEBSI appears to be one tool that may be used to gain such information in a reliable, valid, thorough, and timely manner. Family members and acquaintances (e.g., teachers, counselors) should be used when possible to obtain a more accurate picture of victimization experiences and should be involved in treatment when indicated.

2. Given the correlations between victimization history and perpetration indices, offenders should explore in therapy how their emotional, physical, and sexual abuse

histories, if present, impacted them, and how they may have initiated or maintained their current perpetration patterns. They should also explore healthy ways of gaining a sense of power and control.

3. Therapists should explore the relationships between youth and perpetrators. Feelings of guilt, disappointment, betrayal (e.g., with known perpetrators), and fear of a dangerous and unpredictable world (e.g., with stranger perpetrators) are important to explore. Also, given the strong correlations between the same category (family member, acquaintance, stranger) of perpetrator and victim, the connection between youths' offenders and their victims should be explored.

4. Given the high levels of reported secondary abuse and the moderate to strong correlations between secondary abuse and later perpetration, therapists should address abuse that youth have witnessed and explore what was learned as a result (e.g., intolerance for helplessness, fear-driven reassertion of masculinity, violence gains power).

5. Since almost 60% of participants indicated that at least some people failed to intervene or stop their abuse, protect them, or support them, therapists should discuss the

responses youth received upon discovery of their abuse. They should also explore feelings of betrayal or anger at their lack of protection, if applicable. Increased public education should also be provided (particularly for parents, teachers, and youth leaders) regarding healthy responses to abuse disclosures.

6. Many sexually violent offenders have both experienced and perpetrated physical abuse. One hundred percent of this sample reported experiencing physical abuse, over 90% reported witnessing it, and 100% reported perpetrating it. Effective intervention should not be limited to reducing sexual aggression and exploitiveness, but should also be aimed at reducing physical aggression and teaching anger management strategies.

7. Offenders labeled "physically violent" may have experienced or perpetrated sexual abuse. Forty-two percent of this sample reported experiencing sexual abuse, over 20% reported witnessing it, and 25% reported perpetrating it. After exploring this issue, treatment goals should be developed as indicated.

8. Prevention and treatment programs should be readily available for all children and youth. Psychoeducational and

treatment programs for empathy training, aggression reduction, coping skills acquisition, stress management, gang prevention, domestic violence prevention, and child abuse prevention can be routinely offered in schools, work settings, women's shelters, community centers, and social service agencies.

9. Research in this area must be made a priority. Studies exploring the abuse-violence connection (e.g., correlational and causal, prospective, prevention and treatment outcome, pet abuse) provide vital information in the fight to curb violence.

Limitations

Because this study was retrospective, it must be emphasized that results do not show causality, but rather indicate "gross relationships between variables at the end of long causal chains" (Farrington, 1978, cited in Howing, Wodarski, Kurtz, Gaudin, & Herbst, 1990). Interpretations and conclusions, therefore, must be made with caution. Because of the retrospective nature of the study, a selection bias in the adjudication and referral of delinquents may have existed. However, this bias appears to

be consistent for violent delinquents, and therefore, results are thought to be generalizable to other samples of serious violent offenders.

A second limitation of the study involves the voluntary nature of the sample. A qualitative difference may exist between those offenders or parents/guardians willing to consent to participation and those unwilling (Borg & Gall, 1989). The voluntary nature of the study most likely yields an underestimation of the rates of abuse experienced, witnessed, and perpetrated (especially family abuse rates). Guarantees of confidentiality were used in an effort to minimize this effect.

Third, the fact that the study relied on self-reported information must also be taken into consideration. Stein and Lewis (1992) have emphasized the difficulty in gathering accurate data regarding maltreatment during adolescence. To maximize the participants' comfort level, honesty, and validity of their answers, counselors with whom the subjects had an ongoing relationship administered the interviews whenever possible. Also, to minimize the difficulty of acknowledging abuse, participants were asked to answer yes/no questions and to rate the severity and frequency of

their abuse on a 3-point Likert scale (as opposed to being asked to recall details of abuse incidents). It should also be noted that regardless of the subjects' accuracy in recalling their victimization histories, their perceptions and beliefs regarding past victimization are very important.

Fourth, for analyses of a descriptive or correlational nature, no conclusions can be drawn regarding cause and effect (Glass & Hopkins, 1984).

Finally, a word of caution is in order regarding the division of the two groups. As noted above, some of those categorized as physically violent have also committed crimes of a sexual nature. Likewise, many sexually violent offenders have also committed crimes of a physical nature. The division was based on the type of crime in which participants' acknowledged having participated. Further fundamental difficulties were also inherent in a study of this nature since definitions for key concepts (e.g., serious juvenile offender, sexual offender, etc.) and methodologies affecting outcomes are disparate throughout the literature. To minimize the effects of these difficulties, the best descriptions of the nature of the offenses and details of methodologies were provided.

REFERENCES

- Abel, G. G., Becker, J. V., & Skinner, L. J. (1987). Behavioral approaches to the treatment of the violent sex offender. In L. Roth (Ed.), Clinical treatment of the violent person (pp. 95-118). New York: Guilford.
- Alfaro, J. D. (1983). Report on the relationship between child abuse and neglect and later socially deviant behavior. In R. J. Hanner & Y. E. Walker (Eds.), Exploring the relationship between child abuse and delinquency (pp. 175-219). Montclair, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun.
- Allen-Hagen, B. (1991). Public juvenile facilities: Children in custody 1989. Juvenile Justice Bulletin (Report No. NCJ 127189, pp. 1-10). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Ascione, F. R. (1993). Children who are cruel to animals: A review of research and implications for developmental psychopathology. Anthrozoos, 6(4), 226-247.
- Bass, E., & Davis, L. (1988). The courage to heal: A guide for women survivors of child sexual abuse. New York: Harper & Row.
- Becker, J. V. (1988). The effects of child sexual abuse on adolescent sexual offenders. In G. E. Wyatt & E. J. Powell (Eds.), Lasting effects of child sexual abuse (pp. 193-207). Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bell, C. C., & Jenkins, E. J. (1993). Community violence and children on Chicago's southside. Psychiatry, 56, 46-54.
- Binder, A. (1988). Juvenile delinquency. Annual Review of Psychology, 39, 253-282.

- Blaske, D. M., Borduin, C. M., Henggeler, S. W., & Mann, B. J. (1989). Individual, family, and peer characteristics of adolescent sex offenders and assaultive offenders. Developmental Psychology, 25(5), 846-855.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). Exploring relationships between variables: The correlational method. In R. T. O'Connell, V. L. Blanford, & A. P. Kearns, (Eds.), Educational research: An introduction (5th ed.; pp. 572-635). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Bowers, L. B. (1990). Traumas precipitating female delinquency: Implications for assessment, practice and policy. Child and Adolescent Social Work, 7(5), 389-403.
- Briere, J. (1987). Predicting self-reported likelihood of battering: Attitudes and childhood experiences. Journal of Research in Personality, 21, 61-69.
- Briere, J., & Runtz, M. (1990). Differential adult symptomatology associated with three types of child abuse histories. Child Abuse and Neglect, 14, 357-364.
- Buikhuisen, W. (1989). Explaining juvenile delinquency from a biosocial developmental perspective. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 33(3) 185-196.
- Burgess, A. W., Hartman, C. R., McCormack, A., & Grant, C. A. (1988). Child victim to juvenile victimizer: Treatment implications. International Journal of Family Psychiatry, 9(4), 403-416.
- Carroll, J. C. (1977). The intergenerational transmission of family violence: The long term effects of aggressive behavior. Aggressive Behavior, 3, 289-299.
- DeComo, R., Tunis, S., Krisberg, B., Herrera, N. C., Rudenstine, S., & Del Rosario, D. (1995). Juveniles taken into custody: Fiscal Year 1992 (Statistics Report). Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

- Engel, B. (1989). The right to innocence: Healing the trauma of childhood sexual abuse. New York: Ivy Books.
- Fagan, J., & Wexler, S. (1987). Family origins of violent delinquents. Criminology, 25, 643-669.
- Fagan, J., & Wexler, S. (1988). Explanations of sexual assault among violent delinquents. Journal of Adolescent Research, 3(3-4), 363-385.
- Faller, K. C. (1989). Characteristics of a clinical sample of sexually abused children: How boy and girl victims differ. Child Abuse and Neglect, 13, 281-291.
- Fehrenbach, P. A., Smith, W., Monastersky, C., & Deisher, R. W. (1986). Adolescent sexual offenders: Offender and offense characteristics. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 56(2), 225-233.
- Finkelhor, D. (1984). Child sexual abuse. New York: Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1986a). Abusers: Special topics. In D. Finkelhor (Ed.), A sourcebook on child sexual abuse. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Finkelhor, D. (1986b). The adolescent sexual perpetrator: A new challenge in the field of sexual abuse. (Report No. CG-021-691). Bloomington, MN: National Training Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 352)
- Flowers, B. R. (1986). The adolescent victim of crime and delinquency. (Report No. CG-020-101). Los Angeles, CA: Information Analyses. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 285 059)
- Ford, M. E., & Linney, J. A. (1995). Comparative analysis of juvenile sexual offenders, violent nonsexual offenders, and status offenders. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10(1), 56-70.

- Forward, S., & Buck, C. (1978). Betrayal of innocence: Incest and its devastation. New York: Penguin Books.
- Frazier, M. R. (1996). Is there a connection? An exploratory study of abuse experiences and perpetration patterns among college males. Unpublished master's thesis, Utah State University, Logan.
- Freeman-Longo, R. (1986). The impact of sexual victimization on males. Child Abuse and Neglect, 10, 411-414.
- Friedrich, W. N., Beilke, R. L., & Urquiza, A. J. (1988). Behaviour problems in young sexually abused boys. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 3, 21-28.
- Friedman, J., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (1988). Social control theory: The salience of components by age, gender, and type of crime. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 4(4), 363-381.
- Fromuth, M. E., & Burkhart, B. R. (1987). Childhood sexual victimization among college men: Definitional and methodological issues. Violence and Victims, 2(4), 241-253.
- Fromuth, M. E., & Burkhart, B. R. (1989). Long-term psychological correlates of childhood sexual abuse in two samples of college men. Child Abuse and Neglect, 13, 533-542.
- Garbarino, J. (1981). Child abuse and juvenile delinquency: The developmental impact of social isolation. In R. J. Hunner & Y. Elder Walker (Eds.), Exploring the relationship between child abuse and delinquency (pp. 115-127) Montclair, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun.
- Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D., (1984). Statistical methods in education and psychology. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Grand Forks Abuse and Rape Crisis Center. (1990). Volunteer advocate training manual. Grand Forks, ND: Author.

- Graves, R. B. (1993). Conceptualizing the youthful male sex offender: A meta-analytic examination of offender characteristics by offense type. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, Logan.
- Groth, A. N. (1979). Sexual trauma in the life histories of rapists and child molesters. Victimology, 4, 1-10.
- Groth, A. N., & Lored, C. M. (1981). Juvenile sexual offenders: Guidelines for assessment. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 25, 31-39.
- Groth, N. A., Longo, R. E., & McFadin, J. B. (1982). Undetected recidivism among rapists and child molesters. Crime and Delinquency, 28, 450-458.
- Guarino, S. (1985). Delinquent youth and family violence: A study of abuse and neglect in the homes of serious juvenile offenders. (Report No. CG-019-493). Boston, MA: State Department of Youth Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 961)
- Henggeler, S. W., McKee, E., & Bourduin, C. M. (1989). Is there a link between maternal neglect and adolescent delinquency? Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 18(3), 242-246.
- Howing, P. T., Wodarski, J. S., Kurtz, P. D., Gaudin, J. M., Jr., & Herbst, E. M. (1990). Child abuse and delinquency: The empirical and theoretical links. Social Work, 35(3), 244-249.
- Hunter, M. (1990). Abused boys: The neglected victims of sexual abuse. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books/D. C. Heath.
- Kaufman, J., & Zigler, E. (1987). Do abused children become abusive parents? American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57(2), 186-192.

- Kendall-Tackett, K. A., Williams, L. M., & Finkelhor, D. (1993). Impact of sexual abuse on children: A review and synthesis of recent empirical studies. Psychological Bulletin, 113(1), 164-180.
- Kolvin, I., Miller, F. J. W., Fleeting, M., & Kolvin, P. A. (1988). Social and parenting factors affecting criminal-offence rates: Findings from the Newcastle Thousand Family Study (1947-1980). British Journal of Psychiatry, 152, 80-90.
- Koss, M. P., & Dinero, T. E. (1988). Predictors of sexual aggression among a national sample of male college students. Annals of New York Academy of Science, 528, 133-147.
- Lewis, D. O., & Shanok, S. S. (1977). Medical histories of delinquent and nondelinquent children: An epidemiological study. American Journal of Psychiatry, 134, 1020-1025.
- Lewis, D. O., Shanok, S. S., & Pincus, J. H. (1979). Juvenile male sexual assaulters. American Journal of Psychiatry, 136, 1194-1196.
- Lewis, D. O., Shanok, S. S., Pincus, J. H., & Glaser, G. H. (1979). Violent juvenile delinquents: Psychiatric, neurological, psychological, and abuse factors. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 18, 307-319.
- Loeber, R., Weissman, W., & Reid, J. B. (1983). Family interactions of assaultive adolescents, stealers, and nondelinquents. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 11, 1-14.
- Milner, J. S., Robertson, K. R., & Rogers, D. L. (1990). Childhood history of abuse and adult child abuse potential. Journal of Family Violence, 5(1), 15-34.
- Muster, N. J. (1992). Treating the adolescent victim-turned-offender. Adolescence, 27(106), 441-450.

- Osofsky, J. D. (1995). The effects of exposure to violence on young children. American Psychologist, 50(9), 782-788.
- Parent, D. G. (1993). Conditions of confinement. In E. E. Appleby, C. M. Doyle, & J. D. Kotler, (Eds.), Juvenile Justice (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 2-7). Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Patterson, G. R., & Dishion, T. J. (1985). Contributions of families and peers to delinquency. Criminology, 23, 63-79.
- Pfouts, J. H., Schopler, J. H., & Henley, H. C., Jr. (1982). Forgotten victims of family violence. Social Work, 27(4), 367-368.
- Porter, J. F., & Critelli, J. W. (1992). Measurement of sexual aggression in college men: A methodological analysis. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 21(6), 525-542.
- Reinarman, C., & Fagan, J. (1988). Social organization and differential association: A research note from a longitudinal study of violent juvenile offenders. Crime and Delinquency, 34(3), 307-327.
- Rogers, C. N., & Terry, T. (1984). Clinical interventions with boy victims of sexual abuse. In I. R. Stuart & J. G. Greer (Eds.), Victims of sexual aggression: Treatment of children, women, and men (pp. 91-104). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Rosenbaum, A., & O'Leary, K. D. (1981). Children: The unintended victims of marital violence. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 51, 692-699.
- Rosenbaum, J. L. (1989). Female dysfunction and female delinquency. Crime and Delinquency, 35(1), 31-44.
- Runtz, M., & Briere, J. (1986). Adolescent "acting-out" and childhood history of sexual abuse. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1(3), 326-334.

- Russell, D., & Finkelhor, D. (1984). Women as perpetrators: Review of the evidence. In D. Finkelhor (Ed.), Child sexual abuse: New theory and research (pp. 171-187). New York: Free Press.
- Samson, J. M. (Ed.). (1980). Childhood and sexuality. Montreal: Editions Vivantes.
- Sandberg, D. N. (1986). The child abuse delinquency connection: Evolution of a therapeutic community. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 18(3), 215-220.
- Seghorn, T., Prentky, R. A., & Boucher, R. J. (1986). Childhood sexual abuse in the lives of sexually aggressive offenders. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 26(2), 262-267.
- Smith, W. R. (1988). Delinquency and abuse among juvenile sexual offenders. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 3(4), 400-413.
- Snyder, H. N. (1992). Arrests of youth 1990. Juvenile Justice Bulletin (Report No. NCJ 133011, pp.1-12). Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Snyder, H. N. (1994). Are juveniles driving the violent crime trends? Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Fact Sheet #16. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
- Snyder, H. N., Sickmund, M., & Poe-Yamagata, E. (1996). Juvenile offenders and victims: 1996 update on violence. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Stacey, W. A., & Shupe, A. (1983). The family secret: Domestic violence in America. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Stein, A., and Lewis, D. O. (1992). Discovering physical abuse insights from a follow-up study of delinquents. Child Abuse and Neglect, 16, 523-531.

- Stevens, J. (1992). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 75-88.
- Straus, M. B. (1988). Abuse and victimization across the lifespan. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Utah Department of Human Services (1992). Annual Report 1992, Salt Lake City: Division of Youth Corrections.
- Utah Department of Human Services (1995). Annual Report 1995, Salt Lake City: Division of Youth Corrections.
- Violato, C., & Genuis, M. (1993). Factors which differentiate sexually abused from nonabused males: An exploratory study. Psychological Reports, 72, 767-770.
- Walsh, A. (1992). Genetic and environmental explanations of juvenile violence in advantaged and disadvantaged environments. Aggressive Behavior, 18, 187-199.
- Watkins, B., & Bentovim, A. (1992). The sexual abuse of male children and adolescents: A review of current research. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 33(1), 197-248.
- Widom, C. S. (1989a). Child abuse, neglect, and adult behavior: Research design and findings on criminality, violence, and child abuse. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59, 355-367.
- Widom, C. S. (1989b). The cycle of violence. Science, 244, 160-166.
- Widom, C. S. (1991). The role of placement experiences in mediating the criminal consequences of early childhood victimization. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 61(2), 195-209.

Worling, J. R. (1995). Sexual abuse histories of adolescent male sex offenders: Differences on the basis of the age and gender of their victims. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 104(4), 610-613.

Wyatt, G. E., & Powell, G. J. (Eds.). (1988). The lasting effects of child sexual abuse. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

APPENDICES

Appendix A:

State Department Protection of Human Rights

Review Committee Approval



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Kerry D. Steadman
Executive Director

120 North 200 West, Room 319
PO Box 45500
Salt Lake City, Utah 84145-0500
(801) 538-4001
(801) 538-4016 (FAX)

June 29, 1994

Ms. Monique Poppinga
Utah State University
Department of Psychology
UMC 2810
Logan, Utah 84322-2810

RE: Human Subjects Application - Physically and Sexually Violent Juvenile Offenders: A comparative Evaluation of Victimization History Variables

Dear Ms. Poppinga:

Based on the recommendation of the Department's Protection of Human Rights Review Committee, I am pleased to notify you that I have approved your proposal, Physically and Sexually Violent Juvenile Offenders: A comparative Evaluation of Victimization History Variables.

In the event you make any changes to your research following this approval (e.g., changes in target population, materials to which subjects are to be exposed, procedures to be employed, etc.) please document these changes in a letter and send it to the Protection of Human Rights Review Committee in care of my office. Also, any significant adverse reaction resulting from your study must be reported immediately for Committee review.

If you need further assistance, please contact Susan Hunt (538-4167). Once your research is completed, please send a copy of your final document to the Division of Youth Corrections to allow the Division to benefit from the findings of your research.

Sincerely,

Kerry D. Steadman
Executive Director
Department of Human Services

cc: Susan Hunt, Protection of Human Rights Review Committee

equal opportunity employer



Appendix B:

USU Institutional Review Board Approval

Utah State
UNIVERSITY

VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH OFFICE
Logan, Utah 84322-1450
Telephone: (801) 797-1180
FAX: (801) 797-1367
INTERNET: lpperity@champ.usu.edu

DATE: October 7, 1994

TITLE: Physically and Sexually Violent Juvenile Offenders: A
Comparative Study of Victimization History Variables

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Frank R. Ascione, PhD
Monique Poppinga, Student Researcher

FROM: True Rubal 

Our institutional committee reviewed and approved this proposal on Sept. 30, 1994, contingent upon some corrections. These corrections have been received and you may consider this your official approval letter. This approval covers the original protocol and the revised consent form received on Sept. 27, 1994.

A study status report (continuing review) will be due in one year.

Please keep the committee advised of any changes, adverse reactions or termination of the study.

Appendix C:

Active Parent/Guardian Consent Form

Dear Parent(s)/Guardian(s),

As a graduate student at Utah State University, I am doing a project studying abuse experiences of youth at the facility where your child is staying. My goal is to **help** young people like your child by learning more about them. The information from this study would be used to develop better treatment and prevention programs for young people.

I am asking for your permission to allow your child to participate in a short (about one-half hour) interview with a counselor from the facility. If your child chooses to participate, he/she may be given a token of thanks. The interview would be about experiences that your child may have had as a victim of abuse. The counselor would also ask about abuse that he/she may have seen and about who he/she may have abused. Before being asked to participate, your child would be told:

- 1) what types of questions would be asked,
- 2) that he/she has the right to agree to or refuse to participate,
- 3) that it is ok if he/she decides not to participate,
- 4) that he/she may decide to stop participating at any time without penalty, and
- 5) that what he/she tells the interviewer will not be shared with you or others. Please understand that the only time this would not be true is if your child talks about harming him/herself or someone else, if he/she gives specifics of a past abuse experience that has not been reported, if he/she talks about acts of terrorism or sales of illegal substances to minors or if otherwise required by the law. Your child will be told about these exceptions.

Your child's name would not be included on any interview forms or audiotapes (if used). A code number would be used instead. Again, **all of the information that your child would share during the interview would be anonymous and strictly confidential with the exception of those items listed in item 5) above.**

Before your child will even be asked to participate in this project, I need your agreement in writing to let him/her take part. I value your opinion as a parent/guardian and ask you to take a few minutes right now to fill out this consent form. I hope you will agree to let your child participate so that better treatment programs can be made.

I have read, understand and agree to the contents of this letter.

Signature_____

If you agree to let your child participate, please make sure you have signed the bottom of page 1 and also sign and date the AGREE section of the Parent/Guardian Consent Form on page 3.

If you refuse to let your child participate, please sign and date by the REFUSE section on page 3.

When you are done, please mail this entire 3 page document using the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided or give it to a counselor at your child's facility.

If you have any questions or concerns feel free to contact me at 750-5320. I would like to thank you in advance for your time and cooperation!

Sincerely,

Monique Frazier, M.S.

PARENT/GUARDIAN CONSENT FORM

Department of Psychology
Utah State University
880 Old Main
Logan, Utah 84302

AGREE

I, the undersigned, understand that I am giving permission for my child, named _____, to participate in this project. I have been informed of and understand the details of the project such as its purpose, its confidential nature, the time involved, and the questions to be asked.

I, _____, **AGREE** to give voluntary
(print your name here, please)

permission for my child to participate in the research project.

Parent/Guardian Signature

Date

Parent/Guardian Signature

Date

REFUSE

I, the undersigned, understand that I am refusing to grant voluntary permission for my child, named _____, to participate in this research project.

I, _____, **REFUSE** to allow my
(print your name here, please)

child to participate in the abuse research project being conducted at his/her facility.

Parent/Guardian Signature

Date

Parent/Guardian Signature

Date

WITNESS

Witness Signature

Date

Appendix D:
Youth Consent Form

YOUTH CONSENT FORM

Today, I'd like to ask you about times in your life when you may have been hurt by other people. The reason I would like to do this is so that more can be learned about young people who are in programs like this one. I think that your experiences are very important for making better programs to help young people. The time we would spend talking would be about 30 minutes.

I would ask you whether or not you have been hurt through the use of mean words, through physical hurting, and through sexual hurting. If you have been hurt, I would ask you who it was that hurt you (not specific names, but whether it was an uncle, a friend, a teacher etc.) and what the hurt was like. I would also ask you about times when you may have seen people hurting one another. Lastly, I would ask you about people you may have hurt. Some of the questions may be hard or painful to answer, but it may be helpful for you to talk about these experiences with me. At the end of the interview, I would ask you whether you would like to talk more about your past experiences in your individual counseling sessions.

I promise that I would not tell your parents or anyone else about the answers you would give to my questions. Your parents/guardians have received a letter telling him/her/them about this project and about this promise not to tell him/her/them your answers and he/she/they agreed to it. The only time I would have to break this promise about not telling others is if you talked about:

1. planning to hurt yourself or another person,
2. specific details (such as names) of past experiences of hurt that have not been reported,
3. acts of terrorism,
4. the sale of illegal things to people under age eighteen
or
5. if otherwise required by the law.

My questions would be very specific and I would like you to answer them directly without telling me other things that I don't ask about. This would help the interview to go more smoothly and quickly and would also protect you from telling me information that I would need to report.

I would write down your answers to my questions to help me remember what you said. The paper I would write the answers on would not have your name on it--it would only have a code number

like this (show sample record sheet). No one else would know that you gave these answers.

Your interview would be audiotaped. Again, only the code number would be included on the audiotape, not your name or any identifying information. Since the interview would be audiotaped, neither one of us would say your full name during the interview. The interview would be recorded only for research purposes and would be erased or destroyed as soon as the study is finished.

If you decide to answer these questions, you will be given _____ to thank you for helping.

If you don't want to answer any of these questions today, that's okay. Your time in this program and the kind of services you get here will be the same whether or not you help on this project.

If you do want to answer the questions but when we start, you change your mind and want to stop, that's okay too.

Do you have any questions about what I just told you?

I understand what this project is about. I agree to talk about any past experiences I may have had of being hurt, of seeing others being hurt and of hurting others. I understand I can stop answering questions whenever I want to and it will be okay.

Adolescent's Signature

Date

Interviewer's Signature

Date

Appendix E:
Youth Experiences and Behaviors
Structured Interview Form
(YEBSI)

Subject #: _____

Date: _____

Interviewer: _____

Subject's violence type (circle one or both): physical sexual

Age: _____

Gender: M F

Educational Level (yrs. of ed. received): _____

Ethnicity (Caucasian, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Am. Ind.,
Mixed/Other): _____INTRODUCTION

"We're going to spend the next thirty minutes or so talking about hurt. We will talk about times in the past when you may have been hurt, when you may have seen others being hurt, and when you may have hurt others. We will talk about three kinds of hurt--emotional, physical and sexual. I will tell you what each type of hurt means before asking you questions about that type of hurt. It is very important that you listen carefully to the descriptions I give you and be as honest as you can in telling me about the hurt that has gone on in your life. Although no one deserves to be hurt, many people have been hurt by others in their lives. Sometimes people who love us hurt us for reasons we don't always understand. When I ask you about the hurt in your life, don't think about whether the person who did the hurting is bad or not, if you feel the hurt was deserved or not, or if the hurt was for punishment. If the person who did the hurting just had a bad temper or was drinking alcohol or doing drugs at the time, I still would like to know about it. No matter where the hurt may have happened--at home, at school, on the streets, at a foster home, at a group home, at a correctional facility, at a hospital, or anywhere else--I would like you to tell me about it.

The main thing that is important for me to know today is whether or not the hurt happened.

ABUSE HISTORY

Emotional Hurt

"Please listen carefully to what emotional hurt means and try to think of times in your past you may have been emotionally hurt.

You have been emotionally hurt if another person has done something that made you feel very angry, scared, worthless or bad about yourself. If you have regularly been ignored, insulted, humiliated, shamed, put down, called names, yelled at, unfairly blamed, threatened, said mean words to, forced to do something mean, controlled, not taken proper care of, or stopped from seeing other people, you have been emotionally hurt. I am going to ask you if different types of people have emotionally hurt you. If they have, I will ask you to tell me how many people in a category hurt you and have you rate how often and how badly you were emotionally hurt. Do you understand? What is emotional hurt?" (clarify as necessary)

-For each OFFENDER CATEGORY listed under the three types of abuse, indicate:

1. whether the youth reports past abuse of the specified type
--Y (yes) or N (no).

2. if Y:
 - indicate on a scale of 1 to 3, how many people within the category the youth reports to have been abused by

 - obtain ratings of the frequency and severity of the abuse using the appropriate CUE CARD** (E for emotional abuse, P for physical abuse, and S for sexual abuse)

- obtain a list of offenders (names are not necessary), noting who they are and their gender when it is not apparent (eg. cousin-m)

OFFENDER CATEGORY

F A M I L Y

- | | | | | |
|----|---|-------|-------|------|
| 1. | Were you ever emotionally hurt by a family member/s? (e.g. parent, step-sibling, uncle, cousin, etc.) | Y | | N |
| 2. | How many family members hurt you emotionally? | (1-3) | (4-6) | (>6) |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. | frequency hist E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. | severity hist E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

E FAMILY HISTORY SUBSCALE SCORE _____

5. I would like you to tell me which family members hurt you emotionally. You do not need to tell me any names, only how they are related to you and whether they are male or female. For example, a step-mother. Which family members hurt you emotionally?
-
-
-
-

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

- | | | | | |
|----|---|-------|-------|------|
| 6. | Were you ever emotionally hurt by a person/people you knew but who were <u>not</u> family members? (like classmates, friends, teachers, etc.) | Y | | N |
| 7. | How many people that you knew hurt you emotionally? | (1-3) | (4-6) | (>6) |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. | frequency hist E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 9. | severity hist E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

E ACQUAINTANCE HISTORY SUBSCALE SCORE _____

10. I would like you to tell me which people you knew hurt you emotionally. You do not need to tell me any names, only how you knew them and whether they are male or female. For example, a male classmate. Which people you knew hurt you emotionally?

S T R A N G E R S

- | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|-------|------|
| 11. | Were you ever emotionally hurt by a stranger/s? | Y | N | |
| 12. | How many strangers hurt you emotionally? | (1-3) | (4-6) | (>6) |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 13. | frequency hist E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 14. | severity hist E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

E STRANGER HISTORY SUBSCALE SCORE _____

15. I would like you to tell me who the strangers were that hurt you emotionally and whether they were male or female. For example, a male police officer. Which strangers hurt you emotionally?

EMOTIONAL ABUSE HISTORY SCALE SCORE _____

Physical Hurt

"Please listen carefully now to what physical hurt means and try to think of times in your past you may have been physically hurt. You have been physically hurt if another person has used force or violence toward you that has caused you fear or pain. If someone has pinched, squeezed, spit at, scratched, bitten, pulled your hair,

spanked, slapped, grabbed, pushed, shoved, thrown, hit, kicked, choked, burned, or used weapons such as household items, knives, or guns against you, you have been physically hurt. I am going to ask you if different types of people have physically hurt you. If they have, I will ask you to tell me how many people in a category hurt you and have you rate how often and how badly you were physically hurt. Do you understand? What is physical hurt? (clarify as necessary)

OFFENDER CATEGORY

F A M I L Y

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|------------|
| 16. | Were you ever physically hurt by a family member/s? (e.g. parent, step-sibling, uncle, cousin, etc.) | Y | N |
| 17. | How many family members hurt you physically? | (1-2) | (3-4) (>4) |
| | | 1 | 2 3 |
| 18. | frequency hist P** | 1 | 2 3 |
| 19. | severity hist P** | 1 | 2 3 |
| | P FAMILY HISTORY SUBSCALE SCORE | _____ | |

20. Which family members hurt you physically (no names)?
-
-
-
-

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|------------|
| 21. | Were you ever physically hurt by a person/people you knew but who were <u>not</u> family members? (like classmates, friends, teachers, etc.) | Y | N |
| 22. | How many people that you knew hurt you physically? | (1-2) | (3-4) (>4) |

Department of Psychology
 Utah State University
 400 28
 Logan Utah 84322

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|---|---|---|
| 23. | frequency hist P** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 24. | severity hist P** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

P ACQUAINTANCE HISTORY SUBSCALE SCORE _____

25. Which people you knew hurt you physically (no names)?

S T R A N G E R S

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|-------|------|
| 26. | Were you ever physically hurt by a stranger/s? | Y | | N |
| 27. | How many strangers hurt you physically? | (1-2) | (3-4) | (>4) |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 28. | frequency hist P** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 29. | severity hist P** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

P STRANGER HISTORY SUBSCALE SCORE _____

30. Who were the strangers that hurt you physically (no names)?

PHYSICAL ABUSE HISTORY SCALE SCORE _____

Sexual Hurt

"Please listen carefully now to what sexual hurt means and try to think of times in your past you may have been sexually hurt. You have been sexually hurt if another person (authority figure, adult, older or intimidating youth, friend, etc.) has done any sexual or sexually-related act or behavior towards you when you were under age eighteen

that has made you uneasy or scared--whether or not it seemed "hurtful" or caused you any physical pain. If you have been criticized or teased sexually, kissed or touched when you didn't want to be, talked into, pressured or forced to have sex or perform sexual acts, were involved in child prostitution or pornography, talked into, pressured or forced to have sex after a beating, had sex with weapons present, or were physically attacked against sexual parts of your body, you have been sexually hurt. I am going to ask you if different types of people have sexually hurt you. If they have, I will ask you to tell me how many people in a category hurt you and have you rate how often and how badly you were sexually hurt. Do you understand? What is sexual hurt? (clarify as necessary)

OFFENDER CATEGORY

F A M I L Y

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|------------|
| 31. | Were you ever sexually hurt by a family member/s? (e.g. parent, step-sibling, uncle, cousin, etc.) | Y | N |
| 32. | How many family members hurt you sexually? | (1) | (2-3) (>3) |
| | | 1 | 2 3 |
| 33. | frequency hist S** | 1 | 2 3 |
| 34. | severity hist S** | 1 | 2 3 |

S FAMILY HISTORY SUBSCALE SCORE _____

35. Which family members hurt you sexually (no names)?

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

36. Were you ever sexually hurt by a person/people you knew but who were not family members? (like classmates, friends, teachers, etc.) Y N
37. How many people that you knew hurt you sexually? (1) (2-3) (>3)
1 2 3
38. frequency hist S** 1 2 3
39. frequency hist S** 1 2 3

S ACQUAINTANCE HISTORY SUBSCALE SCORE _____

40. Which people you knew hurt you sexually (no names)?
-
- _____
-
- _____
-
- _____

S T R A N G E R S

41. Were you ever sexually hurt by a stranger/s? Y N
42. How many strangers hurt you sexually? (1) (2-3) (>3)
1 2 3
43. frequency hist S** 1 2 3
44. severity hist S** 1 2 3

S STRANGER HISTORY SUBSCALE SCORE _____

45. Who were the strangers that hurt you sexually (no names)?
-
- _____
-
- _____

SEXUAL ABUSE HISTORY SCALE SCORE _____

TOTAL ABUSE HISTORY SCORE _____

GLOBAL DISCLOSURE RESPONSE SCALE:

(**Use CUE CARD R)

Global disclosure rating: _____

ABUSE WITNESSED

"Now I would like you to tell me about times you may have seen people emotionally, physically or sexually hurting others (including animals). I will ask you if you have seen different types of people hurting others. If you have, I will ask you to tell me how many people in a category you saw hurt others and have you rate how often you saw the hurt and how bad it was. Would you like me to tell you what the different kinds of hurt mean again? (clarify as necessary) If you want me to later on, just let me know."

-For each OFFENDER CATEGORY listed under the three types of abuse, indicate:

1. whether the youth reports witnessing the specified type of abuse--Y (yes) or N (no).
2. if Y:
 - indicate on a scale of 1 to 3, how many people within the category the youth reports having seen hurt others
 - obtain ratings of the frequency and severity of the abuse using the appropriate CUE CARD**
 - obtain a list of offenders (names not necessary), noting their gender when not apparent (eg.cousin-m)

OFFENDER CATEGORY

F A M I L Y

46.	Have you ever seen a family member/s hurt anyone emotionally?	Y	N	
47.	How many family members have you seen hurt others emotionally?	(1-3)	(4-6)	(>6)
		1	2	3
48.	frequency with E**	1	2	3
49.	severity with E**	1	2	3

E FAMILY WITNESS SUBSCALE SCORE _____

50. Which family members did you see hurt others emotionally (no names)?

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

51. Have you ever seen a person/people that you knew but who were not family members hurt others emotionally? Y N
52. How many people that you knew have you seen hurt others emotionally? (1-3) (4-6) (>6)
- | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 53. frequency with E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 54. severity with E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

E ACQUAINTANCE WITNESS SUBSCALE SCORE _____

55. Which people you knew did you see hurt others emotionally (no names)?

S T R A N G E R S

56. Have you ever seen a stranger/s hurt others emotionally? Y N
57. How many strangers have you seen hurt others emotionally? (1-3) (4-6) (>6)
- | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 58. frequency with E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 59. severity with E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

E STRANGER WITNESS SUBSCALE SCORE _____

60. Who were the strangers that you saw hurt others emotionally (no names)?

EMOTIONAL ABUSE WITNESS SCALE SCORE _____

OFFENDER CATEGORY

F A M I L Y

61. Have you ever seen a family member/s hurt anyone physically? Y N

62. How many family members have you seen hurt others physically? (1-2) (3-4) (>4)

1 2 3

63. frequency with P** 1 2 3

64. severity with P** 1 2 3

P FAMILY WITNESS SUBSCALE SCORE _____

65. Which family members did you see hurt others physically (no names)?

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

66. Have you ever seen a person/people that you knew but who were not family members hurt others physically? Y N

67. How many people that you knew have you seen hurt others physically? (1-2) (3-4) (>4)

1 2 3

68.	frequency with P**	1	2	3
69.	severity with P**	1	2	3

P ACQUAINTANCE WITNESS SUBSCALE SCORE _____

70. Which people you knew did you see hurt others physically (no names)?

S T R A N G E R S

71.	Have you ever seen a stranger/s hurt others physically?	Y	N
-----	---	---	---

72.	How many strangers have you seen hurt others physically?	(1-2)	(3-4)	(>4)
-----	--	-------	-------	------

1	2	3
---	---	---

73.	frequency with P**	1	2	3
-----	--------------------	---	---	---

74.	severity with P**	1	2	3
-----	-------------------	---	---	---

P STRANGER WITNESS SUBSCALE SCORE _____

75. Who were the strangers that you saw hurt others physically (no names)?

PHYSICAL ABUSE WITNESS SCALE SCORE _____

OFFENDER CATEGORY

F A M I L Y

76.	Have you ever seen a family member/s hurt anyone sexually?	Y	N
-----	--	---	---

77.	How many family members have you seen hurt others sexually?	(1)	(2-3)	(>3)
-----	---	-----	-------	------

1	2	3
---	---	---

78.	frequency with S**	1	2	3
-----	--------------------	---	---	---

79. severity withn S** 1 2 3

S FAMILY WITNESS SUBSCALE SCORE _____

80. Which family members did you see hurt others sexually (no names)?

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

81. Have you ever seen a person/people that you knew but who were not family members hurt anyone sexually? Y N

82. How many people that you knew have you seen hurt others sexually? (1) (2-3) (>3)
1 2 3

83. frequency withn S** 1 2 3

84. severity withn S** 1 2 3

S WITNESS ACQUAINTANCE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

85. Which people you knew did you see hurt others sexually (no names)?

S T R A N G E R S

86. Have you ever seen a stranger/s hurt others sexually? Y N

87. How many strangers have you seen hurt others sexually? (1) (2-3) (>3)
1 2 3

88. frequency withn S** 1 2 3

89. severity with S** 1 2 3

S STRANGER WITNESS SUBSCALE SCORE _____

90. Who were the strangers that you saw hurt others sexually (no names)?

SEXUAL ABUSE WITNESS SCALE SCORE _____

TOTAL ABUSE WITNESS SCORE _____

ABUSE PERPETRATED

"Finally, I would like to ask you about the people/animals you may have hurt. I will ask you if you have hurt different types of people/animals. If you have, I will ask you to tell me how many people/animals in a category you have hurt and have you rate how often and how badly you hurt the person/animal. Would you like me to tell you what the different kinds of hurt mean again? (clarify as necessary) If you want me to later on, just let me know."

-For each VICTIM CATEGORY listed under the three types of abuse, indicate:

1. whether the youth reports committing the specified type of abuse--Y (yes) or N (no).
2. if Y:
 - indicate on a scale of 1 to 3, how many people within the category the youth reports hurting
 - obtain ratings of the frequency and severity of the abuse using the appropriate CUE CARD**
 - obtain a list of victims (names not necessary), noting their gender if not apparent (eg. cousin-m)

VICTIM CATEGORY

F A M I L Y

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|-------|------|
| 91. | Have you ever hurt a family member/s emotionally? | Y | | N |
| 92. | How many family members have you hurt emotionally? | (1-3) | (4-6) | (>6) |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 93. | frequency perp E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 94. | severity perp E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

E FAMILY PERPETRATE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

95. Which family members did you hurt emotionally (no names)?

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|-------|------|
| 96. | Have you ever hurt a person/people that you knew but who were <u>not</u> family members emotionally? | Y | | N |
| 97. | How many people that you knew have you hurt emotionally? | (1-3) | (3-6) | (>6) |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 98. | frequency perp E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 99. | severity perp E** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

E ACQUAINTANCE PERPETRATE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

100. Which people you knew did you hurt emotionally (no names)?

S T R A N G E R S

101. Have you ever hurt a stranger/s emotionally? Y N

102. How many strangers have you hurt emotionally? (1-3) (3-6) (>6)
 1 2 3
103. frequency perp E** 1 2 3
104. severity perp E** 1 2 3

E STRANGER PERPETRATE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

105. Who were the strangers that you hurt emotionally (no names)?
-
-

EMOTIONAL ABUSE PERPETRATE SCALE SCORE _____

VICTIM CATEGORY

F A M I L Y

106. Have you ever hurt a family member/s physically? Y N
107. How many family members have you hurt physically? (1-2) (3-4) (>4)
 1 2 3
108. frequency perp ** 1 2 3
109. severity perp P** 1 2 3

P FAMILY PERPETRATE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

110. Which family members did you hurt physically (no names)?
-
-
-

A C O U A I N T A N C E S

111. Have you ever hurt a person/people that you knew but who were not family members physically? Y N
112. How many people that you knew have you hurt physically? (1-2) (3-4) (>4)

Department of Psychology
 Utah State University
 Logan, Utah 84302

113. frequency perp P**

1	2	3
1	2	3

114. severity perp P**

1	2	3
---	---	---

P ACQUAINTANCE PERPETRATE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

115. Which people you knew did you hurt physically (no names)?

S T R A N G E R S

116. Have you ever hurt a stranger/s physically?

Y	N	
---	---	--

117. How many strangers have you hurt physically?

(1-2)	(3-4)	(>4)
-------	-------	------

1	2	3
---	---	---

118. frequency perp P**

1	2	3
---	---	---

119. severity perp P**

1	2	3
---	---	---

P STRANGER PERPETRATE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

120. Who were the strangers that you hurt physically (no names)?

A N I M A L S

121. Have you ever hurt an animal/s physically?

Y	N	
---	---	--

122. How many animals have you hurt physically?

(1-2)	(3-4)	(>4)
-------	-------	------

1	2	3
---	---	---

123. frequency perp P**

1	2	3
---	---	---

124. severity perp P**

1	2	3
---	---	---

P ANIMAL PERPETRATE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

125. I would like you to tell me what kinds of animals you hurt physically. For example, a stray cat. What kinds of animals

did you hurt physically?

PHYSICAL ABUSE PERPETRATE SCALE SCORE _____

VICTIM CATEGORY

F A M I L Y

- | | | | |
|--|-----|-------|------|
| 126. Have you ever hurt a family member/s sexually? | Y | | N |
| 127. How many family members have you hurt sexually? | (1) | (2-3) | (>3) |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 128. frequency perp S** | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 129. severity perp S** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

S FAMILY PERPETRATE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

130. Which family members did you hurt sexually (no names)?
-
-
-
-

A C O U A I N T A N C E S

- | | | | |
|--|-----|-------|------|
| 131. Have you ever hurt a person/people that you knew but who were <u>not</u> family members sexually? | Y | | N |
| 132. How many people that you knew have you hurt sexually? | (1) | (2-3) | (>3) |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 133. frequency perp S** | 1 | 2 | 3 |

134. severity perp S** 1 2 3

S ACQUAINTANCE PERPETRATE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

135. Which people you knew did you hurt sexually (no names)?

S T R A N G E R S

136. Have you ever hurt a stranger/s sexually? Y N

137. How many strangers have you hurt sexually? (1) (2-3) (>3)

1 2 3

138. frequency perp S** 1 2 3

139. severity perp S** 1 2 3

S STRANGER PERPETRATE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

140. Who were the strangers that you hurt sexually (no names)?

A N I M A L S

141. Have you ever hurt an animal/s sexually? Y N

142. How many animals have you hurt sexually? (1) (2-3) (>3)

1 2 3

143. frequency perp S** 1 2 3

144. severity perp S** 1 2 3

S ANIMAL PERPETRATE SUBSCALE SCORE _____

145. I would like you to tell me what kinds of animals you hurt sexually. For example, a pet dog. What kind of animals were the ones that you hurt sexually?

SEXUAL ABUSE PERPETRATE SCALE SCORE _____

TOTAL ABUSE PERPETRATE SCORE _____

"How are you feeling? Are there any things we talked about today that you would you like to talk more about with your counselor/me later on?"

No Yes Indicated desire to speak with counselor regarding:
(circle one)

Appendix F:
YEBSI Cue Cards

Appendix F

YEBSI Cue Cards

CUE CARD E

Frequency

hist->"Think of the time in your life you were most often emotionally hurt by (who)."
witn-> most often saw (who) hurting others emotionally."
perp-> most often hurt (who) emotionally."

On a scale of 1 to 3, how often did the emotional hurt happen?

A '1' would be if, on the average, the hurt happened less than once each day.

A '2' would be if, on the average, the hurt happened once or twice each day.

A '3' would be if, on the average, the hurt happened more than twice each day.

Which number best describes how often the hurt happened?"

Severity

hist->"Think of the worst or most severe time when you were emotionally hurt by (who)."
witn-> saw (who) emotionally hurting others."
perp-> hurt (who) emotionally."

On a scale of 1 to 3, how bad or severe was the emotional hurt?

A '1' would be mild emotional hurt or hurt that was less bad or severe. Examples of '1's' would be mild teasing, ignoring, or insulting--hurt that causes little distress.

A '2' would be moderate emotional hurt or hurt that was worse or more severe. Examples of a '2's' would be humiliating, calling bad names, or abandoning--hurt that causes some distress.

A '3' would be severe emotional hurt or hurt that was very bad or severe. Examples of '3's' would be screaming, threatening, or abandoning without food--hurt that causes a lot of distress.

Which number best describes what the hurt was like?

1

LESS THAN ONCE
A DAY



2

TWICE A DAY



3

MORE THAN TWICE



CUE CARD P

Frequency

hist->"Think of the time in your life you were most often physically hurt by (who)."
withn-> most often saw (who) hurting others physically."
perp-> most often hurt (who) physically."

On a scale of 1 to 3, how often did the physical hurt happen?

A '1' would be if the hurt happened less than once each month.

A '2' would be if the hurt happened more than once each month but less than weekly.

A '3' would be if the hurt happened at least once each week.

Which number best describes how often the hurt happened?

Severity

hist->"Think of the worst or most severe time when you were physically hurt by (who)."
withn-> saw (who) physically hurting others."
perp-> hurt (who) physically."

On a scale of 1 to 3, how bad or severe was the physical hurt?

A '1' would be mild physical hurt or hurt that was less severe and resulted in little or no physical harm. An example of a '1' would be if a little pain or hurt was felt or a small scratch was left.

A '2' would be moderate physical hurt or hurt that was worse and resulted in at least some physical harm. An example of a '2' would be if some pain or hurt was felt or temporary bruises or scars were left.

A '3' would be severe physical hurt or hurt that was very violent and may have resulted in a broken bone or a trip to the hospital or emergency room. An example of a '3' would be whippings with a belt buckle or hard hits to the head with an object.

Which number best describes what the hurt was like?

1

LESS THAN ONCE
MONTH



2

LESS THAN WEEKLY



3

WEEKLY



CUE CARD S

Frequency

hist->"Think of the time in your life you were most often sexually hurt by (who)."
witn-> most often saw (who) hurting others sexually."
perp-> most often hurt (who) sexually."

On a scale of 1 to 3, how often did the sexual hurt happen?

A '1' would be if the hurt happened once a year or less.

A '2' would be if the hurt happened more than once a year, but less than weekly.

A '3' would be if the hurt happened once a week or more.

Which number best describes how often the hurt happened?

Severity

hist->"Think of the worst or most severe time when you were sexually hurt by (who)."
witn-> saw (who) sexually hurting others."
perp-> hurt (who) sexually."

On a scale of 1 to 3, how bad or severe was the sexual hurt?

A '1' would be mild sexual hurt or hurt that was verbal only, caused no to slight emotional stress, no physical discomfort or pain, and did not involve penetration (your/the person's body was not entered). Examples of '1's' would be sexual name calling, intentional brushing by sexual parts of people's bodies, or kissing that feels uncomfortable.

A '2' would be moderate sexual hurt or hurt that involved moderate to extreme emotional stress, physical discomfort and pain, but did not involve penetration (your/the person's body was not entered). An example of a '2' would be unwanted touching in private parts of people's bodies.

A '3' would be severe sexual hurt or hurt that involved penetration (your/the person's body was entered) or violence (extreme physical pain was involved). Examples of '3's' would be forcing someone to have sex against their will or touching someone sexually and then beating them.

Which number best describes what the hurt was like?

167

1

ONCE A YEAR



VERBAL

2

MORE THAN ONCE
A YEAR
LESS THAN WEEKLY



UNWANTED
TOUCHING

3

ONCE A WEEK
OR MORE



PENETRATED
BODY

CUE CARD R

"Take a minute to think about how people acted when you told them or when they found out that you were being hurt. On a scale of 1 to 5, I would like you to rate the overall kind of responses you received. A rating of 1 or 2 would be about right if all or most people didn't believe that you were being hurt, didn't do anything to stop you from being hurt, or didn't do anything to protect or support you. A rating of 4 or 5 would be about right if all or most people believed that you were being hurt and did something to stop you from being hurt, protected you or supported you. A rating of 3 would be about right if about half the responses were positive and about half negative. Do you understand? What is your rating?"

1 2 3 4 5



CURRICULUM VITAE

Monique R. Frazier
November, 1996

Personal Information

University Address: Utah State University
Department of Psychology
Logan, UT 84322-2810
Tel. (435) 797-1460

Current Home Address: 1100 S. Hwy. 89-91 #34
Logan, UT 84321
Tel. (435) 755-3290 (h)
Tel. (435) 750-5320 (w)

Date of Birth: 2-24-70

Place of Birth: Minot, North Dakota

Education

<i>Utah State University</i>	10/92-Present	
<i>Degree:</i>	M.S., (Summa Cum Laude)	3/96
	Ph.D. candidate	
<i>Major:</i>	Combined Clinical, Counseling, and School Psychology (APA approved)	
<i>G.P.A.:</i>	3.99	
<i>Honors:</i>	Presidential Fellowship	1992-93
	National Dean's List Award	1993-96
	Walter A. Borg Scholarship	1995-96
	T. Clair and Enid Johnson Brown Scholarship	1996-97
<i>University of North Dakota</i>	8/88-12/91	
<i>Degree:</i>	B.A. (Summa Cum Laude)	12/91
<i>Major:</i>	Psychology	
<i>Minor:</i>	German	
<i>G.P.A.:</i>	4.00	
<i>Honors:</i>	Dean's List Award	1988-89
	J.D. Robertson Scholarship	1988-89
	Larimore-Matthews Scholarship	1989-90
	National Dean's List Award	1989-91
	President's Honor Roll Award	1989-91
	Lars Haugen Scholarship	1990-91

Clinical Experience

Paid Professional Positions:

- * Graduate Assistant Therapist; June 1996-Present
Logan Regional Hospital, Behavioral Health Unit; Logan, Utah
(20 hrs. per week)
Duties: Assess patient behavior; perform individual, couples, and family therapy; participate in multidisciplinary team; assist in and lead group therapy; administer, score, and interpret psychological tests; attend individual supervision.

Total Supervised Hours: 184 hrs.
Supervisor: Dr. Bruce Johns, Ph.D. Clinical Psychologist

- * Graduate Student Therapist; Dec. 1995-Present
Child Evaluation and Treatment Center; Logan, Utah.
(contractual position, approx. 7 hrs. per week)
Duties: Conduct individual (adult and child), couples, family (co-therapy), and play therapy in a private practice setting; lead a sexual abuse group for adolescent girls; conduct psychological testing; write psychological evaluations, treatment plans, and progress notes; attend weekly individual supervision.

Total Supervised Hours: 154 hrs.
Supervisor: Steven Gentry, Ph.D. Child and Family Psychologist

- * Depression Prevention Group Co-leader; April-May 1995
Box Elder County School District, Utah
(half-day weekly clinical research position)
Duties: Co-lead an 8-week interpersonal-oriented psychoeducational treatment group for the prevention of depression and acquisition of social skills for two classes of fifth graders; attend supervision.

Total Supervised Hours: 45 hrs.
Supervisor: Susan Crowley, Ph.D. Counseling Psychologist

- * Mental Health Specialist; Sept. 1994-June 1996
Bear River Head Start, Logan, Utah
(20 hrs. per week)

Clinical Experience (continued)

Duties: Train parents and staff; provide individual (adult and child), couples, family, and group therapy (low SES and ethnically diverse families with children ages 4-5); consult with parents, staff, teachers, and agencies; supervisory duties; conduct classroom observations; administer, score, and interpret psychological tests; implement behavior modification programs; attend individual supervision.

Total Supervised Hours: 1524 hrs.

Supervisors: David Stein, Ph.D. Clinical Psychologist;
Lynette Christensen, BRHS Health Coordinator

* Mental Health Staff Assistant; Oct. 1993-Sept. 1994

Community Family Partnership, Logan, Utah
(20 hrs. per week)

Duties: Administer, score, and interpret intelligence and developmental assessments for children; provide in-home individual, marital, and family therapy (low SES and ethnically diverse families with children ages 0-8); write assessment reports; attend weekly supervision; participate in clinical research.

Total Supervised Hours: 750 hrs.

Supervisors: John Neece, Ph.D. Counseling
Psychologist; Pat Truhn, Ph.D. Neuropsychologist

* Victim Advocate and Protection Worker; Feb.-Aug. 1992

Grand Forks Abuse and Rape Crisis Center, Grand Forks, ND.

(40 hrs. per week)

Duties: Provide crisis intervention and counseling for victims of domestic violence, rape, incest, and abuse; advocate in legal, criminal, medical, and personal matters; participate in research; provide emotional support, transportation, shelter, child care, referrals, legal, and medical information; supervise crisis-line volunteers; attend individual and group supervision/consultation.

Total Supervised Hours: 1040 hrs.

Supervisor: Beth Bensen, ARCC Director

Clinical Experience (continued)

- * Undergraduate Psychology Intern; May-Aug. 1991
Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, Pittsburgh, PA.
(60+ hrs. per week)

Duties: Individual and group counselor for adolescents diagnosed with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder and other mental disorders; design and implement behavior modification treatment; assess behavior change (including single-subject studies); teach social and problem-solving skills; implement anger control program; record, assess, and present research data; attend individual and group supervision.

Total Supervised Hours: 630 hrs.

Supervisors: Steve Evans, Ph.D. Clinical Psychologist; Diana Malone, Ph.D. Counseling Psychologist

Practica Training:

- * Therapist-in-Training; Sept. 1995-June 1996
USU Community Clinic, Logan, Utah
(10 hrs. per week)

Duties: Conduct individual, marital, and family therapy; administer, score, and interpret psychological assessments; write assessment summaries, intake reports, treatment notes, and disposition summaries; attend weekly individual and group supervision.

Total Supervised Hours: 300 hrs.

Supervisors: Kevin Masters, Ph.D. Clinical Psychologist, Scott Blickenstaff, Ph.D. Clinical Psychologist

- * Graduate Student Counselor; Sept. 1994-Sept. 1995
USU Counseling Center, Logan, Utah
(10 hrs. per week)

Duties: Conduct individual, couples, and Survivors of Suicide group counseling; write intake reports, treatment notes, and termination summaries; attend weekly individual and group supervision.

Total Supervised Hours: 348 hrs.

Supervisors: David Bush, Ph.D. Clinical Psychologist, Mary Doty, Ph.D. Counseling Psychologist

Clinical Experience (continued)

- * School Psychology Assistant; Sept. 1993-June 1994
 Cache County Testing, Logan, UT.
 (10 hrs. per week)

Duties: Assess children referred for special education placement, behavioral, or emotional difficulties; write psychological evaluations; attend Individual Education Program meetings; conduct classroom observations; interview and meet with children and parents; attend individual supervision.

Total Supervised Hours: 300 hrs.

Supervisor: Kathleen Kennedy, Ph.D. School
 Psychologist

- * Therapist-in-Training; Jan.-June 1993
 USU Community Clinic, Logan, UT.
 (10 hrs. per week)

Duties: Conduct individual counseling; conduct assessments and write assessment summaries; write intake reports, treatment notes, and disposition summaries; attend weekly individual and group supervision.

Total Supervised Hours: 200 hrs.

Supervisor: Susan Crowley, Ph.D. Counseling
 Psychologist

Summary of Clinical Experience

Therapy Experience:	Client Contact <u>Hours:</u>
Adult/Individual (> 19 yrs.)	584
Adolescent/Individual (13-19 yrs.)	237
Child/Individual (0-12 yrs.)	131
Adult/Group	49
Adolescent/Group and Milieu	482
Child/Group	47
Couples	43
Family	<u>63</u>
<i>Total Therapy Experience Through October, 1996</i>	1636

Summary of Clinical Experience (continued)

Total Supervised Clinical Hours Through October, 1996	5810
Total Supervised Clinical Hours Projected By July 1, 1997	6512
Total Hours of One-On-One Supervision	374
Total Hours of Group Supervision	491

Assessment Experience (Tests Administered, Scored, and Interpreted)

Intelligence/Achievement/Cognition:

Kaufman Adolescent and Adult Intelligence Test	1
Stanford-Binet 4/E	4
Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised	13
Wechsler Individual Achievement Test	3
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-III	46
Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scales of Intelligence-R	2
Woodcock Johnson Psychoeducational Battery-R, 1 & 2	4
Woodcock Johnson Psychoeducational Battery Part II	1

Personality:

California Personality Inventory	1
Meyers Briggs Personality Inventory	2
Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-II	6
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-II	32
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-Adolescent	11
Rorschach	3

Projective:

Incomplete Sentences Blank	32
Person-Tree-House	1
Child and Thematic Apperception Test	2

Affective and Clinical:

Beck Depression Inventory	12
Beck Anxiety Inventory	4
Brief Symptom Inventory	38
Derogatis Psychiatric Rating Scale	32
State-Trait Anxiety Inventory	3

Assessment Experience (continued)

Symptom Checklist-90	3
Child and Adolescent:	
Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist	20
Attention Deficit Disorders Evaluation Scale	6
Battelle Developmental Inventory	45
Behavior Rating Profile-2	73
Conner's Rating Scales (parent form)	4
Devereux Adolescent Behavior Scale	1
Harter Adolescent Self-Concept Test	1
Harter Self-Perception Profile for Children	4
Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale	1
Reynolds Child Depression Scale	1
School Social Behavior Scales	1
Other:	
Scales of Independent Behavior	2
Vineland Scales of Adaptive Behavior	1
Vocational Preference Inventory	2

Teaching Experience

* School Psychology Program Assistant; June-September, 1996

Utah State University, Logan, Utah.

Duties: Co-teach Psychology 646--Professional Issues in School Counseling and School Psychology (lecture, grade presentations and homework, prepare final exam and finalexam study guide, hold weekly office hours) and assist in school psychology research.

Supervisor: Kenneth Merrell, Ph.D. School Psychology Director

* Task Force Member; Winter quarter, 1996

USU Eating Disorders Task Force, Logan, Utah.

Duties: Community lecture/discussion on eating disorders and the influence of popular media on the incidence of eating disorders.

Supervisor: Mary Doty, Ph.D., Director, USU Counseling Center

Teaching Experience (continued)

- * Program Trainer; Winter quarter, 1996;
Spring quarter, 1995
*USU Acquaintance/Date Rape Peer Prevention Program,
Logan, Utah.*
Duties: Conduct inservices (approx. 5) on the
psychological effects of rape and domestic violence,
how to respond to victims of rape and domestic
violence, and how to respond to students who do not
understand the dynamics of abuse.

Supervisor: Carol Rosenthal, Director, USU
Acquaintance/Date Rape Peer Prevention
Program

- * Mental Health Specialist; September, 1994-June 1996
Bear River Head Start, Logan, UT.
Duties: Conduct inservices and parent training on
topics such as mental health, the process of change,
signs and symptoms of child abuse, child abuse laws,
domestic violence, sexual abuse prevention, child
development, self-esteem, and relaxation techniques.

Supervisors: David Stein, Ph.D. Clinical Psychologist
Lynette Christensen, BRHS Health
Coordinator

- * Tutor; October, 1990-May, 1992
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.
Duties: Tutor beginning to advanced level college
students in German, sociology, and psychology.

Supervisor: Vicki French, Master Tutor

Research Experience

- * Doctoral Dissertation Project; October, 1993-April, 1997
(anticipated completion)
Utah State University, Logan, UT
(19.0 quarter credit hours)
Title: Physically and Sexually Violent Juvenile
Offenders: A Comparative Study of Victimization History
Variables

Research Experience (continued)

Supervisor: Frank Ascione, Ph.D. Developmental
Psychologist

- * School Psychology Program Assistant; June-September, 1996
Utah State University, Logan, Utah.
(approximately 15 research hours)

Duties: Assist in data entry for a project piloting a depression measure used with elementary school children.

Supervisor: Kenneth Merrell, Ph.D. School Psychology
Director

- * Masters Thesis Project; October, 1993-March, 1996
Utah State University, Logan, UT
(9.0 quarter credit hours)

Title: Is There a Connection? An Exploratory Study of Abuse Experiences and Perpetration Patterns Among College Males

Supervisor: Frank Ascione, Ph.D. Developmental
Psychologist

- * Research Assistant; June-September, 1993
Utah State University, Logan, UT.
(3.0 quarter credit hours)

Duties: Conduct research on the following topics: a) teacher ratings of student social behavior as a predictor of special education status; b) parent-teacher concordance and gender differences in behavioral ratings of social skills and social-emotional problems of primary-age children with disabilities; and c) the alliance of adaptive behavior and social competence.

Supervisor: Kenneth Merrell, Ph.D. School
Psychologist

- * Research Assistant; March, 1989-May, 1991
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.
(8.0 semester credit hours)

Duties: Conduct research on the following topics: a) effects of vasopressin on memory in white rats; b) comparison of stress resistance measures; c) reactions to acquaintance rape victims; and d) effects of vasopressin on memory in humans.

Research Experience (continued)

Supervisors: William Beckwith, Ph.D Clinical
Psychologist; Jeffery Holm, Ph.D
Clinical Psychologist

* Psychology Intern; May-August, 1991

*Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, Pittsburgh,
Pennsylvania.*

(approximately 125 research hours)

Duties: Assist in clinical research for Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder adolescent program; conduct behavioral observations; assist in assessing behavioral change in behavioral and psychopharmacological outcome studies; design single-subject treatment programs and assess outcomes; record, analyze, and present research data.

Supervisors: Steve Evans, Ph.D. Clinical Psychologist
Diana Malone, Ph.D. Counseling
Psychologist

Publications

Frazier, M.R., & Merrell, K.W., (In Press). Issues in the behavioral treatment of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. Education and Treatment of Children.

Merrell, K.W. & Poppinga, M.R. (1994). Parent-teacher concordance and gender differences in behavioral ratings of social skills and social-emotional problems of primary-age children with disabilities. Diagnostique 19, 1-14.

Merrell, K.W. & Poppinga, M.R. (1994). The alliance of adaptive behavior and social competence: An examination of relationships between the Scales of Independent Behavior and the Social Skills Rating System. Research in Developmental Disabilities, 15, 39-47.

Merrell, K.W., Sanders, D.E., & Poppinga, M.R. (1993). Teacher ratings of student social behavior as a predictor of special education status: Discriminant validity of the School Social Behavior Scales. Journal of Psychological Assessment, 11, 220-231.

Paper and Poster Presentations

Popinga, M.R., and Merrell, K.W. (April, 1994).

Relationship between adaptive behavior and social competence. Poster presented at the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association, Las Vegas, NV.

McSherry, W.C., Holm, J.E., and Popinga, M.R. (November 1991). Sense of coherence and hardiness: Comparing their abilities to predict physical symptoms and psychological distress. Poster presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, New York, NY.

McSherry, W.C., Holm, J.E., and Popinga, M.R. (October, 1991). A comparison of two measures of stress resistance: "Sense of coherence" and "hardiness." Paper presented at the meeting of the North Dakota Psychological Association, Grand Forks, ND.

Other Experience

Program Trainer

USU Acquaintance/Date Rape Peer Prevention Program
Winter quarter, 1996; Spring quarter, 1995

Task Force Member

USU Eating Disorders Week
Winter quarter, 1996

Participant

Bear River Mental Health Play Therapy Workshop
December 27, 1995

Member

Bear River Head Start Health Advisory Board
1994-1996

Program Volunteer

"Expanding Your Horizons in Math and Science" Program
Winter quarter, 1993

Program Volunteer

Little Sister Program, Grand Forks YMCA Family Center
1989-1992

Other Experience (continued)

Member and Officer
 Psychology Club, University of North Dakota
 1988-1991

Membership in Professional Associations and Honor Societies

National Association for School Psychologists
 Student Member (1993-1996)

American Psychological Association
 Student Member (1992-1996)

Psi Chi Honor Society (1989-present)

Phi Beta Kappa Honor Society (1991-present)

Professional References

David Stein, Ph.D.
 Psychology Department Head
 Utah State University
 Department of Psychology
 Logan, UT 84322-2810
 435/97-3274

Bruce Johns, Ph.D.
 Chief Psychologist
 Logan Regional Hospital
 Behavioral Health Unit
 1400 North 500 East
 Logan, UT 84321
 435/50-5320

Steven Gentry, Ph.D.
 Director
 Child Evaluation and
 Treatment Center
 130 South Main
 Logan, UT 84321
 435/753-2222

Kenneth Merrell, Ph.D.
 Director of Training
 Utah State University
 Department of Psychology
 Logan, UT 84322-2810
 435/797-2034

Mary Doty, Ph.D.
 Director
 Utah State University
 Counseling Center
 University Hill
 Logan, UT 84322
 435/97-1012