

**THE JUVENILE VICTIMIZATION QUESTIONNAIRE (JVQ):**

**ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING MANUAL**

Sherry Hamby

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

David Finkelhor, Richard Ormrod, & Heather Turner

Crimes Against Children Research Center

University of New Hampshire



Suggested citation: Hamby, S. L., Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R., & Turner, H. (2005). [The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire \(JVQ\): Administration and Scoring Manual](#). Durham, NH: Crimes Against Children Research Center.

The authors would like to thank Kelly Foster and Tobias Ball for their assistance with preparing the figures and editing the text. © 2005 Sherry Hamby, David Finkelhor, Richard Ormrod, & Heather Turner.

## INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ) is a comprehensive questionnaire designed to gather information on a broad range of victimizations. It can enhance the assessment of any child or adolescent by providing a quantified description of all of the major forms of offenses against youth. Either youth or parents can complete the questionnaire. It covers victimizations that are unique to childhood, such as neglect and statutory rape, as well as crimes that can occur to youth as well as to adults, such as assault and theft. The JVQ includes state-of-the-art techniques for assessing very sensitive victimization. These techniques include specific questions to target victimizations by parents, peers, and other perpetrators that are less likely to be identified through generic questioning, and behaviorally-specific wording that clearly defines the types of incidents children should report (Finkelhor, Hamby, Ormrod, & Turner, 2005).

The JVQ has undergone one of the most exhaustive conceptual and wording screenings of any victimization questionnaire. Extensive attention has been paid to translating clinical and legal concepts such as “psychological abuse” and “aggravated assault” into language that children can understand. The scale has been reviewed by victimization specialists, focus groups of parents and teens, and administered in an in-depth cognitive version to young children in order to determine the appropriateness of its language and content. As a result of this process, the JVQ can also be administered to children as young as age 8, which is substantially lower than most other victimization questionnaires.

Increasingly, professionals who work with children are expected to perform a variety of tasks that require standardized assessment of victimization, including documenting clients’ experience of child maltreatment and other harms and evaluating intervention and prevention programs ranging from school-based violence prevention programs to therapy for traumatized children. These professionals include (but are not limited to) child and family therapists, trauma counselors, child abuse evaluation team members, juvenile court intake workers, forensic

interviewers, violence prevention specialists, police officers (especially those who work in units with a focus on juveniles, such as gang units), and researchers. The JVQ can assist any professional wanting a thorough record of victimization assessment for their client population.

### **General Description**

The JVQ obtains reports on 34 forms of offenses against youth that cover five general areas of concern: Conventional Crime, Child Maltreatment, Peer and Sibling Victimization, Sexual Victimization, and Witnessing and Indirect Victimization. Each of these five areas is a module of the JVQ. Although comprehensiveness is an important goal of the JVQ, these modules have been developed to take into account important conceptual categories that characterize current work with children. They are designed to be usable individually in stand-alone form for situations that call for a more focused assessment. All modules should be administered if a comprehensive picture is desired of all forms of victimization that an individual has experienced.

The questionnaire begins with Conventional Crime for several reasons. This module is more general than the other modules and includes many questions which are less sensitive than those in some other modules. This is followed by Child Maltreatment, next because it is a conceptually distinct but very important domain of child victimization. Peer and Sibling Victimization follows because it continues the theme of known perpetrators. Sexual Victimization, while more stereotypically considered criminal than peer and sibling violence, is placed fairly late in the questionnaire due to the sensitive nature of the questions. Witnessing and Indirect Victimization is last because it moves away from direct experiencing. (Note that there is intentional overlap of some offenses among modules, because they fall in multiple categories. Such items would not be repeated when the whole questionnaire is used.)

A few brief, closed-ended follow-up items can be administered whenever a child or caregiver reports that a victimization occurred. Follow-ups include the number of times a child

has been victimized, who victimized the child, whether the child was hurt, and questions specific to the victimization reported (for example, value of stolen items).

The questionnaire is usable in interview format with children as young as age 8 and as old as age 17. It can be used in a self-administered format for juveniles 12 and older. There is also a “Caregiver version,” by which a caregiver could be interviewed as a proxy for a child, especially a child under age 8. Additionally, it can be adapted for retrospective reporting of childhood events by adult respondents.

### **Purpose and Use**

There is currently enormous interest in determining rates and correlates of juvenile victimization for children receiving therapy, being evaluated for maltreatment, and attending school- and community-based prevention programs. Self-report questionnaires are the major source of data for a variety of important forms of victimization, including community violence and other conventional crime, bullying and other peer and sibling violence, and witnessing all types of violence, including domestic violence. Self-report questionnaires are also important sources of information (along with official reports) on family violence and sexual assault.

Questionnaires such as the JVQ are important because numerous studies have shown that children, especially those school-age or older, have the most information to offer about their own experiences. The JVQ, because it can be administered in self-report form down to age 8, also offers enhanced opportunities to obtain accurate epidemiological data across the span of childhood.

Some scholars have questioned the ability of children to provide self-reports about victimizations, but the reliability and validity of juvenile victimization measures have been demonstrated in a number of ways. Forensic research has shown that children are more than 90% accurate in details of self-report down to age 4 (e.g., Carter et al., 1996). Construct validity has been shown in numerous studies comparing juvenile victimization with psychological and

sociological constructs such as depression and neighborhood crime rates. Self-report also follows logical patterns—for example, rates of witnessing violence are generally higher than rates of sustaining violence. Preliminary data on the reliability and validity of the JVQ are encouraging. Please see the sections on reliability and validity for details.

In addition, the JVQ addresses a number of challenges about interviewing children about victimization, which is a sensitive and complex area. Vocabulary comprehension has been extensively tested in qualitative studies. Time bounding, or making sure that reports all fit the one-year reference period of the questionnaire, receives much more attention than it does on many questionnaires. Practice items are offered to ensure that children understand how to respond. Also, extensive conceptual work has been done to more clearly relate JVQ items and modules to official crime and child protection categories.

The goals of the JVQ are:

- 1) To measure multiple forms of JV to obtain a better estimate of the true total rate of juvenile victimization.
- 2) Enhance the correspondence of juvenile victimization measurement with important social constructs such as crime and child protection categories.
- 3) To provide a means of studying the overlap among forms of juvenile victimization.

## **Module Descriptions**

### **Module A: CONVENTIONAL CRIME**

These are victimizations that parallel the offenses defined and measured by the U.S. Federal Government in the National Crime Victimization Survey (Rennison and Rand, 2003). They are the most important crime categories in virtually every police district in the United States. By organizing questionnaire items around these crime categories, questionnaire results can be compared much more easily to crime statistics and presented in a way more clearly

understandable to police, politicians, and other policy makers. The results from these items can also give guidance as to when to recommend reporting a victimization to the police. This module also includes property crimes, which is the most frequent form of victimization in the U.S. but which is omitted from almost all other victimization questionnaires. The module begins with the property crime items (#1-3) in order to begin the questionnaire with victimizations that are usually less traumatizing than interpersonal victimizations.

C1) Robbery

C2) Personal Theft

C3) Vandalism

C4) Assault with Weapon

C5) Assault without Weapon

C6) Attempted Assault

C7) Kidnapping

C8) Bias Attack

(S2 Nonspecific Sexual Assault *should be asked here if Sexual Victimization module is not given*)

## **Module B: CHILD MALTREATMENT**

These 4 items are intended to parallel offenses of concern to child protection agencies. They specifically include mention of victimization by caregivers because extensive research has shown that people are unlikely to mention family perpetrators to general crime items such as those in Module A (Hamby & Finkelhor, 2000). It is worth noting that, contrary to some expectations, research has shown that parents and other caregivers will report maltreatment committed against their own children in surveys (e.g, Straus, Hamby, Finkelhor, Runyan, & Moore, 1998).

M1) Physical Abuse by Caregiver

M2) Psychological/Emotional Abuse

M3) Neglect

M4) Custodial Interference/Family Abduction

(S1 Sexual Assault by Known Adult *should be asked here if Sexual Victimization module is not given*)

### **Module C: PEER AND SIBLING VICTIMIZATION**

This module covers the common offenses of childhood. Many of these are not typically considered to be crimes, which is one reason questions about peer perpetrators need to be asked separately from the more general assault questions. These are also the forms of victimization of most interest to professionals in schools and similar settings.

P1) Gang or Group Assault

P2) Peer or Sibling Assault

P3) Nonsexual Genital Assault

P4) Bullying

P5) Emotional Bullying

P6) Dating Violence

### **Module D: SEXUAL VICTIMIZATION**

This module was developed because of evidence that general sexual assault questions may not elicit reports of intimate, statutory and other kinds of sexual offenses. Research has also shown that asking multiple screener questions about sexual assault increases the number and accuracy of reports on this very sensitive topic (Bolen & Scannapieco, 1999; Williams, Siegel, & Pomeroy, 2000). The JVQ also assesses more types of sexual victimization than most other questionnaires by including items that do not necessarily involve forced physical attacks.

S1) Sexual Assault by Known Adult

S2) Nonspecific Sexual Assault

S3) Sexual Assault by Peer

- S4) Rape: Attempted or Completed
- S5) Flashing/Sexual Exposure
- S6) Verbal Sexual Harassment
- S7) Statutory Rape & Sexual Misconduct

#### **Module E: WITNESSING AND INDIRECT VICTIMIZATION**

These items are included because offenses against others can have psychological impact on children as well as direct victimizations. Some are very serious but rare victimizations that might not be picked up by other modules, but are important for many policy issues.

- W1) Witness to Domestic Violence
- W2) Witness to Parent Assault of Sibling
- W3) Witness to Assault with Weapon
- W4) Witness to Assault without Weapon
- W5) Burglary of Family Household
- W6) Murder of Family Member or Friend
- W7) Witness to Murder
- W8) Exposure to Random Shootings, Terrorism, or Riots
- W9) Exposure to War or Ethnic Conflict

#### **Limitations**

Juvenile victimization is a sensitive and complex area. Assessment of harm done to a child or adolescent requires clinical sensitivity and knowledge of research on juvenile victimization. Perhaps to an even greater degree than assessment of other factors, assessment of victimization requires attention to context. This includes both the immediate context of the incident and also the broader social and cultural context in which any incident takes place. The JVQ is designed for use by individuals with training in psychological or epidemiological assessment, whether it is



used as an assessment tool in an individual or group setting. While the JVQ can help standardize and organize information obtained about victimization experiences, it should never be used as the sole basis for clinical diagnoses, treatment decisions, child protection determinations, or judgments of criminal liability.

## ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING

The JVQ can be administered as a child interview, caregiver interview, child self-administered questionnaire (SAQ), or caregiver self-administered questionnaire, depending on the age and availability of the child. The first section of this chapter covers directions and considerations in the administration of the JVQ, and the second section covers scoring instructions for both individuals and groups.

### Administration

#### Context, Rapport, and Setting

For any use of the JVQ, be it in clinical, school, or research settings, it is important that respondents are comfortable and motivated to answer accurately. It is important the setting be private enough so that the child or caregiver can be assured that no one besides the test examiner can hear or see the answers to JVQ questions. A private office is ideal. If the JVQ is to be administered in a group setting in a school or similar location, it is recommended that children be seated in every other chair or some other arrangement that affords the maximum amount of privacy.

As with any assessment, it should be introduced initially by briefly explaining the reason the JVQ is being administered, how the results will be used, and what feedback, if any, will be available to the child and/or caregiver. If children are the source of information, both children and caregivers should understand in advance what access, if any, caregivers will have to information provided by the respondent. Given the focus of the JVQ on juvenile victimization, some arrangements should be made in advance to ensure that children have access to helping resources and that some mechanism is in place for assisting children in danger. Because of the wide variety of applications of the JVQ, there is no one mechanism that would apply in every situation. As the JVQ is most likely to be used in a setting that is already addressing issues of

juvenile victimization in some form, whether it be through intervention, prevention, or research, it is likely that the mechanisms already in place will also apply to the JVQ.

Many of the items on the JVQ have been experienced by a majority of the U.S. population. These include peer and sibling assaults and witnessing physical assaults of others. Victimization such as property crimes are also quite common. Thus, it is fine to communicate in some way that many children have had the types of experiences that will be asked about in order to make youth more comfortable disclosing their own experiences. Confidentiality should also be clearly addressed in an effort to increase the likelihood of accurate disclosure. While there will often be some limits to confidentiality, children should still be made aware that their answers will only be known to a small group and will not be disclosed, for instance, to peers, siblings, or others. If parents are to be told the results of the questionnaire, they should also be encouraged to protect the child's privacy.

### **Examiner Characteristics**

The actual administration of the JVQ is fairly straightforward and can be conducted by any experienced test examiner. Paraprofessionals or research assistants should only administer the JVQ under supervision. Anyone administering the JVQ should acquaint themselves with the questions. Those who plan to administer the JVQ as an interview with the follow-up items should be especially familiar with the general flow of questions and how to describe time bounding to children and go over practice items. The JVQ includes a number of sensitive questions and any examiner should be capable of discussing these concepts without personal anxiety and know how to gain assistance for any child in need. Interpretation of the scores requires a qualified professional who is familiar with the psychometric properties of the test and current knowledge on juvenile victimization.

## **Respondent Characteristics**

Most children aged 8 to 17 and adults should be able to complete the JVQ without difficulty. It has been extensively tested to maximize comprehension. Children aged 8 to 12 who have any cognitive difficulties, including low IQ and receptive or expressive aphasia, are likely to have trouble completing the JVQ. Adolescents and adults with mild cognitive difficulties may be able to complete the JVQ, but it is recommended that the narrative interview (see below) be administered so that their results can be adjusted for any misunderstanding of items. Children or adults who may have poor reading abilities should be administered an interview version of the JVQ.

## **Materials and Forms**

The JVQ has 34 screen questions about different forms of victimization that the identified child has experienced in the last year. There are several forms of the JVQ, which vary by reporter, administration mode, amount of incident data and referent period. On the long forms, if a child or caregiver indicates that the victimization occurred in the last year, then a few brief follow-up items are administered. To administer the JVQ you need the correct form and a writing instrument.

The child interview is designed for children aged 8 to 17 and is appropriate for one-on-one administration by an examiner with a background in assessment. Highly verbal 6- and 7-year-old children may also be able to complete the child interview. The interview can be completed either face-to-face or over the telephone. Users may want to consider setting appropriate child-age thresholds for some items.

The caregiver interview is designed for any caregiver who has had regular contact with the target child for at least the one-year period prior to the interview. It is not appropriate for use by non-custodial or foster parents who have not been a primary caregiver of the child for the duration of the previous year. The caregiver interview can be used for children of any age, 0 to

17, but users may want to consider setting appropriate child-age thresholds for some items. As with the child interview, the caregiver interview can be completed face-to-face or over the telephone.

The child self-administered questionnaire (SAQ) is designed for children aged 12 to 17 and can be administered individually or in group settings. In group settings, the test can also be administered by having the items read orally to the group while each child fills out the SAQ form.

The caregiver SAQ can be used for children aged 0 to 17 and as with the interview form requires a caregiver who has had regular contact with the child over the year prior to the assessment. It can also be used either as a screening instrument only, or with the follow-up questions.

A narrative interview is available for those who wish to obtain detailed descriptions of victimization incidents. This interview has been used in qualitative pre-testing with children as young as age 6. This version is appropriate for professionals seeking an in-depth description of a child's victimization incidents, or who have questions about a child's comprehension of the items. This is the most appropriate form to use with 6- and 7-year-old children, because the test interpreter can screen out any inappropriate reports (for example, reports of accidents instead of intentional harm), which appear to be more common among very young reporters.

Retrospective form with a full childhood (0-17 or 0-current age) referent period. While the JVQ is intended primarily for assessing recent victimization of children, it can also be used to try to obtain reports from children or adults about ALL their childhood experiences. This can be done either as an interview or SAQ. In the retrospective form, the phrase "In the last year" is omitted and "ever" is inserted.

Although the advantage of the retrospective form appears to be in getting a complete lifetime inventory and, particularly for researchers, in having more "cases," we urge caution in using this form for a number of reasons. First, accurate memory for many of the JVQ events like

having items stolen or being assaulted by peers is not likely to be good after the passage of considerable time. One-year referent periods have been shown to have much greater accuracy. In addition, the increase in number of cases produced by an “ever” as opposed to “in the last year” referent period is typically much smaller than researchers expect. Moreover, lifetime referent periods also make it impossible to compare rates for children of different ages directly. With lifetime referent periods, one cannot know if higher rates reported by 12-year-olds than 8-year-olds, for example, are due to greater vulnerability or a 50% longer time of exposure (cf. Hamby & Finkelhor, 2000). Thus, although one can only use the full childhood format for adults, the one-year referent periods are preferable for juveniles. We also caution about administering both one-year and lifetime referent periods in a single administration (i.e., by asking two questions for each form of victimization). Doubling the length of the JVQ is likely to be tiring for participants and could easily promote a less thoughtful response set. This is less of a problem in cases where only one module or a few JVQ items are being used.

### **Age Limits for Some Items**

It may be appropriate to limit some JVQ items, such as dating violence and statutory rape, to older youth. This will depend in part on the individual or sample to which the JVQ will be administered. In the Developmental Victimization Survey, which is the basis of our national norms, Dating Violence, Sexual Harassment and Statutory Rape/Sexual Misconduct were only asked of youth age 12 and older. Robbery and Personal Theft were only asked about youth age 6 and over.

### **Directions**

As already discussed in the section on **Context, Rapport, and Setting**, the purpose behind the administration of the JVQ should be explained to the child and/or caregiver and any needed consents obtained. The directions to the JVQ itself are simple and brief to facilitate data

collection. For interview administration, begin with the preamble on the interview form that defines the period of interest as the previous year. The self-report form begins similarly, but also includes instructions on circling responses.

Next “time bounding” is addressed. It is critical that time bounding is covered for all respondents. Time bounding is the process of helping to make sure that events that are reported on the JVQ happened in the last year, and not more than one year ago. For all interview respondents and anyone who receives a self-administered of the JVQ, time bounding instructions are included that lead them through key events that help define the past year, such as their last birthday, Christmas or other holidays, summer vacation, and school-related events and experiences.

For pre-adolescents who will be interviewed (either face-to-face or via telephone), the JVQ instructs examiners to personalize the description of the last year so that the child’s birthday and other events are described in detail. It has been our experience that it is especially important to point out what school years, or portions of school years, are included in the last 12 months. Many young children think of years in terms of the school calendar and will forget to include items from the previous school year, even though that could easily fall into the last 12 months of the standard (Roman) calendar.

For the child interview, two practice items appear next, one on going swimming and one on getting a shot from a doctor, that should be used with all pre-adolescents receiving an interview administration and any others who may need extra help learning the format. The interview then moves on to victimization questions.

### **Completion of All Questionnaire Items**

Every respondent should be encouraged to respond to all of the JVQ items in order to obtain the most accurate victimization rates. Of course, respondents should be made aware of their right to decline to answer any questions or discontinue. Examiners should be especially

sensitive to children's expressions of desires to omit a question or stop the questionnaire.

Module or Composite scores (see below) should not be calculated if more than one item is missing from those used to determine the score, but individual items can still be interpreted if the examiner feels the respondent was giving valid responses to completed items. Examiners should repeat the question or otherwise help clarify the item if it appears the respondent did not understand the item.



## Scoring

### Overview

The JVQ can be scored in a variety of ways to produce variables that are of interest for a number of different contexts. The most basic scores are item-level scores and module scores. Composite scores have also been created to capture forms of victimization that are surveyed in more than one module, such as physical assault. In addition, follow-up responses can be used to create even more specialized categories of victimization, such as aggravated assault (assault with weapon and injury).

### Screener Only Form

#### Item-level Scores

Many users of the JVQ use the results at the item level, because each item measures a specific form of youth victimization, and many of these, such as rape or witnessing domestic violence, have clinical or research findings that are unique to that form. At the item level, scores can be calculated either as a one-year incidence rate or as a frequency of number of incidents in the last year.

#### Module Scores

Each module can be scored to produce a one-year incidence rate for that module. Because of the potential overlap among items (for instance, peer assault and bullying could occur in the same incident), it is NOT recommended that the frequencies be used at the module level. Rather, module scores should be used as dichotomous scores. Thus, a “yes” or 1 for a module indicates that at least one form of victimization on that module was reported, whereas a “no” or zero indicates that no forms of victimization on that module were reported.

Possible module scores are: Any Conventional Crime (Module A), Any Child Maltreatment (Module B), Any Peer or Sibling Victimization (Module C), Any Sexual Victimization (Module D), and Any Witnessing or Indirect Victimization (Module E).

## Composite Scores

Some forms of victimization are represented by sub-sets of items within a module or by items in more than one module. For example, while there are assault questions in the Conventional Crime module, a total rate for all assaults might want to include caregiver and peer assaults as well, from the Child Maltreatment and Peer and Sibling Victimization modules. For this reason, we have developed several Composite Scores. As with Module Scores, these are scored dichotomously as “yes” if any victimization in that composite is reported and “no” if no form of victimization included in that composite was identified.

1) Property Crime Composite = YES if any “yes” to: Robbery (C1) or Personal Theft (C2) or Vandalism (C3).

2) Physical Assault Composite = YES if any “yes” to: Assault with Weapon (C4) or Assault without Weapon (C5) or Attempted Assault (C6) or Kidnapping (C7) or Bias Attack (C8) or Physical Abuse by Caregiver (M1) or Gang or Group Assault (P1) or Peer or Sibling Assault (P2) or Nonsexual Genital Assault (P3) or Dating Violence (P6).

3) Sexual Assault Composite = YES if any “yes” to: Sexual Assault by Known Adult (S1) or Nonspecific Sexual Assault (S2) or Sexual Assault by Peer (S3) or Rape (Attempted or Completed) (S4). *Note: This composite differs from the Sexual Victimization module in that only those questions that clearly involve both nonconsensual and physical contact are included.*

4) Peer & Sibling Assault Composite = YES if any “yes” to: Gang or Group Assault (P1) or Peer & Sibling Assault (P2) or Nonsexual Genital Assault (P3) or Dating Violence (P6) or Sexual Assault by Peer (S3).

## **Screener Form With Follow-up Questions**

Each of the screener questions has associated follow-up questions that can be used to collect details on perpetrator(s) and other victimization characteristics. One of the limitations of most existing uses of juvenile victimization questionnaires is the lack of precision and the lack of

correspondence with official crime and child protection categories. Important improvements in both of these areas can be obtained by incorporating data from the follow-up items into JVQ scoring. (Note: follow-up items are lettered for consistency throughout questionnaires; not all screeners share all follow-up items, resulting in apparent “gaps” in lettering.)

A number of more precise forms of victimization can be scored by incorporating follow-up data into event classification. For example, some assault screeners are general items that do not specify a class of perpetrators, while others are perpetrator-specific. This is because past research shows that generic questions about assault are important for identifying stranger and unknown assailants, but often miss assaults by intimates and peers. To obtain the most complete rates for perpetrator-specific items, assaults reported in general screeners that name perpetrators only later in follow-ups should be re-scored. Also, responses to follow-up questions about weapon-use, injury, and sexual penetration can be used to rescore some victimizations in terms of relative severity, creating offense descriptions that are more complete than those obtained from screeners only.

The following is a suggested list of victimization types that were used in the Developmental Victimization Survey (see Appendix A). They can be used if follow-up questions are asked and used for rescoring. Some victimizations remain the same as the item level victimization types described above, others represent **rescored** victimization types.

#### PHYSICAL ASSAULTS, BULLYING AND TEASING

- 1) Assault with Weapon (rescored)  
Someone hit or attacked child on purpose with something that would hurt (like a stick, rock, gun, knife or other thing). Includes item level scores from C4, plus rescoring from M1, P1, P2, P3 and P6 if a weapon was involved. (Items C5, C7 and C8 have no weapon data)
- 2) Assault with Injury (rescored)  
Someone hit or attacked child, and child was physically hurt when this happened. (Hurt means child felt pain the next day, or had a bruise, a cut that bled, or a broken bone.) No weapon was used (weapon has priority over injury in rescoring). Includes rescoring from C5, C7, C8, M1, P1, P2, P3 and P6 if an injury occurred and **no** weapon was involved.

- 3) Assault without Injury (rescored)  
Someone hit or attacked child, and child was not physically hurt when this happened. No weapon was used. Includes rescores from C5, C7, C8, M1, P1, P2, P3 and P6 if **no** injury occurred and **no** weapon was involved.
- 4) Attempted Assault  
Someone started to attack child, but for some reason it didn't happen. No weapon was used, and child was not physically hurt. Identical to C6 item level score.
- 5) Attempted/Completed Kidnapping  
Child was made to go, or there was an attempt to make the child go, somewhere, like into a car, by someone who they thought might hurt them. Identical to C7 item level score.
- 6) Multiple Perpetrator Assault, with any Peer (rescored)  
Child was attacked by more than one person, and at least one perpetrator was a juvenile. Includes item level scores from P1, plus rescores from C4, C5, C7, C8, P2, P3 and P6 if more than one perpetrator was involved **and** any perpetrator was a peer (juvenile).
- 7) Assault by Sibling (rescored)  
Child was attacked by a sibling. Includes rescores from C4, C5, C7, C8, M1, P1, P2, P3 and P6 if any perpetrator was a sibling.
- 8) Assault by Non-sibling Peer (rescored)  
Child was attacked by a peer, not including any sibling. Includes rescores from C4, C5, C7, C8, M1, P1, P2, P3 and P6 if any perpetrator was a peer (juvenile), but no sibling was involved.
- 9) Nonsexual Genital Assault  
A peer tried to hurt child's private parts on purpose by hitting or kicking. Identical to P3 item level score.
- 10) Dating Violence (rescored)  
A boyfriend or girlfriend of child, or someone child went on a date with, slapped or hit child. Includes item level scores from P6, plus rescores from C4, C5, C7, C8, P2 and P3 if any boy- or girlfriend perpetrator was involved **and** victim was 12 years or older. (In DVS, P6 only asked of children 12 years or older.)
- 11) Dating Violence with Injury (rescored)  
Child suffered dating violence, and was injured. Same as Dating Violence (previous), but if injury also occurred.
- 12) Bias Attack  
Child was hit or attacked because of child's skin color or religion, where the child's family comes from, because of child's physical problem, or because of sexual orientation attributed to child. Identical to C8 item level score.
- 13) Bullying  
A peer picked on child (for example, by chasing, grabbing hair or clothes, or making child do something they did not want to do). Identical to P4 item level score.

- 14) Teasing/Emotional Bullying  
Child was scared or made to feel really bad because child was harassed by a peer (for example, by name calling, having mean things said, or being told they were unwelcome). Identical to P5 item level score.
- 15) Any Physical Assault  
Child experienced any physical assault victimization. Excludes bullying and teasing/emotional bullying. Identical to Physical Assault Composite score, defined above.

## SEXUAL VICTIMIZATIONS

- 1) Sexual Assault  
Someone touched child's private parts when unwanted, made child touch their private parts, or forced child to have sex. Or attempted any of these acts. Identical to Sexual Assault Composite score, defined above.
- 2) Completed Rape (rescored)  
Someone forced child to have sexual intercourse and put any part of their body inside child. Includes rescores from S1, S2, S3 and S4 if penetration occurred.
- 3) Attempted/Completed Rape (rescored)  
Someone forced, or attempted to force, child to have sexual intercourse. Includes item level scores from S4, plus rescores from S1, S2 and S3 if penetration occurred. (Note: completed rape can be identified from S1, S2 and S3 rescores, but attempted rape cannot.)
- 4) Sexual Assault by Known Adult (rescored)  
An adult the child knows touched child's private parts, made child touch their private parts, or forced child to have sex. Includes item level scores from S1, plus rescores from S4 if any known adult perpetrator was involved.
- 5) Sexual Assault by Adult Stranger (rescored)  
An adult the child does not know touched child's parts, made child touch their private parts, or forced child to have sex. Includes item level scores from S2, plus rescores from S4 if any adult stranger perpetrator was involved.
- 6) Sexual Assault by Peer (rescored)  
A peer made child do sexual things. Includes item level scores from S3, plus rescores from S4 if any peer (juvenile) perpetrator was involved.
- 7) Flashing/Sexual Exposure by Peer (rescored)  
A peer made child look at their private parts by using force or surprise, or by "flashing" child. Includes victimization from S5 if any peer (juvenile) perpetrator was involved.
- 8) Flashing/Sexual Exposure by Adult (rescored)  
An adult made child look at their private parts by using force or surprise, or by "flashing" child. Includes victimization from S5 if any adult perpetrator was involved.

- 9) Sexual Harassment  
Someone hurt child's feelings by saying or writing sexual things about child or child's body. Identical to S6 item level score.
- 10) Statutory Sexual Offense (rescored)  
For child under 16 years of age, child did sexual things with an adult (18 years and older), even willingly. Includes rescores from S7 if victim was less than 16 years of age and any perpetrator was adult (18 years and older).
- 11) Any Sexual Victimization (rescored)  
Child experienced any sexual victimization. Includes any victimization from S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6 or a statutory sexual offense, as rescored. (Note: this is similar to Any Sexual Victimization (Module D) score, but item S7 is not counted unless it meets statutory sexual offense rescore criteria.)

#### CHILD MALTREATMENT

- 1) Physical Abuse by Caregiver (rescored)  
An adult in child's life hit, beat, kicked, or physically abused child in any way. Includes item level scores from M1, plus rescores from C4, C5, P2 and P3 if any parent perpetrator was involved. (Note: other assault items can also be used in rescores if parent perpetrators are present.)
- 2) Psychological/Emotional Abuse  
An adult made child scared or feel really bad by name calling, saying mean things, or saying they didn't want child. Identical to M2 item level score.
- 3) Neglect  
Adults in child's life did not take care of child the way they should (for example, by not getting child enough food, not taking child to doctor when sick, not making sure child had a safe place to stay). Identical to M3 item level score.
- 4) Custodial Interference/Family Abduction (rescored)  
A parent took child, kept child, or hid child to prevent child from being with another parent. Includes item level scores from M4, plus rescores from C7 if any parent or live-out relative was involved.
- 5) Any Maltreatment (rescored)  
Child experienced any maltreatment victimization. Identical to Any Child Maltreatment (Module B) score, plus any Sexual Assault by Known Adult rescored victimization.

#### PROPERTY VICTIMIZATIONS

- 1) Robbery by Non-sibling (rescored)  
A non-sibling (peer or adult) used force to take something away from child that child was carrying or wearing. Includes victimization from C1 if any non-sibling perpetrator was involved.

- 2) Robbery by Sibling (rescored)  
A sibling (only) used force to take something away from child that child was carrying or wearing. Includes victimization from C1 if only sibling perpetrator(s) involved.
- 3) Theft by Non-sibling (rescored)  
A non-sibling (peer or adult) stole something from child and never gave it back. Includes victimization from C2 if any non-sibling perpetrator was involved. (Note: theft by sibling with long term keeping has very low incidence.)
- 4) Vandalism by Non-sibling (rescored)  
A non-sibling (peer or adult) broke or ruined any of child's things on purpose. Includes victimization from C3 if any non-sibling perpetrator was involved.
- 5) Vandalism by Sibling (rescored)  
A sibling (only) broke or ruined any of child's things on purpose. Includes victimization from C3 if only sibling perpetrator(s) involved.
- 6) Any Property Victimization  
Child experienced any property victimization. Identical to Property Crime Composite score, defined above.

#### WITNESSED AND INDIRECT VICTIMIZATIONS

- 1) Witness Domestic Violence (rescored)  
Child saw one parent get hit (for example, slapped, hit, punched, or beat up) by another parent, or parent's boyfriend or girlfriend. Includes item level scores from W1, plus rescores from W3 or W4 if both victim and perpetrator were parents.
- 2) Witness Parent Assault of Sibling (rescored)  
Child saw a parent hit, beat, kick, or physically abuse a sibling. Includes item level scores from W2, plus rescores from W3 or W4 if a parent was perpetrator and any victim was sibling.
- 3) Witness Assault with Weapon  
Child saw (in real life) someone get attacked or hit on purpose with a stick, rock, gun, knife, or other thing that could hurt. Identical to W3 item level score.
- 4) Witness Assault with No Weapon  
Child saw (in real life) someone get attacked or hit on purpose, with no weapon used. Identical to W4 item level score.
- 5) Household Theft  
Someone stole something (for example, furniture, clothing, TV, stereo, car) from child's house that belonged to child's family or household. Identical to W5 item level score.
- 6) Murder of Someone Close  
Someone close to child (for example, family member, friend, or neighbor) was murdered. Identical to W6 item level score.

- 7) Witness Murder  
Child saw (in real life) someone murdered. Identical to W7 item level score.
- 8) Exposure to Shooting, Bombs, Riots  
Child was in a place (in real life) where child could see or hear random shootings, terror bombings, or riots. Identical to W8 item level score.
- 9) Exposure to War/Ethnic Conflict  
Child was in a place (in real life) in the middle of a war where child could hear real fighting with guns or bombs. Identical to W9 item level score.
- 10) Any Witnessed or Indirect Victimization  
Child experienced any witnessed or indirect victimization. Identical to Any Witnessing or Indirect Victimization (Module E) score, defined above.

### **Other Composites and Scores**

The above scores are not an exhaustive list of all appropriate groupings of JVQ responses. While we have tried to anticipate the most likely scoring needs with the composites and rescores presented here, the creation of additional scores may be appropriate. For example, Witness to Domestic Violence and Witness to Parental Assault of Sibling could be combined to create a Witness to Family Violence Composite. Composites for victimizations by intimate, non-intimate, and/or stranger perpetrators could also be computed. The creation and use of new composites or other rescores will depend on the purposes of the administration and the expertise of the professionals interpreting the results.



## INTERPRETATION

### Principles of Interpretation

This section provides JVQ users with an overall strategy for the interpretation and use of JVQ responses. It is also appropriate for individual users to develop their own strategies for interpretation, just as it is appropriate to select the most relevant modules or items for administration. Users should carefully study the sections on scale development and the results of studies using the JVQ that are available to date. While we make every effort to keep the manual up-to-date, recent findings may not be represented here and users should attempt to keep abreast of current research in their area of interest. Accurate interpretation of the JVQ requires an understanding of how the questionnaire was developed, and a familiarity with the item content and scoring procedures.

### Clinical Implications of Item, Module and Composite Scores

One of the most frequent questions that comes up in the assessment of juvenile victimization is whether abuse can be diagnosed from self-report questionnaires, particularly abuse that requires mandatory reporting to child protection agencies. One of the goals of the JVQ is in fact to tailor items, especially in the Child Maltreatment and Sexual Offenses Modules, to the types of victimizations that are usually investigated by child protection agencies. Nonetheless, positive responses to these and other items that may represent reportable offenses are **not diagnostic in and of themselves**. Children may misunderstand the question or otherwise mistakenly give an incorrect positive response to a screener question. Additional one-to-one interviewing or other investigation would be required in order to determine whether a report to the JVQ constitutes a reportable offense.

## SCALE DEVELOPMENT

### **Review by Victimization Professionals**

The completed draft instrument has undergone extensive review by more than a dozen academicians with experience studying juvenile victimization. Review was made to ensure that each item has conceptual integrity and is phrased in ways that are developmentally appropriate for children.

The first phase of peer review involved comments from researchers at the Family Research Laboratory and Crimes Against Children Research Center, including critiques by Murray Straus, Ph.D., professor and Co-Director of the Family Research Laboratory, Glenda Kaufman Kantor, Ph.D., a member of the Family Research Laboratory faculty, as well as post-doctoral fellows of the FRL.

The second phase of peer review sought feedback from additional experts in the fields of victimization and measurement. These included critiques by: Victoria Banyard, Ph.D., University of New Hampshire; Lucy Berliner, Ph.D., University of Washington; Kathy Kendall-Tackett, Ph.D., University of New Hampshire; Mary Koss, Ph.D., University of Arizona; James Lynch, Ph.D., American University; Harriet MacMillan, M.D., M.Sc., F.R.C.P. (C), McMaster University; and Joy Osofsky, Ph.D., University of New Orleans.

Each phase of the peer review process produced numerous revisions, with many comments focusing on construct clarification and methodological issues.

### **Focus Groups with Parents and Teens**

Review of the draft instrument by parents and youths was considered an essential step in developing an instrument that produces the most accurate data on victimization rates. It was one in a series of steps that assessed comprehension of items by people outside of the criminal justice

and victimization fields. To this end, a series of focus groups were conducted, six with parents and three with teens.

The first stage of focus group review was parent meetings. Due to the length of the questionnaire, there were six groups, each focusing on one of the six original modules. The groups were recruited by: the staff of the University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension office, an advertisement in the Concord (NH) Monitor newspaper seeking the participation of organizations, and personal contacts. The following groups participated: College of Lifelong Learning Behavioral Science students; the Association for American Mothers; three groups affiliated with the UNH Cooperative Extension in rural areas of New Hampshire; and a group of teachers.

The second stage of focus group review was adolescent meetings. These were conducted after the instrument draft was revised in response to the parent focus group suggestions. The draft seen by the adolescents included these revisions. The groups were composed of adolescents recruited from: Good Beginnings, a program for teen parents in a rural area in New Hampshire; and Serenity House, a non-profit organization that provides support services to parents and teens.

The focus groups produced feedback about ways to make the language of the questionnaire simpler, ways to make the items relevant for youth living in both rural and urban settings, and word choices that are more likely to be understood and/or used in children in their everyday lives. For example, we received considerable feedback that “private parts” was the word for genitalia that was taught in most school and family settings, including in many child abuse prevention programs. Also, whereas some professionals during our peer review questioned whether today’s youth referred to each other as “boyfriend” or “girlfriend,” parents and teens made it clear that those are still the most familiar terms and that other alternatives such as “date” or “intimate partner” would be less well understood. More detail on the results of the focus groups is available in Hamby, Finkelhor, & Kopiec, 2000.

## **Cognitive Interviews with Youth**

A semi-structured interview version of the survey was developed in order to assess young children's comprehension of survey items on victimization. This is a key reliability and validity question that has been seriously under-studied to date. The cognitive interview obtains detailed narrative descriptions of all victimization reports as well as probes to assess comprehension, over-reporting, spontaneous organization of categories such as frequency, and possible under-reporting due to literal interpretations of items or discomfort related to disclosure. Many of these probes were developed from focus group comments as well as the measurement and clinical experiences of the research team.

Larry Ricci, M.D., and Kerry Drach, Psy.D., of the Spurwink Child Abuse Program (Portland, ME), collaborated with the authors on collecting cognitive interview data. The Spurwink Child Abuse Program was chosen as a site for initial cognitive interviews due to the need to locate a high-risk sample so that a sufficient number of narratives could be obtained with a relatively small sample size.

Twenty-four children aged 6 to 15 participated. The results of the cognitive interviews led to additional simplification and shortening of items to maximize comprehension by the youngest children. More on these results is available in Hamby et al., 2000.

## PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES AND VALIDATION

The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire is a new measure and its psychometric properties are still being established. Its use in the Developmental Victimization Survey, a nationally representative survey conducted in 2002 (described in Appendix A), provides some initial benchmark values (Finkelhor, Hamby, Ormrod, & Turner, 2005; Finkelhor, Turner, Ormrod, & Hamby, 2005). In addition to the cognitive interviews mentioned in scale development, portions of the JVQ have been used in two studies: the Youth Internet Safety Survey (Finkelhor, Mitchell, & Wolak, 2000), and Parents of Children with Asperger's-Spectrum Disorders Survey (Little, 2002). More information on these surveys is in Appendix A. These preliminary results provide some evidence of construct validity and give some preliminary indication about rates in two samples. Others are using the JVQ in ongoing projects and additional information on its psychometric properties will be released when it becomes available.

## REFERENCES

- Bolen, R. M., & Scannapieco, M. (1999, July). Estimating the prevalence of child sexual abuse in North America. 6th International Family Violence Research Conference, Durham, NH.
- Carter, C. A., Bottoms, B. L., & Levine, M. (1996). Linguistic and socioemotional influences on the accuracy of childrens' reports. Law and Human Behavior, *20*(3), 335-358.
- Finkelhor, D., Mitchell, K., & Wolak, J. (2000). On-line victimization: A report on the nation's youth. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Finkelhor, D., Hamby, S. L., Ormrod, R., & Turner, H. (2005). The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ): Reliability, validity, and national norms. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, *29*, 383-412.
- Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., Ormrod, R., & Hamby, S. L. (2005). The victimization of children and youth: A comprehensive, national survey. *Child Maltreatment*, *10*(1), 5-25.
- Hamby, S. L., & Finkelhor, D. (2000). The victimization of children: Recommendations for assessment and instrument development. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, *39*(7), 829-840.
- Hamby, S. L., Finkelhor, D., & Kopiec, K. M. (2000, July). Asking children about victimization: A qualitative study of the language of victimization surveys. Presented at Victimization of Children & Youth: An International Research Conference, Durham, NH.
- Little, L. (2002). Middle-class mothers' perceptions of peer and sibling victimization among children with Asperger's Syndrome and Nonverbal Learning Disorder. Issues in Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing, *25*, 43-57.
- Mitchell, K.J., Finkelhor, D., & Wolak, . (2001). Risk factors and impact of online solicitation of youth. JAMA, *285*(23): 3011-3014.

Rennison, C.M. & Rand, M. R. (2003) Criminal victimization 2002 (NCJ 187007).

Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Finkelhor, D., Moore, D. W., & Runyan, D. (1998).

Identification of child maltreatment with the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales: Development and psychometric data for a national sample of American parents. Child Abuse and Neglect, 22, 249-270.

Williams, L. M., Siegel, J. A., & Pomeroy, J. J. (2000). Validity of women's self-reports of documented child sexual abuse. In A.S. Stone et al. (Eds), The science of self-report: Implications for research and practice (pp 211-226). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

## APPENDIX A

### RATES IN SAMPLES AVAILABLE TO DATE

#### Developmental Victimization Survey

The most comprehensive data yet collected using the JVQ are provided by the Developmental Victimization Survey (DVS) conducted between December, 2002 and February, 2003 (Finkelhor, Turner, Ormrod, & Hamby, 2005). This survey assessed the experiences of a nationally representative sample of 2,030 children age 2-17 years living in the contiguous United States. The complete JVQ, including follow-up questions, was used to obtain one-year incidence estimates of a comprehensive range of victimizations across gender, race, and developmental stage.

Sample selection procedures were based on a list-assisted random digit dial (RDD) telephone survey design, which enhances the number of household contacts and decreases the rate of dialing of business and non-working numbers. A short interview was conducted with an adult caregiver (usually a parent) to obtain family demographic information. A sample child was randomly selected from all eligible children living in a household by choosing the child with the most recent birthday. The JVQ was conducted as a telephone interview with children 10-17 years old, while for children under 10 years old, a caregiver version of the JVQ was conducted with the caregiver “most familiar with the child’s daily routine and experiences.” The caregiver version used wording very similar to the self-report questionnaire, which allowed the direct comparison of items across the age groups.

Tables 1 through 6 give the rates reported by the DVS for a wide range of victimizations. Some victimization types represent screener item scores, others are rescores based on perpetrator or severity data from follow-up questions, and yet others are composite scores that combine information from several item level scores and/or rescores. All of the victimizations identified in these tables are described and defined in the manual.



In this study, some items were restricted to children of certain ages. Robbery and Personal Theft were only asked about children aged 6 and over (for ages 6 through 9 this was based on caregiver report). Dating violence, verbal sexual harassment, and statutory rape were only asked of youth aged 12 and over.

Details on the reliability and validity of the JVQ in this dataset can be found in Finkelhor, Hamby, Ormrod, & Turner (2005).

**Table 1. Assaults and Bullying**

VICTIMIZATION TYPE:	n (unweighted)	All Cases (rate/1000)	Est. Juvenile Victims in US Population	Victim Gender:		Victim Age:			Perpetrator Relationship to Victim:			Perpetrator Age:	
				Male (rate/1000)	Female (rate/1000)	Age 2-5 yr (rate/1000)	Age 6-12 yr (rate/1000)	Age 13-17 yr (rate/1000)	Family (any)	Acquaint (any)	Stranger (any)	Adult (any)	Juvenile (any)
<b>Any physical assault</b> ***	983	530 (22)	33,651,000	<b>589</b>	<b>472</b>	a. <b>470<sup>bc</sup></b>	b. <b>568<sup>a</sup></b>	c. <b>523<sup>a</sup></b>	54%	44%	4%	7%	93%
asslt w weap	146	81 (12)	5,106,000	<b>95</b>	<b>66</b>	84	74	87	28%	63%	8%	11%	91%
asslt w inj	198	103 (13)	6,512,000	115	91	<b>91<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>71<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>154<sup>ab</sup></b>	43%	56%	3%	13%	89%
asslt no inj	746	409 (21)	25,923,000	<b>456</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>363<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>470<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>361<sup>b</sup></b>	66%	32%	3%	4%	96%
atmptd asslt	124	64 (11)	4,065,000	<b>76</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>38<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>62</b>	<b>85<sup>a</sup></b>	6%	84%	10%	8%	92%
kidnap, atmpt/complt	12	6 (3)		<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>3<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>14<sup>ab</sup></b>	30%	16%	54%	100%	0%
mul perp asslt	161	95 (13)	6,008,000	<b>108</b>	<b>82</b>	72	93	113	43%	61%	6%	3%	100%
asslt by sib	594	355 (21)	22,481,000	366	344	<b>331<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>411<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>298<sup>b</sup></b>	100%	2%	0%	0%	100%
asslt by peer, no sib	318	139 (15)	8,779,000	<b>177</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>124<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>123<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>170<sup>ab</sup></b>	1%	97%	2%	0%	100%
genital asslt	98	54 (10)	3,406,000	<b>78</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>13<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>51<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>87<sup>ab</sup></b>	21%	80%	3%	1%	99%
dating viol	36	14 (5)	887,000	18	10	-	-	36	0%	100%	0%	16%	84%
dating viol, w inj	9	5 (3)		5	4	-	-	13	0%	100%	0%	43%	57%
bias attack	32	19 (6)	1,188,000	21	17	<b>5<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>12<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>37<sup>ab</sup></b>	0%	100%	2%	0%	100%
bullying ***	425	217 (18)	13,735,000	<b>241</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>217<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>270<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>147<sup>ab</sup></b>	56%	46%	0%	1%	100%
tease, emot bully ***	493	249 (19)	15,745,000	233	264	<b>169<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>328<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>200<sup>b</sup></b>	14%	90%	1%	1%	99%

\* Bold values are significantly different at p = .05.

\*\* Percentages based on victims with described perpetrators and may sum to more than 100% because some victimizations had multiple perpetrators who fit into more than one category.

\*\*\* Total for any physical assault, excludes bullying and tease/emot bully.

<sup>a,b,c</sup> Value is significantly different from value in column identified (a,b,c) at p=.05.

**Table 2. Sexual Victimizations**

VICTIMIZATION TYPE:	<i>n</i> (unweighted)	All Cases (rate/1000)	(CI, 95%)	Est. Juvenile Victims in US Population	Victim Gender: *		Victim Age: *			Perpetrator Relationship to Victim:			Perpetrator Age: **	
					Male (rate/1000)	Female (rate/1000)	Age 2-5 yr (rate/1000)	Age 6-12 yr (rate/1000)	Age 13-17 yr (rate/1000)	Family (any)	Acquaint (any)	Stranger (any)	Adult (any)	Juvenile (any)
<b>Any sexual victimization</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>82</b> (12)		5,191,000	<b>67</b>	<b>96</b>	a. <b>15<sup>bc</sup></b>	b. <b>53<sup>ac</sup></b>	c. <b>168<sup>ab</sup></b>	2%	91%	7%	15%	86%
sex assault	59	32 (8)		2,053,000	22	42	12 <sup>c</sup>	18 <sup>c</sup>	67 <sup>ab</sup>	3%	85%	12%	29%	72%
rape, compltd	8	4 (3)			3	5	1	0	11	5%	84%	11%	25%	84%
rape, attmpt/compltd	43	22 (6)		1,405,000	12	33	1 <sup>c</sup>	3 <sup>c</sup>	63 <sup>ab</sup>	1%	85%	14%	33%	69%
sex asslt, knwn adult	11	6 (3)			1	11	4	3	12	12%	88%	0%	100%	10%
sex asslt, adult stranger	7	4 (3)			1	6	3	1	8	0%	0%	100%	100%	0%
sex asslt, w peer	40	21 (6)		1,335,000	18	24	8 <sup>c</sup>	12 <sup>c</sup>	42 <sup>ab</sup>	1%	95%	4%	6%	96%
flash, w peer	57	26 (7)		1,671,000	31	22	6 <sup>c</sup>	8 <sup>c</sup>	65 <sup>ab</sup>	3%	97%	0%	3%	100%
flash, w adult	10	4 (3)			3	5	2	0	11	5%	40%	55%	100%	19%
sex harass	68	38 (8)		2,411,000	19	57	0 <sup>bc</sup>	28 <sup>ac</sup>	78 <sup>ab</sup>	1%	97%	2%	2%	98%
statutory sex offns	7	3 (2)			3	3	0	0	8	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%

\* Bold values are significantly different at p = .05.

\*\* Percentages based on victims with described perpetrators and may sum to more than 100% because some victimizations had multiple perpetrators who fit into more than one category.

<sup>a,b,c</sup> Value is significantly different from value in column identified (a,b,c) at p=.05.

**Table 3. Maltreatment**

VICTIMIZATION TYPE:	<i>n</i> ( <i>unweighted</i> )	All Cases (rate/1000)	Est. Juvenile Victims in US Population	Victim Gender: *		Victim Age: *			Perpetrator Relationship to Victim:			Perpetrator Age: **	
				Male (rate/1000)	Female (rate/1000)	Age 2-5 yr (rate/1000)	Age 6-12 yr (rate/1000)	Age 13-17 yr (rate/1000)	Family (any)	Acquaint (any)	Stranger (any)	Adult (any)	Juvenile (any)
<b>Any maltreatment</b>	271	138 (15)	8,755,000	137	140	<b>75<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>132<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>191<sup>ab</sup></b>	77%	23%	2%	91%	11%
physical abuse	67	37 (8)	2,320,000	36	37	<b>12<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>27<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>67<sup>ab</sup></b>	83%	17%	3%	88%	12%
sex asslt, knwn adult	11	6 (3)		<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	4	3	12	12%	88%	0%	100%	100%
psych/emotional abuse	206	103 (13)	6,498,000	101	105	<b>58<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>97<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>143<sup>ab</sup></b>	70%	30%	2%	90%	13%
neglect	31	14 (5)	909,000	15	14	17	13	14	94%	6%	0%	100%	0%
custod interfer/ fam abduct	29	17 (6)	1,099,000	14	21	12	17	21	100%	0%	0%	100%	2%

\* Bold values are significantly different at p = .05.

\*\* Percentages based on victims with described perpetrators and may sum to more than 100% because some victimizations had multiple perpetrators who fit into more than one category.

<sup>a,b,c</sup> Value is significantly different from value in column identified (a,b,c) at p=.05.

**Table 4. Property Victimization**

VICTIMIZATION TYPE:	<i>n</i> (unweighted)	All Cases (rate/1000)	Est. Juvenile Victims in US Population	Victim Gender: *		Victim Age: *			Perpetrator Relationship to Victim:			Perpetrator Age: **	
				Male (rate/1000)	Female (rate/1000)	Age 2-5 yr (rate/1000)	Age 6-12 yr (rate/1000)	Age 13-17 yr (rate/1000)	Family (any)	Acquaint (any)	Stranger (any)	Adult (any)	Juvenile (any)
<b>Any property victimization</b>	529	273 (19)	17,287,000	<b>294</b>	<b>252</b>	a. <b>109<sup>bc</sup></b>	b. <b>315<sup>a</sup></b>	c. <b>335<sup>a</sup></b>	27%	65%	9%	9%	92%
robbery, w non-sib	86	40 (9)	2,543,000	47	34	<b>0<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>58<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>45<sup>a</sup></b>	6%	88%	6%	12%	89%
robbery, sib only	23	14 (5)	903,000	12	17	<b>0<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>30<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>4<sup>b</sup></b>	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
vandalism, w non-sib	188	96 (13)	6,103,000	108	84	<b>49<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>112<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>110<sup>a</sup></b>	5%	95%	3%	8%	94%
vandalism, sib only	87	53 (10)	3,345,000	50	56	60	56	44	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
theft, w non-sib	288	140 (15)	8,887,000	153	127	<b>0<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>151<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>227<sup>ab</sup></b>	1%	79%	21%	16%	85%

\* Bold values are significantly different at p = .05.

\*\* Percentages based on victims with described perpetrators and may sum to more than 100% because some victimizations had multiple perpetrators who fit into more than one category.

<sup>a,b,c</sup> Value is significantly different from value in column identified (a,b,c) at p=.05.

**Table 5. Witnessing/Indirect Victimizations**

VICTIMIZATION TYPE:	<i>n</i> (unweighted)	All Cases (rate/1000)	Est. Juvenile Victims in US Population	Victim Gender: *		Victim Age: *			Perpetrator Relationship to Victim:			Perpetrator Age: **	
				Male (rate/1000)	Female (rate/1000)	Age 2-5 yr (rate/1000)	Age 6-12 yr (rate/1000)	Age 13-17 yr (rate/1000)	Family (any)	Acquaint (any)	Stranger (any)	Adult (any)	Juvenile (any)
<b>Any witness or indirect victimization</b>	695	357 (21)	22,599,000	376	338	<b>182<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>284<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>579<sup>ab</sup></b>	17%	62%	23%	34%	66%
witness domestic violence	71	35 (8)	2,190,000	30	39	38	38	28	93%	6%	1%	97%	3%
witness physical abuse	21	11 (5)	726,000	12	10	4	13	15	100%	0%	0%	100%	2%
witness assault with weapon	264	138 (15)	8,769,000	147	130	<b>33<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>106<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>257<sup>ab</sup></b>	8%	69%	27%	25%	76%
witness assault without weapon	434	209 (18)	13,212,000	221	196	<b>72<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>127<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>414<sup>ab</sup></b>	12%	75%	15%	16%	84%
witness murder	6	4 (3)		5	3	0	0	11	0%	0%	100%	100%	0%
exposed to shooting, bomb, riot	96	55 (10)	3,495,000	57	53	<b>29<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>40<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>94<sup>ab</sup></b>					
exposed to war	3	3 (2)		1	6	0	1	9					
someone close murdered	38	29 (8)	1,821,000	<b>18</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>24<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>12<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>55<sup>ab</sup></b>	0%	29%	71%	100%	0%
household theft	186	102 (13)	6,460,000	111	93	<b>75<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>92<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>135<sup>ab</sup></b>	12%	40%	48%	78%	23%

\* Bold values are significantly different at p = .05.

\*\* Percentages based on victims with described perpetrators and may sum to more than 100% because some victimizations had multiple perpetrators who fit into more than one category.

<sup>a,b,c</sup> Value is significantly different from value in column identified (a,b,c) at p=.05.

**Table 6. Demographic Differences among Victimization Type**

VICTIMIZATION TYPE:	n (unweighted)	HH INCOME:				RACE/ETHNICITY			
		\$20,000 & less (rate/1000)	\$20,000 - \$50,000 (rate/1000)	Over \$50,000 (rate/1000)	Refused Question (rate/1000)	White, non-Hisp (rate/1000)	Black, non-Hisp (rate/1000)	Other Race, non-Hisp (rate/1000)	Hispanic, any race (rate/1000)
		a.	b.	c.	d.	a.	b.	c.	d.
<b>Any physical assault</b> **	983	516	536	539	485	533	506	438	564
asslt w weap	146	<b>111<sup>cd</sup></b>	<b>99<sup>cd</sup></b>	<b>65<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>45<sup>ab</sup></b>	74	95	97	92
asslt w inj	198	89	117	98	89	88	134	104	120
asslt no inj	746	403	406	424	359	<b>424<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>336<sup>ad</sup></b>	<b>320</b>	<b>433<sup>b</sup></b>
atmptd asslt	124	<b>108<sup>bcd</sup></b>	<b>64<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>55<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>52<sup>a</sup></b>	58	59	90	87
kidnap, atmpt/complt	12	11	11	2	2	5	11	0	8
multi perp asslt	161	<b>144<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>94<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>76<sup>ad</sup></b>	<b>124<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>78<sup>bd</sup></b>	<b>121<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>125</b>	<b>115<sup>a</sup></b>
asslt by sib	594	307	354	377	317	<b>375<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>290<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>306</b>	<b>352</b>
asslt by peer, no sib	318	166	149	132	97	125	171	104	159
genital asslt	98	70	64	47	27	52	51	56	56
dating viol	36	22	14	15	0	16	20	7	6
dating viol, w inj	9	20	1	4	0	4	7	7	6
bias attack	32	<b>44b<sup>cd</sup></b>	<b>18<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>14<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>10<sup>a</sup></b>	17	11	42	22
bullying	425	<b>170<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>191<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>261<sup>abd</sup></b>	<b>160<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>255<sup>bd</sup></b>	<b>103<sup>acd</sup></b>	<b>195<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>179<sup>ab</sup></b>
tease, emot bully	493	287	245	247	219	261	240	243	210
<b>Any sexual victimization</b>	154	97	80	84	58	75	88	49	115
sex assault	59	49	28	34	22	<b>29<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>24<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>21</b>	<b>59<sup>ab</sup></b>
rape, compltd	8	3	1	6	5	6	2	0	0
rape, atmpt/complt	43	<b>47<sup>bd</sup></b>	<b>11<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>26<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>11<sup>a</sup></b>	20	22	14	34
sex asslt, knwn adult	11	20	4	2	13	4	9	0	14
sex asslt, adult stranger	7	6	5	3	0	3	4	0	8
sex asslt, w peer	40	9	19	28	9	21	13	21	31
flash, w peer	57	35	20	30	24	<b>32<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>42<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0<sup>ab</sup></b>
flash, w adult	10	2	4	5	0	5	4	0	0
sex harass	68	15	47	41	21	<b>32<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>33<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>21</b>	<b>73<sup>ab</sup></b>
statutory sex offns	7	7	4	1	0	3	4	7	0
<b>Any maltreatment</b>	271	<b>170</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>190</b>	137	138	111	145
physical abuse	67	54	32	38	24	<b>38<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>11<sup>ad</sup></b>	<b>14</b>	<b>56<sup>b</sup></b>
sex asslt, knwn adult	11	20	4	2	13	4	9	0	14
psych/emotional abuse	206	<b>139<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>92<sup>ad</sup></b>	<b>87<sup>ad</sup></b>	<b>170<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>104<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>134<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>97</b>	<b>64<sup>ab</sup></b>
neglect	31	19	15	14	9	15	11	0	17
custod interfer/ fam abduct	29	32	20	14	2	<b>13<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>4<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>0<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>48<sup>abc</sup></b>
<b>Any property victimization</b>	529	290	286	246	333	<b>270<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>356<sup>acd</sup></b>	<b>194<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>226<sup>b</sup></b>
robbery, w non-sib	86	49	47	34	35	41	46	35	22
robbery, sib only	23	<b>11</b>	<b>14<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>11<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>37<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>21<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0<sup>a</sup></b>
vandalism, w non-sib	188	130	103	85	80	92	123	56	98
vandalism, sib only	87	39	52	59	46	58	64	56	22
theft, w non-sib	288	175	145	120	177	<b>134<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>191<sup>ad</sup></b>	<b>118</b>	<b>128<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>Any witnss or indirct vicztn</b>	695	<b>476<sup>bcd</sup></b>	<b>370<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>321<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>321<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>335<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>420<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>340</b>	<b>383</b>
witns domest viol	71	<b>109<sup>bcd</sup></b>	<b>32<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>20<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>14<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>29<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>61<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>28</b>	<b>31</b>
witns phys abuse	21	20	8	14	0	13	7	7	11
witns asslt w weap	264	<b>200<sup>bcd</sup></b>	<b>140<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>124<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>123<sup>a</sup></b>	131	160	97	159
witns asslt no weap	434	256	202	201	206	<b>210<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>250<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>250<sup>d</sup></b>	<b>154<sup>abc</sup></b>
witns murder	6	14	1	0	15	1	20	0	0
expos to shooting, bomb, riot	96	<b>108<sup>bc</sup></b>	<b>63<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>35<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>57</b>	<b>37<sup>bd</sup></b>	<b>110<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>42</b>	<b>78<sup>a</sup></b>
expos to war	3	3	4	3	0	1	0	0	17
someone close murdered	38	<b>62<sup>cd</sup></b>	<b>37<sup>cd</sup></b>	<b>18<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>5<sup>ab</sup></b>	<b>9<sup>bd</sup></b>	<b>70<sup>ac</sup></b>	<b>14<sup>bd</sup></b>	<b>67<sup>ac</sup></b>
household theft	186	<b>170<sup>bcd</sup></b>	<b>115<sup>ad</sup></b>	<b>86<sup>ad</sup></b>	<b>42<sup>abc</sup></b>	<b>85<sup>bd</sup></b>	<b>134<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>104</b>	<b>140<sup>a</sup></b>

\* Bold values are significantly different at p = .05

\*\* Excludes bullying and tease/emot bully.

a,b,c,d Value is significantly different from value in column identified (a,b,c, or d) at p=.05.

## **Youth Internet Safety Survey**

A short form of the JVQ was included in the recent Youth Internet Safety Survey (Finkelhor, Mitchell & Wolak, 2000; Mitchell, Finkelhor & Wolak, 2001). The Youth Internet Safety Survey is a national sample of 1501 juveniles, aged 10 to 17, who were regular Internet users. Regular Internet users, defined as those who used the Internet at least once a month for the past six months, were identified from a nationally representative survey of more than 16,000 households, the Second National Incidence Study of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMA2). Children were interviewed by telephone.

As would be expected, the final sample is not representative of the entire U.S. youth population because Internet users tend to have higher incomes, more education, and are more likely to be White. Boys are also somewhat more likely than girls to use the Internet, and based on these data older teens were more likely to use the Internet than pre-adolescents. It would be most useful for comparison with other samples who shared at least some of these demographic characteristics.

Table 7 gives the rates of the 8 forms of victimization that were asked about in the Internet survey. These are: Personal Theft, Nonspecific Physical Assault, Physical Abuse by Grown-up, Peer or Sibling Assault, Gang or Group Assault, Bullying, Nonspecific Sexual Assault, and Witness to Assault. Table 1 also gives the rates of two composites created from these 8 items, one for Any Victimization that gives a rate for all 8 victimizations combined, and one for Any Physical or Sexual Victimization which gives a rate for the 5 items that refer to some form of interpersonal assault (omitting Personal Theft, Bullying, and Witness to Assault).



**Table 7: Youth Internet Safety Survey Short Form Version of the JVQ.**

A preliminary short form of the JVQ was used in the Internet survey. The items and the obtained yearly incidence rates are as follows:

**Personal Theft**

Yes	29.2%	Don't know	0.3
No	70.5	Missing	0.1

**Nonspecific Physical Assault**

Yes	6.3	Don't know	0
No	93.6	Missing	0.1

**Physical Abuse by Grown-up**

Yes	1.4	Don't know	0.2
No	98.2	Missing	0.2

**Peer or Sibling Assault**

Yes	29.2	Don't know	0.1
No	70.5	Missing	0.1

**Gang or Group Assault**

Yes	2.1	Don't know	0
No	97.9	Missing	0.1

**Bullying**

Yes	12.9	Don't know	0.2
No	86.7	Missing	0.2

**Nonspecific Sexual Assault**

Yes	0.8	Don't know	0.1
No	99.1	Missing	0.1

**Witness to Assault**

Yes	26.6	Don't know	0.2
No	73.2	Missing	0.1

**Any Physical or Sexual Victimization** (not Personal Theft, Bullying, or Witness to Assault)

Yes	32.8
No	67.2

**Any Victimization**

Yes	57.2
No	42.8

## **Parents of Children with Asperger's-Spectrum Disorders Survey**

The Peer and Sibling Module of the JVQ was included in a recent survey of Parents of Children with Asperger's-Spectrum Disorders (Little, 2002). The Asperger's-spectrum survey is a national sample of parents of children with either Asperger's Syndrome or Nonverbal Learning Disorder, both of which are considered mild forms of autism. To identify parents, the project used the web pages of national support groups for these disorders. Parents who expressed an interest in participating were then mailed (via U.S. mail) a questionnaire. The response rate was 70%.

The final sample is not representative of the entire U.S. population of parents of children with these disorders because parents had to have Internet access and volunteer to participate. This is the largest sample of parents to date of parents of children with these rare disorders, however, and hence is a noteworthy sample of parents of children with psychiatric disabilities. As would be expected, the income and educational backgrounds of this Internet-savvy, volunteer sample are fairly high. It would be most useful for comparison with other samples that shared at least some of these demographic characteristics. For analytic purposes, only mothers describing children aged 4 to 17 were included (n = 411).

Table 8 gives the rates of the 5 forms of Peer and Sibling victimization that were asked about in the Asperger's Spectrum survey. These are: Peer or Sibling Assault, Gang or Group Assault, Nonsexual Genital Assault, Bullying, and Emotional Bullying. Table 8 also gives the rates of Any Peer & Sibling Victimization, which represents a rate for all 5 victimizations combined.

**Table 8. Peer & Sibling Victimization Rates from the Parents of Children with Asperger's-Spectrum Disorders Survey.**

Peer or Sibling Assault	72.9%
Gang or Group Assault	10.3
Nonsexual Genital Assault	15.0
Bullying	55.2
Emotional Bullying	75.5
Any Peer Victimization	90.0