

2005

Child abuse and crime: Testing in the "Cycle of Violence" theory

Melanie A. Cox
West Virginia University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Cox, Melanie A., "Child abuse and crime: Testing in the "Cycle of Violence" theory" (2005). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 4143.
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/4143>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

***Child Abuse and Crime:
Testing in the “Cycle of Violence” Theory***

Melanie A. Cox

Thesis submitted to the
Eberly College of Arts and Sciences
at West Virginia University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Sociology

James Nolan Ph.D., Chair
Ron Althouse Ph.D.
Fred Prichard Ph.D.

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Morgantown, West Virginia
2005

***Keywords: Child Neglect, Child Physical abuse, Child Sexual Abuse,
Offender/Perpetrator, Adulthood Criminality, Cycle of Violence Theory***

Copyright 2005 Melanie A. Cox

ABSTRACT

Child Abuse and Neglect: Testing in the “Cycle of Violence” Theory

Melanie A. Cox

This study of *Child Abuse and Neglect: Testing in the “Cycle of Violence” Theory*, is a demonstration of Applied Social Research in partial fulfillment of a master’s degree in Sociology. It examines the Cycle of Violence theory by looking at two groups of children: an abuse/neglect group and a control group. It tests the likelihood of the abuse/neglect group to commit a crime in adulthood i.e., property crime, person crime, or public morality; while controlling for race, sex and type of abuse. Also, the odds of gender and race of the children in the abuse/neglect group, becoming a criminal offender are examined. The findings from this study indicate a child who has been abused/neglected has a higher likelihood of committing a criminal act in adulthood.

DEDICATION

This research is dedicated to my Great-Grandmother, Bernice Gain and Great-Grandfather Burlin “Junky” Gain who are only able to see thru the eyes of heaven. God Bless and I Love You!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my family who has stuck by me from the very beginning. They have been there no matter how stubborn and upset I got. I thank each and every one of them for their patience and understanding and for keeping me going no matter how discouraged I got. Thank you Mom, Dad, Papal, Mamal, Angie & Roger, Brandon, Daron, Uncle Mike, and Petal. This is because of all of you.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
List of Tables	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Limitations of the Study.....	5
Definitions of Terms.....	6
Chapter 2 : Review of Literature.....	7
Offender.....	9
Adulthood Crime by Victim	12
Theory.....	15
Chapter 3: Methods	16
Data Collection-Secondary Data Analysis.....	16
Design and Procedures.....	17
Data.....	19
Research Questions.....	23
Chapter 4: Findings	24
Results	24
Chapter 5 : Discussion/Conclusion	37
Bibliography	42
Appendix A.....	47
Appendix B	55
Appendix C.....	57
Appendix D	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Sample Size by Gender and Group Status	19
Table 2 Sample Size by Race and Group Status	20
Table 3 Means and Standard Deviations for Number and Type of Criminal Act by Group Status	21
Table 4 Logistic Regression of arrests for Property Crimes and Race, Sex, and Group Status	24
Table 5 Logistic Regression of arrests for Person Crimes and Race, Sex, and Group Status	25
Table 6 Logistic Regression of arrests for Public Morality Crimes and Race, Sex, and Group Status	26
Table 7 Logistic Regression of arrests for Property Crimes and Race and Sex for Abuse/Neglect Group	28
Table 8 Logistic Regression of arrests for Person Crimes and Race and Sex for Abuse/Neglect Group	28
Table 9 Logistic Regression of arrests for Public Morality Crimes and Race and Sex for Abuse/Neglect Group	29
Table 10 Logistic Regression with Physical Abuse and Type of Crime	33
Table 11 Logistic Regression with Neglect and Type of Crime	34
Table 12 Logistic Regression with Sexual Abuse and Type of Crime	35
Table 13 Logistic Regression with Crime/No Crime and Type of Abuse, Race, Sex and Group Status	36

INTRODUCTION

It is 2005 and Billy Jacobs, 23 years old, sits in his prison cell contemplating how his life ended up this way. He had been arrested for sexually abusing a young boy whom he had met at the park one afternoon. However, as it turns out this was not Billy's only incident of abusing a child, he had a past criminal history of physically and sexually abusing young boys with whom he had only just met. As it turns out, during Billy's trial, his defense attorney recounted Billy's own tortured childhood from the hand of his father, where he had also been physically and sexually abused from the age of eight until middle teenage years. With this in mind, one wonders if a personal incident of being abused as a child could lead that person to continue the cycle of violence throughout their own adulthood?

The U.S. Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect (1995) reports that each year near fatal abuse and neglect leaves over 18,000 permanently disabled children. Many of the victims not only suffer lifelong psychological trauma, but may turn to crime or even become future perpetrators of abuse to children.

The Cycle of Violence theory is based on the idea that victims of child abuse and/or neglect are predisposed to become criminal offenders later in life. The Cycle of Violence hypothesis, or the notion of an inter-generational transmission of violence, holds that abused children become abusers, and victims of violence become violent offenders. The problem is that

there may be numerous other circumstances or conditions that help to explain why a victim of child abuse and/or neglect would eventually lead to adult criminality, and also why other victims of abuse/neglect do not become criminals at all. To date, there does not appear to be enough empirical research that explores the relationship between child abuse and future criminality. In other words, the “Cycle of Violence” theory may be too broad and general.

The previous literature has had many difficulties being able to distinguish between the actual issue of child abuse and those preexisting factors such as the family surroundings and the normal stressors that occur during childhood. Therefore, a direct relationship cannot be made toward the effects of child abuse and/or neglect. This relationship can only be assumed and based on self-reports, which leads to difficulties in “proving” this relationship.

Contemporary research in this areas is aimed at factors that predict how a child may be abused/neglected - either physically, sexually, or neglected. However, the literature says little about those children who have already been victimized and have not gotten the proper help in readjusting their lives. By studying criminal patterns in adults who have been abused as children, patterns may emerge which helps to better understand this phenomenon.

This research is designed to do just this, by comparing the patterns of criminal behaviors in adults who had been abused as children and in those who were not abused.

Cathy Widom (1988) stated in her original work that, “despite widespread belief in the

cycle of violence, problems of methodology in previous studies have made it difficult to draw conclusions about the long-term consequences of early childhood victimization”(p.160). The problem is relying on peoples’ memories about their past experiences through retrospective research, and also through the lack of a control group to compare the abuse and/or neglect group to.

In prior research, the subject was mostly studied in a retrospective manner, i.e., an adult who had been convicted of a crime was interviewed and asked several questions about their childhood abuse and/or neglect. However, by asking the individual these questions, it was never clear how biased or true the information would be. The data used in this research were gathered prospectively, therefore avoiding this shortcoming allowing the information to be gathered through official records which were taken at the time of the exact incident, therefore not leading to any questions of biased responses.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the Cycle of Violence theory, by exploring the relationship between the type of abuse/neglect and the actual type of crime committed by the victim in adulthood. Also the relationship between the gender and race of the victims and its affect on adult criminality will be analyzed. This study will use child abuse/neglect cases from over 30 years ago that were originally researched by Cathy Widom (1967-1988). The use of a matched control group will also be implemented in order to determine if the actual case of previous childhood abuse played a role in determining a future life of adult criminality.

Limitations of the Study

An important limitation in this research is the fact that at the time of the original study was researched, the information was gathered from official records, which does not allow for any extra information to be gathered. Also, at the time the records were prepared - the late 60's and early 70's - it was not mandatory to report any incident of abuse or neglect. This was also a period prior to passage of the Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. This issue raises questions as to the actual reliability of the control group's avoidance of any incident of child abuse or neglect. Another issue that may cause a bias is the fact that there is very little reporting, especially during this era, from the higher income socioeconomic status groups, whereas they were more likely to be reported as accidents rather than abuse cases. This leads to a higher rate of reporting from low income and minority groups for the study's participants.

Definitions of Terms

The Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA), (42 U.S.C.A §5106g), as amended by the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003, defines child abuse and neglect as follows: “any recent act or failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker which results in death, serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse or exploitation; or an act or failure to act which presents an imminent risk of serious harm” (National, 2004). The act also defines the term sexual abuse as follows:

- a.) “the employment, use, persuasion, inducement, enticement, or coercion of any child to engage in, or assist any other person to engage in, any sexually explicit conduct or simulation of such conduct for the purpose of producing a visual depiction of such conduct; or
- b.) the rape, and in cases of caretaker or inter-familial relationships, statutory rape, molestation, prostitution, or other form of sexual exploitation of children, or incest with children.”

Other terms used in the study are defined below.

Physical abuse refers to cases including injuries such as bruises, welts, burns, abrasions, lacerations, wounds, cuts, bone and skull fractures, and other evidence of physical injury.

Sexual abuse refers to cases of sodomy, rape, incest, fondling, and “assault and battery with intent to gratify sexual desires”

Neglect cases refers to cases in which the court found a child to have no proper parent care or guardianship, to be destitute, homeless, or to be living in a physically dangerous environment (Widom, 1989c, 2001).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Child Abuse and Neglect

Young children become victims much easier because they lack independence from their guardians and they are unaware how to protect themselves. In fact, they are often unaware that what their parents are doing to them is actually wrong. Child abuse causes both physical and emotional harm, in fact, “the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System data for 2002 demonstrated children younger than 1 year accounted for 41 percent of fatalities of all childhood deaths, while children younger than 4 years accounted for 76 percent of fatalities of all childhood deaths” (Child Abuse, 2004).

Weiler and Widom, (1996) indicate that childhood victimization has been associated with various forms of maladjustment, including conduct disorder, aggressiveness, and antisocial behavior. They suggest, therefore a likely connection between abuse and neglect as children and later criminality. Research shows that children who were raised in violent families have a significantly higher rates of creating a violent family system as adults. This is the “Cycle of Violence” hypothesis. However, not all children raised in violent families become abusive spouses or parents or even criminal offenders. The following is a list of factors that researchers have found that minimizes or breaks the cycle of violence provided by the (Radford Education Center, 2005). Individuals who were abused as children were less likely to engage in criminal

behavior later in life if they...

- 1.) were not in denial as to what happened to them as children - did not idealize their past
- they got angry about what happened to them and rejected their past parenting.
- 2.) had more social supports—were not socially isolated.
- 3.) were not abused by both parents.
- 4.) had a supportive relationship with one parent.
- 5.) had fewer “stressful events” in their lives.
- 6.) had experienced less severe and shorter periods of maltreatment.
- 7.) had positive school experience during childhood.
- 8.) had received some form of therapy.

Offenders

According to the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System's (2002) most current report, "of the approximately 896,000 child abuse and neglect victims in 2002, the largest percentage of perpetrators were parents (81%), including birth parents, adoptive parents, and stepparents. Other relatives accounted for an additional 6.6%. Unmarried partners of parents accounted for 2.9% of perpetrators." (Child Abuse, 2004). It was reported by the National Clearinghouse that "in 2002 one or both parents were involved in 79 percent of child abuse or neglect [cases]. Of the other 21 percent 16 percent were the result of maltreatment by non-parent caretakers, and 5 percent were unknown or missing." (Child Abuse, 2004). In 2002, the Administration for Children and Families reported that 58.3% of child abuse and neglect perpetrators were female and 41.7% were males. For the most part, female perpetrators were younger than male perpetrators; 42.5% of females compared to 32.4% of males were younger than 30 years old. Therefore, it can be noted that the relationship of the offender plays a large role in the incident of the abuse towards the child.

Luchenko, Gold, and Cot, (2000) found a connection between the relationship of the offender to the emotional stability of adult women who had survived sexual abuse as a child. They concentrated on three characteristics of the offender: 1.) the exact relationship of the offender to the victim, 2.) where they resided-either with the child or not, and 3.) if the offender

played a role in caring for the victim as a child. Their subjects consisted of 67 women who had been enrolled in an outpatient treatment program for sexual abuse survivors. The instrument used for the study was a structured clinical interview specifically designed for such a study. Their final results showed that there were no real connections between the three characteristics of the offender and the emotional outcome of the victim. However, they went on to state that their findings were not consistent with previous research nor what is generally accepted in the literature on the topic (p.172).

It is important to note that not only does the relationship of the offender to the victim have an impact, but also the location of the two to each other. This is imperative because if the offender lives in the same household even if he or she is not necessarily a blood relative, the situation is much more different than if the offender is unknown and lives outside of the household. Also, if the victim and offender have been living in the same household, it is reasonable to assume that the abuse and/or neglect has occurred more frequently and for a longer duration. However, it is important to state that abuse by a trusted neighbor may be more upsetting to the victim than a relative with whom they do not see often or know little about. Therefore, it is difficult to determine if the actual family and non-family ties plays a role in the prediction of the trauma.

Ketring and Feinauer (1999) found that family ties were not as important as actually

knowing the offender of the abuse in predicting the trauma of sexual abuse. Within the entire perspective of relationships to the victim, the most highly rated is that of a father to his child. In such cases the victim experiences a much more traumatic episode of emotional distress and is often plagued with long-lasting adjustment problems, both behaviorally and psychologically. (p.109).

Tong, Oates, and McDowell (1987) found that boys were nearly three times more likely than girls to be sexually abused by strangers. This finding was later supported by Finkelhor who found that females were more likely to be abused by family members and that males were more likely to be abused by strangers..

Adulthood Crime by Victims

A second issue is the topic of child abuse victims committing crimes later in life. The fact is, is that not every child who was abused or neglected will eventually turn to a life of crime.

There are several factors that are included in predicting the outcomes of these individuals. This includes: “the child’s age and development status when the abuse or neglect occurred, the type of abuse, frequency, duration and severity of abuse, and relationship between the victim and his or her abuser” (Child Abuse, 2004). Every child deals with things that happen in his/her life differently, and that is due to the fact that everybody copes in their own way to trauma, which is called, “resilience”, there are several factors that influence a child’s resilience, which includes, “individual characteristics, such as optimism, self-esteem, intelligence, creativity, humor, and independence” (Child Abuse, 2004).

However, with all of this said, it is still imperative to realize that the abuse/neglect has some kind of affect on the child. Widom (1989a) stated that, “[several] findings indicate that abused and neglected children have significantly greater risk of becoming delinquents, criminals, and violent criminals.” (p. 358). The abuse that a child receives may not always lead to a life of crime, but it does usually cause some kind of behavioral problem in the child. “Burgess, Hartman, and McCormack (1987) reported that their sample of sexually abused boys all showed antisocial behavior. Indeed, an association between childhood sexual abuse and deviant and

criminal behaviors has been reported in a number of samples of murderers and sex offenders” (Weeks & Widom, 1998, p.350).

Several studies have been conducted that have been concerned with convicted offenders and whether they had child abuse and/or neglect in their background. Lewis, Shanok, Pincus, and Glaser (1979) reported that approximately 75% of a sample of incarcerated male juvenile offenders had experienced childhood physical abuse. In a later follow-up interview with the same subjects, 80% of the subjects reported childhood physical abuse” (Stein & Lewis, 1992).

According to Widom, in regard to child abuse and neglect leading to felons being incarcerated, she found that of all three types of abuse - physical, sexual, and neglect, that physical abuse had the highest rate of leading to a criminal lifestyle. She also stated that the second highest were those children who had been neglected, and lastly those of sexual abuse. However, when it came to sexual abuse, she felt that this was misleading, because the majority of victims of sexual abuse cases were females, and they deal differently with their problems than males. “In a national survey of adult men and women, Finkelhor, Hotaling, Lewis, and Smith (1990) concluded that men externalized their symptoms by using drugs or alcohol, or acting out, and that women internalized their symptoms through depression, fear, and anxiety”.

And lastly, a study compiled by Dutton and Hart (1992-1994) studied 604 adult male inmates incarcerated in Canadian institutions. Using a combined variable that included physical

and sexual abuse and neglect, Dutton and Hart reported that 41% of their sample overall had experienced some form of serious abuse as children” (Weeks & Widom, 1998, p.357).

Widom (1989b), found that “abused and neglected subjects were...likely to have an adult criminal record and a substantially higher rate of arrest...then the matched control group.

Despite these findings, the relationship between childhood victimizations and adult criminality is not inevitable: 29% of abused and neglected subjects evidence adult criminal records; however, 71% did not”.(p. 258)

Professor Robert Shepherd (2005) at the University of Richmond School of Law, noticed the high incidence of childhood victimization of those people facing charges of criminal activity or charged as status offenders. These experiences have led lawyers to wonder whether the consequence of victimization and offending is evidence of a link between the two or is purely a coincidence. In capital cases, defense lawyers generally search for evidence of a history of abuse or neglect to produce as mitigation during the sentencing stage- often enough that some authors have derisively referred to it as a convenient “abuse excuse”.

Theory

This research examines the Cycle of Violence theory which suggests a relationship between childhood victimization of abuse and/or neglect and then later involvement in adulthood criminality. Widom (1989c) found that “early child abuse and neglect...have demonstrated long-term consequences for violent criminal behavior”(p.164). This theory has been around for years and just shows that when someone has been a victim of violence while at an impressionable age, then their odds increase that they will in turn become the person who then victimizes another person.

Despite all the data about the link between abuse and neglect and criminal offending, most children who are abused or neglect during childhood probably do not engage in criminal behavior later in life. There are factors that come into play to interrupt the path these children are on. There may be other things going on in their lives that may help turn their life around, including an older sibling, a strong sense of religion being introduced, or another adult stepping in to provide guidance.

Shepherd (2005) stated that, “The presence of the history of abuse does not provide an excuse for the behavior, but it may be very instructive about a possible course of treatment or rehabilitation to prevent further offending in the future.”

METHODS

Data Collection–Secondary Data Analysis

The data in this study were obtained from a National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) file # 9480. The original study was conducted by Cathy Widom. Widom's research consisted of collecting official records of actual child abuse and neglect cases that occurred between 1967 through 1971 in a metropolitan area in the Mid-West. Widom then gathered these files in order to create her abuse group, whereas she reviewed old school records of children who had no record of child abuse or neglect and who were consistently of the same age, race, and gender of each particular abuse subject to create the matched control group. Widom's final population consisted of 1,575 individuals, where 908 were included in the abuse and/or neglect group and 667 were placed in the control group.

After several years of gathering information on these children, Widom began another data collection, which consisted of these same individuals and their criminal histories which began during the years of 1986 continuing through 1988. These files were obtained from juvenile court and probation department records. The information was gathered and then placed to the side, where Widom then began her final step of the research.

Between 1989 and 1995, Widom tracked down the original individuals from both the abuse/neglect group and the control group, she administered a questionnaire and conducted a two hour interview. Adult criminal histories were obtained from a search of public records. For more information on the original study see *The Cycle of Violence*, by Cathy Widom, 1989.

Design and Procedures

The author used Widom's data to explore the connection between early childhood abuse/neglect and criminality. Criminal behavior was defined as crimes against property, crimes against person, or crimes against public morality. In addition, the researcher examined the relationship between sex and race and the affect of childhood abuse/neglect on criminality.

The independent variable(s) are attributes of participants, such as sex, race, and type of abuse, i.e., physical, sexual, or neglect and whether they were in the abuse/neglect group or control group. The dependent variable(s) are the number of criminal offenses and the type of offense, i.e., property, person, or public morality. Certain variables had to be recoded when the research began, due to the fact that the original research interpreted the types of crimes committed differently. These variables are broken down into their respective recoding in Appendix A. The study also consists of a control group that is statistically matched by age, race, gender, and location.

The data file for this study consisted of the abuse and neglect group and the control group's demographic information, this included age, race, sex, date of birth, and a three digit numeric case identification number. The file also included the abuse history which consisted of physical abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect and the duration, perpetrator history, and location of

each type and incident. Also within the file were the family and perpetrator histories of the complainant, relationship of offender to victim, age, placement, and incident information. Also, included was that of the type of adult criminality that subjects from either group was arrested for.

There were several variables that were created from the data, which included an index of each group of abuse - physical, sexual, and neglect; whether the subject committed a criminal offense; the exact type of crime committed and number of offenses, i.e., property, person, or public morality; and lastly, a new identification number that specified not only the original case number but also the group number - either abuse/neglect or control group.

Data

The sample population for this study consisted of 1,575 children - 667 in the control group and 908 in the abuse/neglect group. Table 1 presents a breakdown of the sample by gender and group status.

Table 1

Sample Size by Gender and Group Status.

Sex	Control Group	Abuse/Neglect Group	Total
Male	333	465	798
Female	334	443	777
Total	667	908	1575

There was no majority of gender for the subjects, which will help the study be more significant.

Table 2 consists of the data for the race of the subject and the group status.

Table 2

Sample Size by Race and Group Status

Race	Control Group	Abuse/Neglect Group	Total
Black	233	282	515
White	434	607	1041
Other	0	19	19
Total	667	908	1575

The majority of both the Control group and the Abuse/Neglect Group consisted of a majority of blacks. The variable “other” consisted of all other races depicted that were not black or white.

Table 3. displays means and standard deviations for group status by the number and type of criminal act.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Number and Type of Criminal Act by Group Status.

	Group Status	N	Mean	Standard Deviations
# of Person Crimes	Control group	667	.08	.383
	Abuse/neglect	908	.13	.552
# of Property Crimes	Control Group	667	.27	1.099
	Abuse/Neglect	908	.55	1.0765
# of Public Morality Crimes	Control Group	667	.74	2.554
	Abuse/Neglect	908	1.31	4.562

The abuse/neglect group had a higher average offending rate than the control group in all three categories of crime. The subjects in the abuse/neglect group also had a higher mean score for committing counts of public morality crimes than any other type of criminal act (Mean = 1.31).

Whereas the control group also scored a high mean score for public morality crimes (Mean =

.74). The type of crime with the lowest mean score for both the control group and the abuse/neglect group was person crimes (Mean = .08 control; Mean = .13 abuse/neglect). A list of what each type of crime consists of can be found in Appendix A.

Research Questions

The research questions that the study was designed to answer are as follows:

1. Does the “Cycle of Violence” theory hold true in general, i.e.,
Does childhood abuse and neglect predict future criminality?
2. Does the Cycle of Violence theory hold true for males and females?
3. Does the Cycle of Violence theory hold true for all races?
4. Does type of abuse, i.e., physical, sexual, neglect, affect adult criminality?

FINDINGS

QUESTION # 1

**Does the “Cycle of Violence” theory hold true in general,
i.e., does childhood abuse and neglect predict future criminality?**

Using binary logistic regression, the analysis showed that controlling for race and sex, the odds that the abuse/neglect group would be arrested for a property crime increased by a factor of 1.87 (See Table 4).

Table 4

Logistic Regression of arrest for Property Crime and Race, Sex, and Group Status

	B	S.E.	Significance	Exp (B)
Race	.860	.149	.000	2.364
Sex	1.338	.162	.000	3.810
Group	.627	.156	.000	1.873

Also controlling for race and sex, the odds that the abuse/neglect group would be arrested for a persons crime increased by a factor of 1.48 (See Table 5).

Table 5

Logistic Regression of arrests for Person Crimes and Race, Sex, and Group Status

	B	S.E	Significance	Exp (B)
Race	1.049	.211	.000	2.854
Sex	1.782	.272	.000	5.942
Group	.398	.218	.069	1.488

Lastly, for crimes against public morality, while controlling for race and sex, the odds that the abuse/neglect group would be arrested increased by a factor of 1.70 (See Table 6).

Table 6

Logistic Regression of arrests for Public Morality Crimes and Race, Sex, and Group Status

	B	S.E.	Significance	Exp (B)
Race	.527	.136	.000	1.693
Sex	1.845	.149	.000	6.331
Group	.536	.135	.000	1.709

The findings indicate that compared to the control group, the abuse/neglect group had a higher odds ratio of committing both property crime (Exp(B)=1.873) and public morality crime (Exp(B)=1.709). When it comes to person crimes, the abuse/neglect group is just about fifty percent more likely (Exp(B)=1.488) to commit than the control group, however the findings for this test were not significant.

QUESTION # 2

Does the Cycle of Violence theory hold true for males and females?

Logistic Regression was used with arrest for each type of criminal act, i.e., property, person, and public morality and gender. When it came to arrests for property crime, the odds that males would be arrested increased by a factor of 3.81 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 4). When it came to arrests for person crimes, the odds that males would be arrested increased by a factor of 5.94 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 5). Lastly, when it came to public morality crimes, the odds that males would be arrested increased by a factor of 6.33 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 6).

Looking just at the abuse/neglect group, data indicate that for property crimes, the odds that males would be arrested increased by a factor of 3.76 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 7), whereas the findings show a small difference for the abuse/neglect group.

Table 7

Logistic Regression of arrests for Property Crime and Race and Sex for Abuse/Neglect Group

	B	S.E.	Significance	Exp (B)
Race	1.004	.185	.000	2.730
Sex	1.326	.197	.000	3.767

Also for arrests for person crimes, the odds that males would be arrested increased by a factor of 8.01 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 8), whereas the findings show a difference of just the abuse/neglect group at a 200% higher likelihood to be arrested.

Table 8

Logistic Regression of arrests for Person Crimes and Race and Sex for Abuse/Neglect Group

	B	S.E.	Significance	Exp (B)
Race	1.258	.269	.000	3.517
Sex	2.082	.369	.000	8.019

Lastly, for arrests for public morality crimes, the odds that males would be arrested increased by 5.37 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 9), whereas the findings show a difference of almost a 100% higher likelihood to be arrested for the abuse/neglect group.

Table 9

Logistic Regression of arrests for Public Morality Crimes and Race and Sex for Abuse/Neglect

Group

	B	S.E.	Significance	Exp (B)
Race	.571	.172	.001	1.769
Sex	1.681	.179	.000	5.371

QUESTION # 3

Does the Cycle of Violence theory hold true for all races?

Logistic Regression was used with arrest for each type of criminal act, i.e., property, person, and public morality and race. When it came to arrests for property crime, the odds that blacks would be arrested increased by a factor of 2.36 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 4). When it came to arrests for person crimes, the odds that blacks would be arrested increased by a factor of 2.85 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 5). Lastly, when it came to public morality crimes, the odds that blacks would be arrested increased by a factor of 1.69 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 6).

However, these results are for the odds of either abuse/neglect group or control group. The findings for just the abuse/neglect group indicate that of arrests for property crimes, the odds that blacks would be arrested increased by a factor of 2.73 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 7), whereas the findings show a small difference for the abuse/neglect group. Also for arrests for person crimes, the odds that blacks would be arrested increased by a factor of 3.51 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 8), whereas the findings show a difference when just the abuse/neglect group of almost 100% higher likelihood to be arrested.

Lastly, for arrests for public morality crimes, the odds that blacks would be arrested increased by a factor of 1.76 with a significance of $p=.000$ (See Table 9), whereas the findings show a difference of almost 10% higher likelihood to be arrested for the abuse/neglect group.

QUESTION # 4

Does type of abuse, i.e., physical, sexual, neglect affect adult criminality?

After doing all the tests, the findings show that there is no possibility that the type of abuse may affect later criminality. This can be seen by the fact that within all three types of crimes, there was no significant finding to show that the odds that an abused or neglected child would be arrested for any type of crime. In fact, the odds that a physically abused child would be arrested for a public morality crime decreased by a factor of .689, with a significance of $p=.059$. Therefore showing that a person who had been physically abused, would probably not be out on the streets because of possible fear of more physical abuse (See Table 12).

Also, for all other types of crime there were no significant findings that showed that a being a victim of neglect or sexual abuse plays a role in later criminality. (Table 10, 11, 12, and 13). This was also evident when testing if in general, a person who had been abused i.e., physically, sexually, or neglected would have a higher odds of being arrested or not being arrested, and these findings show indeed the odds would decrease, however these were not significant findings to “prove” this correct. Therefore, this tests shows that no specific type of abuse will lead to a certain type of adult criminality, so with this in mind it must be understood that any type of abuse should be taken seriously.

Table 10

Logistic Regression with Property Crime and Type of Abuse, Race, Sex, and Group Status

	B	S.E.	Significance	Exp (B)
Physical index	-.049	.200	.808	.952
Neglect index	-.031	.104	.768	.970
Sexual index	.101	.227	.656	1.106
Race	.863	.150	.000	2.370
Sex	1.369	.169	.000	3.932
Group	.669	.244	.006	1.951

Table 11

Logistic Regression with Person Crime and Type of Abuse, Race, Sex, and Group Status

	B	S.E.	Significance	Exp (B)
Physical index	-.068	.300	.821	.934
Neglect index	-.139	.154	.365	.870
Sexual index	-.078	.389	.841	.925
Race	1.055	.214	.000	2.872
Sex	1.806	.282	.000	6.088
Group	.629	.349	.071	1.877

Table 12

Logistic Regression with Public Morality Crime and Type of Abuse, Race, Sex, and Group

Status

	B	S.E	Significance	Exp (B)
Physical index	-.373	.197	.059	.689
Neglect index	-.053	.097	.584	.948
Sexual index	.148	.208	.478	1.159
Race	.507	.137	.000	1.661
Sex	1.908	.157	.000	6.739
Group	.668	.222	.003	1.951

Table 13

Logistic Regression with Crime/No Crime and Type of Abuse, Race, Sex, and Group Status

	B	S.E.	Significance	Exp (B)
Physical index	-.199	.174	.253	.820
Neglect index	-.046	.091	.609	.955
Sexual index	-.006	.193	.976	.994
Race	.642	.128	.000	1,901
Sex	1.526	.135	.000	4.598
Group	.618	.206	.003	1.856

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

The results from this study shows that indeed the “Cycle of Violence” has evidence for its existence. When it comes to the Cycle of Violence theory, the roles that race and gender play are very similar to the “typical” stereotype of the average convicted offender. This includes that most are male and black. However, controlling for race and sex, types of abuse does not have an impact on the type of criminality therefore, the actual type of abuse plays little importance in the Cycle of Violence theory. This can not only be seen in this research, but in some previous research. An example would have to be that the results exhibited evidence for those children who were physically abused and their decrease in likelihood to commit a crime, to be more specific, this would be a crime against public morality. Needless to say though, the results also showed that a black male who was abused or neglected has the highest odds of committing a crime as an adult.

Therefore, the results show that even though there is evidence that a criminal life could be inevitable, it is not to the extreme of being a violent offender. The results of this particular study show that the criminal act would not be in direct harm of a person, but mostly petty crimes. Whatever the end result, those who have been abused or neglected as a child have a higher risk of arrest for a criminal act. With this said it only goes to say that the years of literature and research have indeed “proven” the theory correct. This study advances the understanding of the Cycle of

Violence theory by not only controlling for sex, race, and type of abuse, but by focusing on the actual type of crime. With this knowledge not only do the victims of child abuse/neglect have a higher likelihood to become a criminal offender, but also that there are particular paths that they may follow, in which this study found that to be public morality crimes.

The present study was built on Widom's past research and reexamined the findings based on a different aggregation of crime. Specifically, that research examined the Cycle of Violence theory using violent crimes, adult criminality, and juvenile criminality as the dependent variable. However, within this research, three types of crime: crimes against property, crimes against persons, and public morality crimes were the dependent variables. The researcher felt that this interpretation may help to better understand the cycle of violence theory, compared to actual crimes committed and not just arrest records. .

Also, within this study more emphasis was placed on the actual testing of the "Cycle of Violence" theory, whereas the original research by Widom focused mostly on the aspects of arrests for violent crimes by abused or neglected victims. Therefore, this research allows for a more empirical study of the data. Lastly, by using the Logistic Regression test throughout the study, the researcher was able to predict the odds ratio of each variable tested in order to allow for another interpretation of the "Cycle of Violence" theory.

The original research for this study recorded reports of child abuse and neglect cases from the late sixties and early seventies, however back during this time it was not mandatory to report any incident of abuse or neglect. Now that it is almost forty years later, things have come a long way. There are now mandatory reporting laws in which anybody can report the abuse of a child. Also there is more knowledge of the situation, which can lead to a less stigmatizing result for both the child and their future development. The United States Department of Health and Human Services has since created the Administration for Children and Families, in which the Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act was developed. This act is described in further detail in Appendix C.

Another advancement in the understanding of child abuse and neglect can be seen by the efforts of the United States government through the White House. This is represented by an announcement by President George W. Bush on March 26, 2003, in which he declared the month of April 2003 as National Child Abuse Prevention Month, Appendix B. Within this letter he stated that he “encourage[s] all Americans to join together to support strong families, protect our children from abuse, neglect, and maltreatment, and make our Nation a more promising place for all” (Bush, 2003). Therefore, maybe with a better understanding and stronger prevention programs, the cycle of violence will begin to stop or just slow down its rapid course.

In conclusion, it must be noted that even though the results do not show that all abused and neglected children will eventually grow to commit a crime, there is always that small possibility that they may follow the wrong path. There are for some unknown reasons, up to this point, that one child will be influenced into that way of life and yet a child who was exposed to the same kind of abuse/neglect may lead an “ordinary” way of life. Until this issue is resolved, the “Cycle of Violence” theory will continued to be questioned in order to find the answers that could possibly help save a generation of children from the devastating after effects of being abused or neglected in their young life.

Further research should be directed toward looking at the possible intervening factors that turn a person’s life around and allows them to avoid their predetermined path. These factors can range from biological differences, social interventions, religious directions, or a new start in life through foster/adoption care. There is not enough research out there that can distinguish between which person, who was a child abuse and/or neglect victim, will follow which path. Another issue that needs to be addressed is the differences that gender plays in future criminal activity. There is plenty of research out there that shows that males will commit more criminal acts, whereas females will become self-destructive, however there needs to be research that can distinguish the exact point in which one sex goes one direction and the other leads another direction.

Now that the Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) has been passed, a new prospective study needs to be researched to determine the difference in generations. This being because the young people of today may just be the offspring of the past child abuse and/or neglect victims. Lastly, research needs to be completed that focuses on persons from a higher socioeconomic status, this will be to determine how much income/status actually plays a role in the “cycle of violence” theory.

Bibliography

Child Abuse and Neglect Fatalities: Statistics and Interventions. National Clearinghouse

on Child Abuse and Neglect Information. 2004. [Http://nccanch.acf.hhs.gov](http://nccanch.acf.hhs.gov)

Bush, G.W. 2003. National Child Abuse Prevention Month, 2003. White House. 17

March 2003. [Http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030326-8.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030326-8.html)

Factors that Break the Intergenerational Transmission of Parenting Patterns. Radford. 23

March 2005. [Http://www.radford.edu/~junnever/family_violence.html](http://www.radford.edu/~junnever/family_violence.html)

Finkelhor, D., Hotaling, G., Lewis, I., & Smith, C. (1990). Sexual abuse in a national

survey of adult men and women: Prevalence, characteristics, and risk factors. Child

Abuse & Neglect, 10, 5-15.

Horowitz, A.V., Widom, C.S., McLaughlin, J. and H.R. White. 2001. The Impact of

Childhood Abuse and Neglect on Adult Mental Health: A Prospective Study.

Journal of Health and Social Behavior, Vol. 42 p. 184-201.

Ireland, T. and Widom, C.S. 1995. Childhood Victimization and Risk for Alcohol and

Drug Arrests. United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice.

- Kaufman, J.G. and Widom, C.S. 1999. Childhood Victimization, Running Away, and Delinquency. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 36 no. 4 p. 347-370.
- Ketring, S. and Feinauer, L. 1999. Perpetrator-Victim Relationship: Long-Term Effects of Sexual Abuse for Men and Women. American Journal of Family Therapy, Vol. 27 p. 109.
- Korbin, J.E. 2003. Children, Childhoods, and Violence. Annual Review of Anthropology, Vol. 32 p. 431-446.
- Long-Term Consequences of Child Abuse and Neglect. National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect Information. 2004. [Http://nccanch.acf.hhs.gov](http://nccanch.acf.hhs.gov).
- Lucenko, B. A., Gold, S.N. and M.A. Cott. 2000. Relationship to Perpetrator and Posttraumatic Symptomatology Among Sexual Abuse Survivors. Journal of Family Violence, Vol. 15, No. 2 p. 169-179.
- Pallant, J. 2001. SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows (Versions 10 and 11). Open University Press, New York. Pg. 186.

Section I: Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. U.S. Department of Health &

Human Services: Administration for Children & Families. Sec. 111. Definitions.

[42 US. C. 5106g]. 17 March 2005.

[Http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/laws/capta03/sec_I_111.htm](http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/laws/capta03/sec_I_111.htm)

Shepherd Jr., Robert E. Juvenile Justice. University of Richmond School of Law in

Virginia. 17 March 2005.

[Http://www.abanet.org/crimjust/juvjus/cjmchildmaltreat.html](http://www.abanet.org/crimjust/juvjus/cjmchildmaltreat.html)

Statistics: Child Abuse. 2003. 19 April 2004. [Http://www.yesican.org/statisticsCA.html](http://www.yesican.org/statisticsCA.html).

Stein, A., & Lewis, D.O. (1992). Discovering physical abuse: Insights from a follow-up study of delinquents. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 16(4), 523-531.

Tong, L., Oates, K., & McDowell, M.. (1987). Personality development following sexual abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 11, 378-383.

Uniform Crime Reports - Data Collection Guidelines. September 1996. National Incident-Based Reporting System. Vol. 1 Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Weeks, R. and Widom, C.S. 1998. Self-Reports of Early Childhood Victimization Among Incarcerated Adult Male Felons. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 13 No. 3; p. 346-361.

Weiler, B.L. and Widom, C.S. 1996. Psychopathy and violent behaviour in abused and neglected young adults. Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, Vol. 6; p. 253-271.

What is Child Abuse and Neglect? National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect Information. 2004. [Http://nccanch.acf.hhs.gov](http://nccanch.acf.hhs.gov)

Widom C.S. 1988. Sampling Biases and Implications for Child Abuse Research. American Orthopsychiatric Association, p. 260-270.

----- 1989a. Child Abuse, Neglect, and Adult Behavior: Research Design and Findings on Criminality, Violence, and Child Abuse. American Orthopsychiatric Association, Inc. Vol. 59 No. 3; p. 355-367.

----- . 1989b. Child Abuse, Neglect, and Violent Criminal Behavior. Criminology, Vol. 27 No. 2; p. 251-271.

----- . 1989c . The Cycle of Violence. Science, Vol. 244; p. 160-166.

----- . 1989d. Does Violence Beget Violence? A Critical Examination of the Literature. Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 106 No. 1; p. 3-28.

----- . 1991a. Avoidance of Criminality in Abused and Neglected Children. Psychiatry, Vol. 54; p. 162-174.

----- . 1991b. The Role of Placement Experiences in Mediating the Criminal Consequences of Early Childhood Victimization. American Journal of Orthopsychiatric, Vol 61 No. 2 p. 195-209.

----- . 1999. Child Abuse, Neglect, and Violent Criminal Behavior in a Midwest Metropolitan Area of the United States, 1967-1988. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Michigan.

Widom, C.S. and Kuhns, J.B. 1996. Childhood Victimization and Subsequent Risk for Promiscuity, Prostitution, and Teenage Pregnancy: A Prospective Study. American Journal of Public Health, Vol. 86 p. 1607

Widom, C.S. and Maxfield, M.G. 2001. An Update on the "Cycle of Violence". 24 February 2004. [Http://www.ncjrs.org/txtfiles1/nij/184894.txt](http://www.ncjrs.org/txtfiles1/nij/184894.txt).

Widom, C.S. and Morris, S. 1997. Accuracy of Adult Recollections of Childhood Victimization: Part 2. Childhood Sexual Abuse. Psychological Assessment, Vol 9. No. 1 p. 34-46.

APPENDIX A.

Recoded Variables

New Recoded Physical Abuse Codes 1,2,3, & 4 ➤ Old Physical Abuse Codes 1,2,3, & 4

None (0) _ ➤ No apparent physical abuse to this child nor to other children in family; No apparent physical abuse to this child but physical abuse to a sibling; Other; Physical injuries possibly sustained, not certain.

Minor (1) _ ➤ Mention of physical abuse but no mention of injuries sustained; Bruises, welts; Abrasions, lacerations; Tied up.

Serious (2) _ ➤ Sprains, dislocation; Malnutrition, Freezing, Burns, scalding, Wounds, cut, punctures; Internal injuries; Bone fractures; Skull fracture; Teeth knocked out; Failure to thrive.

New Recoded Neglect Type 1,2,3, & 4 ➤ Old Neglect Type 1,2,3, & 4

None (0) _ ➤ No apparent neglect of this child nor other children in family; No apparent neglect of this child but neglect of a sibling; Not certain whether incidence of neglect.

Minor (1) ➤ Neglect related skin disorders; Does not provide adequate supervision, child left alone for periods of time; Cannot keep child in school regularly; Verbal abuse; Does not keep appointments with welfare department or school officials.

Serious (2) ➤ Physical neglect: bodies not kept clean, does not provide for adequate food, clothing, or housing; Physical neglect: does not provide adequate medical attention; Abandoned by mother and father; Mother does not wish to keep child; Child in care of someone other than mother who does not wish to continue care; Confinement; Emotional neglect.

New Sexual Abuse Codes 1 & 2 ➤ Old Sexual Abuse Codes 1 & 2

None (0) ➤ No apparent sexual abuse of this child nor other children in family; No indication of sexual abuse to this child but mentioned in relation to a sibling.

Minor (1) ➤ Tried to entice into car; Allegations of sexual abuse, uncertain.

Serious (2) ➤ Fondling, touching in obscene manner; Sexual abuse but specifics not given; Vaginal penetration with penis; Vaginal penetration with

other than penis; Sodomy/anal penetration; Forced to perform sexual acts; Evidence of sexually transmitted disease; Evidence of sibling incest; Forced to perform oral sodomy; Forced to submit to oral sodomy; Evidence of parental incest; Exposing to child.

New Other, Non-Abuse/Neglect 1,2, &3 ➤ Old Other, Non-Abuse/Neglect 1,2, & 3

None (0) ➤ None or no other mentioned.

Other abuse (1) ➤ Needed wardship for placement of this child; Wardship needed since other (s) willing to assume care but wish to have guardianship established legally; Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable to provide for child because of medical reasons; Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable to provide for child for financial reasons; Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable to provide for child because in prison, girls school, or jail; Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable to provide for child because in mental hospital or mentally incapable; Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable or unwilling to provide for child because institutionalized, type not known; Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable to provide for child, reason not given;

Moral environment objectionable to officials; Death of guardian (s)
left child orphaned; Violence in the home not directed at child.

New Complainant 1 & 2 ➤ Old Complainant 1 & 2

Mother (0)_ ➤ Mother

Father (1)_ ➤ Father

Other Family (2)_ ➤ Stepmother or female companion; Grandmother; Other related
female adult; Stepfather, or male companion; Grandfather; Other
related male adult; Child in family.

Non-Family (3)_ ➤ Other, non-related adult; Welfare Department officials; Police
Department officials; School officials; Hospital, clinic, or other
health officials.

New Relation of Perpetrator 1 & 2 to abused/neglected child(ren) ➤ Old Perpetrator 1 & 2

Mother (0)_ ➤ Mother

Father (1)_ ➤ Father

Other family (2)_ ➤ Stepmother; Female companion; Stepfather; Male companion;
Grandmother; Grandfather; Other related adult;

Non-Family (3)_ ➤ Other adult with legal guardianship; Other, non-related adult but known to family; Other, non-related adult, not known to family; Male, uncertain relation, in household; Male, unknown if known to family.

New Description given is given by whom _ ➤ Old Description given is by whom

Mother (0)_ ➤ Mother

Father (1)_ ➤ Father

Other Family (2)_ ➤ Stepmother or female companion; Grandmother; Other related female adult; Stepfather or male companion; Grandfather; Other related male adult; Child in family.

Non-Family (3)_ ➤ Other non-related adult; Welfare Department officials; Police Department officials; School officials; Hospital, clinic, or other health officials; Court officials.

New With Whom was Child Living Regularly at time of incident _ ➤ Old Child Living

Mother (0) _ ➤ Mother

Father (1) _ ➤ Father

Other Family (2) _ ➤ Stepmother or female companion; Stepfather or male companion; Grandmother; Grandfather; Other related adult.

Non-Family (3) _ ➤ Other adult with legal guardianship; Other non-related adult; Child was institutionalized at the time.

New Relation of Sex Perpetrator to Sexually Abuse Child 1& 2 _ ➤ Old Relation of Sex

Perpetrator to Sexually Abuse Child 1 & 2

Mother (0)_ ➤ Mother

Father (1)_ ➤ Father

Other Family (2)_ ➤ Stepmother; Female companion; Stepfather; Male companion; Grandmother; Grandfather; Other related adult.

Non-Family (3)_ ➤ Other adult with legal guardianship; Other non-related adult but known to family; Other non-related adult, not known to family; Male, uncertain relation, in household; Male, unknown if known to family.

New Charges pertaining to both juveniles and adult _ ➤ Old Charges pertaining to both

Property (0)_ ➤ Theft/conversion/shoplifting/offense against property act;

Burglary/attempted burglary; Unlawful entering/breaking & entering; Robbery; Possession of stolen property/intention to receive; Larceny; Arson; Fraud/forgery/bad checks/false id; Embezzlement; Robbery with injury; Bribery; Habitual offender.

Person (1)_ ➤ Intimidation; Assault; Assault and battery; Battery with injury; Battery; Aggravated assault; Manslaughter/reckless homicide/involuntary manslaughter/motor vehicle accident resulting in death; Confinement; Kidnaping; Murder/attempted murder; Incest; Child molestation; Rape, sodomy; Burglary with injury; Child abuse/neglect.

Public Morality (2)_ ➤ Gambling; Criminal mischief/vandalism/trespassing/recklessness; Disorderly conduct(DOC)/breach of peace; Visiting a common nuisance (VCN)/keeping a common nuisance; Alcohol offenses/public intoxication/1935 Beverage Act; Violation, controlled substance act (VCSA)/drug offenses; Resisting arrest/fleeing a police officer/taunting a police officer/resisting law enforcement (RLE)/leaving the scene of a crime/refusing ID/interfering;

Possession of a firearm/firearms act (FAA); Injury to morals;
Prostitution; Peeping; Public indecency; Criminal deviant conduct;
Driving while intoxicated (OMVUIL); Traffic; Violation of
probation or parole; Vagrancy; Fugitive; Failure to appear;
Escape/AUOL.

Other (3)_ ➤ Conspiracy/assisting a criminal; Contempt; Contributing to
the delinquency of a minor; False crime report; Other.

Lastly, indexes were created for all of the Physical abuse, Sexual abuse, Neglect and Other Abuse variables. There were labeled Phyindex, Sexindex, Negindex, and Othindex; whereas, 0 = no counts; 1 = one count; 2 = two counts; 3 = three counts; and 4 = four counts of abuse or neglect respectively.

APPENDIX B.

March 26, 2003

National Child Abuse Prevention Month, 2003

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Our nation has an important responsibility to create a caring environment in which our children can flourish and reach their full potential. As we observe the 20th anniversary of National Child Abuse Prevention Month, we recognize the significant progress we have made to increase the safety and security of our children. We also renew our commitment to protecting our most vulnerable citizens from harm. Child abuse and neglect are national tragedies, and we must work together to eradicate them.

Every day, thousands of children are mistreated by their parents, guardians, relatives, or caregivers. On average, three children a day die as a result of abuse and neglect, and countless others remain silent, their pain unnoticed and unreported. These children face challenges that no child deserves, and young people who have experienced abuse may grow into adults who are self-destructive and damaging to our communities. To help these children become healthy and happy adults, parents and caregivers must provide them with love, security, emotional support, and a strong connection to their extended families and communities.

To help ensure the safety and well-being of our children, my Administration is committed to supporting and strengthening families. In the last year, we have worked with faith-based and community organizations to promote healthy marriages, responsible fatherhood, and partnerships that seek to prevent child abuse and neglect. We also worked with the Congress to reauthorize the Promoting Safe and Stable Families program. This year, we are asking the Congress to fully fund this program at \$505 million, an increase of more than 65 percent. In addition, we are working with the Congress to reauthorize the Child Abuse and Prevention and Treatment Act. This important legislation will provide funding to States for child abuse prevention activities and other vital programs.

Every child is a blessing. Through the cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments, faith-based and community organizations, schools, law enforcement, and health and human service agencies, we can develop and enhance successful prevention strategies that protect our young people. In addition, we must continue to recognize the spirit of compassion in individuals and community groups across our Nation that offer care, guidance, and support for young people, parents, and caregivers. By working together, we can put hope in our children's hearts and ensure healthy and safe lives for all our children.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, GEORGE W. BUSH, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim April 2003 as National Child Abuse Prevention Month. I encourage all Americans to join together to support strong families, protect our children from abuse, neglect, and maltreatment, and make our Nation a more promising place for all.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-sixth day of March, in the year of our Lord two thousand three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty seventh.

GEORGE W. BUSH

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030326-8.html>

APPENDIX C.

*U.S. Department of Health & Human Services
Administration for Children & Families
Laws/Policies*

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT ACT

2. SUMMARY

Legislative Authority:

Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, as amended

U.S. Code Citation:

42 U.S.C. 5101 et seq; 42 U.S.C. 5116 et seq.

ACF Regulations:

45 CFR 1340

Summary of Legislative History:

The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA, P.L. 93-247) was originally enacted in 1974 and was later amended by the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment and Adoption Reform Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-266). The law was completely rewritten in the Child Abuse Prevention, Adoption and Family Services Act of 1988 (P.L. 100-294, 4/25/88). It was further amended by the Child Abuse Prevention Challenge Grants Reauthorization Act of 1989 (P.L. 101-126, 10/25/89) and the Drug Free School Amendments of 1989 (P.L. 101-226, 12/12/89).

The Community-Based Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Grants program was originally authorized by sections 402 through 409 of the Continuing Appropriations Act for FY 1985 (P.L. 98-473, 10/12/84). The Child Abuse Prevention Challenge Grants Reauthorization Act of 1989

(P.L. 101-126) transferred this program to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, as amended.

A new title III, Certain Preventive Services Regarding Children of Homeless Families or Families at Risk of Homelessness, was added to the Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention and Treatment Act by the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act Amendments of 1990 (P.L. 101-645, 11/29/90).

The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act was amended and reauthorized by the Child Abuse, Domestic Violence, Adoption, and Family Services Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-295, 5/28/92) and amended by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act Amendments of 1992 (P.L. 102-586, 11/4/92).

CAPTA was amended by the Older American Act Technical Amendments of 1993 (P.L. 103-171, 12/2/93) and the Human Services Amendments of 1994 (P.L. 103-252, 5/19/94).

CAPTA was further amended by the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act Amendments of 1996 (P.L. 104-235, 10/3/96), which amended title I, replaced the title II Community-Based Family Resource Centers program with a new Community-Based Family Resource and Support Program and repealed title III, Certain Preventive Services Regarding Children of Homeless Families or Families at Risk of Homelessness. In 2003, CAPTA was reauthorized and amended by the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act of 2003.

Administration for Children and Families_370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W._ Washington, D.C.
20447

<http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/laws/capta03/summary.htm>

Data Resources Program of the
National Institute of Justice

Data Set JU.2428

CHILD ABUSE, NEGLECT AND
VIOLENT CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

Cathy Spatz Widom

Codebook

July 1990

Sociometrics Corporation
170 State Street, Suite 260
Los Altos, CA 94022-2812
(415) 949-3282

ICPSR 9480

NIJ grant 86-IJ-CX-0033

Note: Column locations of variables are presented on pages 13-15 of this codebook.

(PART 1: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION)

CASENO: 3 digit numeric case identification number.

GRP: Whether abuse/neglect or control group.

- 1 - Control
- 2 - Abuse/neglect,

AGE: Age, in years, at time of petition (Variable deleted from data file by investigator)

RACE:

- 1 - Black
- 2 - White
- 3 - Hispanic
- 9 - Race unknown

SEX:

- 1 - Female
- 2 - Male

DOB: Date of birth (string variable)

Several formats for recording date of birth are used. In general order of frequency these are:

- MM-DD-YY Exact date of birth
- YYYY-YY Approximate year of birth
- MM-YY Month and year of birth
- YYYY Year of birth
- ? Date of birth unknown

MATCHTYP: Whether Control is birth match or school match.

- 1 - Birth
- 2 - School
- 3 - Abuse/neglect

(PART 2: ABUSE/NEGLECT)

CASENO: 3 digit numeric case identification number.

PHY1, PHY2, PHY3, PHY4: Physical abuse codes

- 0 - No apparent physical abuse to this child nor to other children in family.
- 1 - No apparent physical abuse to this child but physical abuse to a sibling.
- 2 - Mention of physical abuse but no mention of injuries sustained.
- 3 - Bruises, welts
- 4 - Sprains, dislocations
- 5 - Malnutrition
- 6 - Freezing
- 7 - Burns, scalding
- 8 - Abrasions, lacerations
- 9 - Wounds, cuts, punctures
- 10 - Internal injuries
- 11 - Bone fractures (other than skull)
- 12 - Skull fracture
- 14 - Teeth knocked out
- 51 - Failure to thrive
- 52 - Tied up
- 98 - Other
- 99 - Physical injuries possibly sustained, not certain (old scars, etc)

PHY2, PHY3, PHY4 - 0 IF NO OTHER PHYSICAL ABUSE

PHYDUR: Duration of abuse, ie., whether isolated instance or longer term:

- 0 - Isolated instance
- 1 - 1 year or less
- 1 - Exact duration unknown, evidence of long standing duration. - MISSING
- 98 - Not applicable - MISSING
- 99 - Duration not known - MISSING

NEG1, NEG2, NEG3, NEG4: Type neglect

- 0 - No apparent neglect of this child nor other children in family
- 1 - No apparent neglect of this child but neglect of a sibling
- 2 - Physical neglect: bodies not kept clean, does not provide for adequate, food, clothing, or housing (unclean home, bodies, etc).
- 3 - Physical neglect: does not provide adequate medical attention (Including other physical complaints as pain, fatigue).
- 4 - Neglect related skin disorders (infections, etc.)
- 5 - Does not provide adequate supervision, child left alone for periods of time (but not directly abandoned).
- 6 - Cannot keep child in school regularly (Educational neglect).
- 7 - Abandoned by mother and father (or father unable to care, dead, whereabouts unknown)
- 8 - Mother (or other person in charge of child) does not wish to keep child (whether permanently or temporarily)

- 9 - Child in care of someone other than mother (or other parent) who does not wish to continue care (whether permanently or temporarily)
- 10 - Verbal abuse (swearing, threats, etc)
- 11 - Does not keep appointments with welfare department or school officials
- 12 - Confinement
- 51 - Emotional neglect
- 99 - Not certain whether incidence of neglect.

NEG2, NEG3, NEG4 = 0 IF NO OTHER NEGLECT

NEGDUR: Duration of neglect, i.e., whether isolated incident or longer term.

- 0 - Isolated instance
- 1 - 1 year or less
- 1 - Exact duration unknown, evidence of long standing duration. - MISSING
- 98 - Not applicable - MISSING
- 99 - Duration not known - MISSING

SEX1 AND SEX2: Sexual abuse codes (SEX2 CODED 0 IF NO OTHER SEXUAL ABUSE)

- 0 - No apparent sexual abuse of this child nor other children in family
- 1 - No indication of sexual abuse to this child but mentioned in relation to a sibling.
- 2 - Fondling, touching in obscene manner.
- 3 - Sexual abuse but specifics not given (eg., A & B with intent)
- 4 - Vaginal penetration with penis.
- 5 - Vaginal penetration with other than penis.
- 6 - Sodomy/anal penetration.
- 7 - Forced to perform sexual acts.
- 8 - Evidence of sexually transmitted disease.
- 9 - Evidence of sibling incest
- 10 - Forced to perform oral sodomy
- 11 - Forced to submit to oral sodomy
- 12 - Evidence of parental incest.
- 13 - Exposing to child
- 14 - Tried to entice into car
- 51 - Allegations of sexual abuse, uncertain

SEXDUR: Duration of sex abuse

- 0 - Isolated instance
- 1 - Exact duration unknown, evidence of long standing duration - MISSING
- 1 - Exact duration unknown, evidence of long standing duration. - MISSING
- 98 - Not applicable - MISSING
- 99 - Duration not known - MISSING

SEXIJ: Injuries sustained as a consequence of sexual abuse:

- 0 - No, no mention
- 1 - Yes, mention
- 98 - Not applicable - MISSING
- 99 - Unknown - MISSING

OTH1, OTH2, OTH3: Other, non-abuse/neglect, reasons for petition

- 0 - None or no other mentioned.
- 1 - Needed wardship for placement of this child (in clinic, home for the retarded, etc.)
- 2 - Wardship needed since other(s) willing to assume care but wish to have guardianship established legally
- 3 - Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable to provide for child because of medical reasons
- 4 - Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable to provide for child for financial reasons,
- 5 - Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable to provide for child because in prison, girls school, or jail
- 6 - Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable to provide for child because in mental hospital or mentally incapable.
- 7 - Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable or unwilling to provide for child because institutionalized, type not known
- 8 - Mother or other legal guardian temporarily unable to provide for child, reason not given
- 9 - Moral environment objectionable to officials (eg.: mother living with man she's not married to, frequent pregnancies without being married, alcohol or drug use, etc.)
- 10 - Death of guardian(s) left child orphaned
- 11 - Violence in the home not directed at child (eg., wife abuse)

PLAC1: If petition involved removal of child from home, where was child initially placed?

- 0 - Child was not removed, no placement involved
- 1 - Guardian Home (or other public facility for non-delinquent)
- 2 - Relative's home
- 3 - Foster care
- 4 - Medical facility
- 5 - Psychiatric facility
- 6 - Home/ school for the mentally retarded
- 7 - Adopted
- 8 - Other, please list
- 98 - Not known if placed or not - MISSING
- 99 - Child placed but where not known - MISSING

PLYR, PMON, PLDY - 98,99 = MISSING

PLYR: Date initial placement, year (99=unknown, 98=Unknown if placed)

PMON: Date initial placement, month (99=unknown, 98=Unknown if placed)

PLDY: Date initial placement, day (99=unknown, 98=Unknown if placed)

PLTIM: How long was child in this initial placement, in months?

- 88 - Until age 18
- 89 - Permanent
- 98 - Unknown if placed - MISSING
- 99 - Unknown amount of time in placement - MISSING

ICPSR 9480

FOS1: Placement in a foster home was an outcome of this petition

- 1 - Yes
- 2 - Placed in foster but not as consequence of this petition.
- 88 - Until age 18
- 99 - No, unknown - MISSING

NOREL: Was there mention that there were no other relatives willing to assume care for this child?

- 1 - Yes
- 99 - No information - MISSING

DEAD 1: Indication that child is now dead

- 0 - No
- 1 - Yes

DEAD2: Age at death in years

- 98 - Not applicable - MISSING
- 99 - Age at death unknown - MISSING

DEAD3: Cause of death:

- 1 - Natural causes (disease)
- 2 - Related to parental abuse/neglect
- 3 - Outcome of other violent act
- 4 - Accident
- 5 - Suicide
- 99 - Not applicable - MISSING

(PART 3: FAMILY AND PERPETRATOR)

CASENO: 3 digit numeric case identification number.

PYR: Year petition filed.

CRIMCT: This case was a consequence of criminal charges being brought

- 1 - Yes
- 0 - No evidence for criminal charges

COMPL1: Complainant (charges brought by).

- 1 - Mother
- 2 - Father
- 3 - Stepmother or female companion
- 4 - Grandmother
- 5 - Other related female adult (aunt, etc.)
- 6 - Stepfather, or male companion
- 7 - Grandfather
- 8 - Other related male adult (uncle, etc.)
- 9 - Child in family
- 10 - Other, non-related adult (neighbor, babysitter, etc.)
- 11 - Welfare Department officials
- 12 - Police Department officials
- 13 - School officials
- 14 - Hospital, clinic, or other health officials
- 99 - Initiator unknown - MISSING

COMP2: Other involved in initiating complaint. Code as above; if no other initiator, code 99

PERP1: Relation of Perpetrator(1) (known or suspected) to abused/ neglected child(ren)

- 1 - Mother
- 2 - Father
- 3 - Stepmother
- 4 - Female companion
- 5 - Stepfather
- 6 - Male companion
- 7 - Grandmother
- 8 - Grandfather
- 9 - Other related adult (uncle, aunt, etc)
- 10 - Other adult with legal guardianship (foster, adoptive parent)
- 11 - Other, non-related adult but known to family (neighbor, etc.)
- 12 - Other, non-related adult, not known to family (stranger)
- 13 - Male, uncertain relation, in household
- 14 - Male, unknown if known to family
- 99 - Identity of perpetrator unknown - MISSING

PERAGE1: Age of perpetrator1, in years

- 99 - Age of perpetrator unknown - MISSING

ICPSR 9480

PERSEX1: Sex of perpetrator1
1 - Female
2 - Male

PERRCE1: Race of perpetrator1
1 - Black
2 - White
3 - Other (Hispanic, Oriental, etc).
99 - Race unknown - MISSING

INHOME1: Was perpetrator(1) living in the home of the victim at the time?
0 - No
1 - Yes
99 - Unknown - MISSING

PERP2: Other perpetrator (known or suspected) involved in incident. Code as PERP1 above except:
99 - Unknown if other perpetrator - MISSING

PERAGE2: Age of perpetrator2, in years
99 - Age of perpetrator2 unknown or no second perpetrator - MISSING

PERSEX2: Sex of perpetrator2
1 - Female
2 - Male
99 - Sex of perpetrator2 unknown or no second perpetrator - MISSING

PERRCE2: Race of perpetrator2:
1 - Black
2 - White
3 - Other (Hispanic, Oriental, etc).
99 - Race unknown or no second perpetrator - MISSING

INHOME2: Was perpetrator(2) living in the home of the victim at the time?
0 - No
1 - Yes
9 - Unknown or no second perpetrator - MISSING

DESCRIP: Description given is given by whom?
1 - Mother
2 - Father
3 - Stepmother or female companion
4 - Grandmother
5 - Other related female adult (aunt, etc.)
6 - Stepfather, or male companion
7 - Grandfather
8 - Other related male adult (uncle, etc.)
9 - Child in family
10 - Other, non-related adult (neighbor, etc.)
11 - Welfare Department officials
12 - Police Department officials

- 13 - School officials
- 14 - Hospital, clinic, or other health officials
- 15 - Court officials
- 99 - Unknown - MISSING

REPORT: Complaint initially reported to:

- 1 - Police
- 2 - Welfare or other social service agency
- 3 - School officials
- 4 - Hospitals
- 5 - Court officials
- 99 - Unknown, cannot tell from description given - MISSING

PAR1: With whom was child living regularly at time of incident?

(= mother if mother involved with care of child at time).

- 1 - Mother
- 2 - Father
- 3 - Stepmother or female companion
- 4 - Stepfather or male companion
- 5 - Grandmother
- 6 - Grandfather
- 7 - Other related adult (uncle, aunt, etc)
- 8 - Other adult with legal guardianship (foster, adoptive parent)
- 9 - Other, non-related adult (neighbor, friends,etc)
- 10 - Child was institutionalized at the time
- 99 - Unknown - MISSING

PAR2: Other person involved with care of child at time. Coded as above, 99 if no other person known to be involved with care.

MOVES: Evidence of family moving two or more times during the year preceding petition?

- 1 - Yes,
- 0 - No
- 99 - Can't tell - MISSING

SEPAR: Evidence of recent family disruption (divorce, separation, death of family member)?

- 0 - No
- 1 - Yes
- 99 - Can't tell - MISSING

NFATH: Children in this family born from more than one father.

- 0 - No
- 1 - Yes
- 99 - Unknown - MISSING

INSTN1: Was this the first instance of abuse/neglect brought to the attention of the courts/police/welfare authorities? (i.e., no mention of previous instances).

- 1 - Yes, only this instance.

ICPSR 9480

- 2 - One previous instance.
- 3 - Two prior instances, etc.
- 88 - More than one prior instance, exact number unknown.
- 99 - Unknown. - MISSING

INSTN2: Are there reports of subsequent instances of abuse/neglect, not directly a consequence (or follow-up) of the current case which were brought to the attention of the courts/police/welfare authorities?

- 0 - No, no further dealings with these systems concerning abuse/neglect
- 1 - Yes, one subsequent instance.
- 2 - Yes, two subsequent instances, etc.
- 88 - More than one prior instance, exact number unknown
- 99 - Unknown. - MISSING

SEXPERP: Relation of Sex perpetrator(1) (known or suspected) to sexually abused child

- 1 - Mother
- 2 - Father
- 3 - Stepmother
- 4 - Female companion
- 5 - Stepfather
- 6 - Male companion
- 7 - Grandmother
- 8 - Grandfather
- 9 - Other related adult (uncle, aunt, etc)
- 10 - Other adult with legal guardianship (foster, adoptive parent)
- 11 - Other, non-related adult but known to family (neighbor, etc.)
- 12 - Other, non-related adult, not known to family (stranger)
- 13 - Male, uncertain relation, in household
- 14 - Male, unknown if known to family
- 99 - Not sexual abuse. - MISSING

NOTE: NO CODE FOR SEX OF SEX PERPETRATOR #1 SINCE ALL MALE.

SRACE: Race of sex perpetrator1:

- 1 - Black
- 2 - White
- 3 - Other (Hispanic, Oriental, etc).
- 9 - Race unknown - MISSING
- 99 - No sex perpetrator - MISSING

SAGE: Age of sex perpetrator1, in years

- 98 - No sex perpetrator - MISSING
- 99 - Age of sex perpetrator1 unknown - MISSING

SEXIN: Was sex perpetrator1 living in the home of the victim at the time?

- 0 - No
- 1 - Yes
- 9 - Unknown - MISSING
- 99 - No sex perpetrator - MISSING

SEXDISP: (Undocumented variable)

SEXP2: Perpetrator2 of sexual abuse incident; Coded as SEXP above
except:

98 - Not sexual abuse incident - MISSING

99 - No second sex perpetrator - MISSING

ICPSR 9480

(PART4: ADULT CRIMINALITY)

CASENO: 3 digit numeric case identification number.

GRP: Whether abuse/neglect or control group

- 1 - Control
- 2 - Abuse/neglect

INST: Number of each occasion of arrest, i.e., each separate arrest incident numbered uniquely (i.e., may be more than one type adult charge for any arrest incident)

CHRG: Unique charge numbers within each arrest incident.

MULT: If, for any one offense there are multiple counts of the same type, the number of counts for that type. Example - a person is charged with two traffic offenses, TYPE 46 and MULT = 2. 99 only one charge of a particular type

CRYR: Year, adult criminal arrest charge

(99 = unknown) - MISSING

PLACE: Location of arrest (where offense committed).

- 1 - City (local)
- 2 - State
- 3 - Out of state

TYPE (OF OFFENSE): Charges pertaining to both juveniles and adults

- 7 - Theft/ conversion/ shoplifting/offense against property act (OAPA)
- 8 - Burglary/attempted burglary
- 9 - Unlawful entering/breaking & entering
- 10 - Robbery
- 11 - Possession of stolen property/intention to receive
- 12 - Larceny
- 13 - Arson
- 14 - Fraud/ forgery/ bad checks/ false id
- 15 - Embezzlement
- 16 - Conspiracy/ assisting a criminal
- 17 - Gambling
- 18 - Criminal mischief/ vandalism/ trespassing/recklessness
- 19 - Disorderly conduct (DOC)/ breach of peace
- 20 - Visiting a common nuisance (VCN)/ keeping a common nuisance
- 21 - Alcohol offenses/ public intoxication/ 1935 Beverage Act
- 22 - Violation, controlled substance act (VCSA)/ drug offenses
- 23 - Resisting arrest/ fleeing a police officer/ taunting a police officer/ resisting law enforcement (RLE)/ leaving the scene of a crime/ refusing ID/ interfering
- 24 - Intimidation
- 25 - Possession of a firearm/ firearms act (FAA)
- 26 - Assault
- 27 - Assault and battery

- 28 - Battery with injury
- 29 - Battery
- 30 - Aggravated assault
- 31 - Manslaughter/ reckless homicide/ involuntary manslaughter/motor vehicle accident resulting in death
- 32 - Confinement
- 33 - Kidnapping
- 34 - Murder/ attempted murder
- 35 - Injury to morals
- 36 - Prostitution
- 37 - Incest
- 38 - Child molestation
- 39 - ALB with intent to gratify
- 40 - Rape, sodomy
- 41 - Peeping
- 42 - Public indecency
- 43 - Criminal deviant conduct
- 44 - Other sex
- 45 - Driving while intoxicated (OMVUIL)
- 46 - Traffic (NOL, etc.)
- 47 - Violation of probation or parole (VT, VSRC)
- 48 - Burglary with injury
- 49 - Robbery with injury
- 50 - Child abuse/neglect
- 51 - Contempt
- 52 - Bribery
- 53 - Habitual offender
- 54 - Vagrancy
- 55 - Fugitive
- 56 - Failure to appear
- 57 - Escape/ AUOL
- 58 - Contributing to the delinquency of a minor
- 59 - False crime report
- 98 - Other
- 99 - Unknown what type offense - MISSING

ICPSR 9480

(PART 5: JUVENILE CRIMINALITY)

CASENO: 3 digit numeric case identification number.

GRP: Whether abuse/neglect or control group.

- 1 - Control
- 2 - Abuse/neglect

YR: Year of juvenile charge.

NUM: Each separate arrest incident numbered uniquely (i.e., may be more than one type juvenile charge for any arrest incident)

TYPE (OF OFFENSE): Charges pertaining only to juveniles:

- 0 - Delinquent child
- 1 - Runaway
- 2 - Beverage act/ minor in possession
- 3 - Truancy
- 4 - Ungovernable/incorrigible
- 5 - Curfew
- 6 - Injury to health

For other charges, coded as above for adults.