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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate on a knowledge and behavioural level the impact of a child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention programme called 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No'. A quasi-experimental design was used. The sample (n=55) consisted of an experimental group of twenty-eight children and a control group of twenty-seven. Prior to the educational programme being taught, ability, behavioural, and cognitive style measures were completed for each child. The parents of the children completed a pre- and post-questionnaire which provided socio-economic data, the advice given to their children on stranger abduction and their views on child sexual abuse prevention programmes. The children completed a pre- and post-knowledge test which included two vignettes on stranger abduction. With ethical safeguards to ensure no child was placed at risk, a subset (n=28) from both groups took part in a ‘blind’ simulation of a stranger abduction. Data were triangulated from these children, their parents and teachers, to evaluate if there was any evidence of desensitisation to approaches by strangers. The children were followed up for fifteen months to assess if they could generalise Programme strategies to real life situations. The study used both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

Both groups made significant knowledge gains which is inconsistent with findings in the literature. In the experimental group, the children with above average ability made the most knowledge gains. In the stranger vignettes, pre-test, both groups could predict that sexual assault was a likely outcome of abduction in the female vignette. In the post-test, the experimental group were more likely to predict that sexual assault was a likely outcome of stranger abduction in the male vignette. They were also more able to attribute fault appropriately for sexual assault in both vignettes.

In a paper and pencil exercise, the majority of children in both groups were able to identify the appropriate behaviour by a child when approached by a stranger. In contrast, there was evidence from the behavioural measure (simulation of a stranger abduction) that almost half of the children placed themselves at risk. Despite this, and the fact that both groups had similar pre- and post-test knowledge scores, the children in the experimental group were more likely to pass the simulation. The data did not support desensitisation to approaches by strangers. Possible factors contributing to vulnerability to stranger abduction are discussed in the text. In the fifteen-month follow-up, there were five reported incidents of children using Programme strategies as well as a child who used them to prevent an attempted abduction and rape. Parents fully supported the Programme and felt schools should take a lead role in child sexual abuse prevention.

This evaluation makes a contribution to the literature as Programme effectiveness was demonstrated in areas not examined in previous studies. Recommendations for further research which flow from the main findings of the study are considered. The thesis concludes with suggestions of the locus of school-based prevention programmes in a comprehensive strategy for the prevention of child abduction and child sexual assault.
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DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions and terms are used in this study:

i) **Abduction**
   Removal of a child by coercion, force or threats without parental consent. (This definition does not include children involved in custodial disputes between parents).

ii) **Child**
   A person under 16 years.

iii) **Child Sexual Abuse**
   According to Faller (1988 p. 11) child sexual abuse is defined as-
   
   "Any act occurring between people who are at different developmental stages which is for the sexual gratification of the person at the more advanced developmental stage. This definition assumes a diadic relationship. However, it is possible to have more than two people involved in a sexual abuse encounter, both victims and perpetrators. Ordinarily, the actors in sexual abuse are adults and children, but sometimes both victims and perpetrators are children. The perpetrator may be an adolescent and the victim a latency-aged younger child."

For the purpose of any child reporting usage of the programme, child sexual abuse is defined to include the above definition as well as the categories defined in Scottish Law Statutes:

- Plagium;
- Abduction;
- Incest;
- Indecent Assault;
- Indecent Exposure;
- Sodomy;
- Rape;
- Unlawful Intercourse;
- Lewd and Libidinous Practices;
- Child Prostitution and Child Pornography;

iv) **Pre-test**
   As used in this study, the pre-test refers to a paper and pencil instrument used to evaluate pupils' awareness and knowledge prior to treatment.

v) **Post-test**
   As used in this study, the post-test refers to a paper and pencil instrument used to evaluate the pupils' awareness and knowledge after treatment (or absence thereof in the case of the control group).
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

"The myth of childhood being a carefree, happy time persists despite scant evidence to substantiate it. On the contrary, there is much that frustrates, frightens and baffles the growing child just because of his inevitable lack of experience and power" (Pringle 1977 p.107).

Aim of the Study

In the writer's experience, the words of the late Mia Kellmer Pringle aptly capture some of the conflicts faced by children who have been sexually abused. It is, however, only in the last decade that child abduction and child sexual abuse have been widely recognised as a significant social problem in the western world. According to Rush (1980), child sexual abuse is not a new phenomenon; children have been sexually abused throughout history and across cultures. Furthermore, earlier this century, reports of it happening were sometimes attributed to Oedipal fantasies (Masson 1984).

Recent years have seen a dramatic increase in public awareness, media attention and legislation concerning child sexual abuse. Concerns reached new heights in England with the outcry over the professional handling of cases in Cleveland in 1987. This was followed by a public inquiry which brought to British public attention the reality of child sexual abuse as a serious contemporary social problem (Butler-Sloss 1988). More recently, following another public inquiry into action by police and social workers to remove children from their homes in Orkney, the problem received nationwide attention in Scotland (Clyde 1992).

In America, a popular aspect of efforts to prevent child abduction and sexual abuse has been the development of educational programmes, the majority of which are implemented in schools. The primary aims of these programmes are to provide children with knowledge
including ways to respond to abusive approaches and to aid children in disclosing abuse.

Despite a plethora of available programmes, their development has outstripped their evaluation. Although well-intentioned, there is little published research support for the conceptual assumptions (largely involving empowerment) upon which preventive education programmes are based. Additionally, there is limited empirical support of their effectiveness. The goal of this study, therefore, was to examine the impact of a specific educational child abduction and sexual abuse prevention programme, called 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' (National Film Board of Canada 1984)\(^1\) by comparing knowledge and behavioural outcomes between an experimental and a control group of children.

**Significance of the Problem**

The literature on child abduction in this country is sparse. However, there have been many surveys of child sexual abuse carried out in America. A telephone survey conducted by the Los Angeles Times (Crewdson 1988) is notable because it was large (involving 2,627 persons), it included both men and women, and consisted of a national sample. The results showed that 22% of respondents reported sexual victimisation as children - 27% of women and 16% of men. In contrast, the most comprehensive study of child sexual abuse in Britain, (Baker & Duncan 1985) showed the average prevalence rate was 10% (12% female, 8% male). What these findings indicate is that sexual abuse is a significant problem.

**Justification for Investigation of the Problem**

Intuitively, the notion of preventing child abduction and sexual abuse is attractive for both humanitarian and social cost reasons. Children have a right to be protected from such harm and society as a whole must assume responsibility for protecting future generations. While

\(^1\) Given the frequency of reference to the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme throughout this thesis, future sources of reference are omitted.
intervention to deal with the negative consequences of abuse can be seen as society's minimal responsibility, policies aimed at avoiding initial abuse are particularly attractive. A child should not have to experience harm before services become available and the public purse is spared significant costs of long-term therapeutic interventions. Therefore, the reasons for undertaking this study are significant since:-

- Research findings (elaborated in the Literature Review) in Britain (Baker & Duncan 1985), and more recently in Lothian Region (Anderson et al 1990), show that the incidence of attempted child abduction and sexual abuse by strangers may have been underestimated. Child abduction is a serious social problem, the motivation frequently being sexual assault of children, and the consequences, more often than not, resulting in a child's death.

- Child abduction and sexual abuse are serious social problems. The consequences suffered by victims require intervention by, and resources from, a variety of different agencies to help them through the trauma. Any attempt at prevention must, therefore, be viewed seriously.

- Given the considerable resources and manpower from a variety of different agencies presently assigned to post-sexual abuse disclosures and treatment, it is postulated that educational prevention programmes may be cost effective.

- Unlike intra-familial abuse, the concepts in prevention programmes surrounding stranger abduction are clearly delineated, more concrete, and therefore more readily understood by children (Conte et al 1985). This, therefore, makes this study more feasible than one focusing on familial abuse.

- In the past, a side-effect of child sexual abuse prevention programmes has been disclosure by children of past or on-going abuse. If disclosures are handled appropriately, it is suggested that such programmes may prevent some of the longer term effects of abuse and thus be more cost-effective.

- Whilst acknowledging their shortcomings, the research findings (fully addressed in the Literature Review) show that a child is more likely to be sexually abused by someone known to them, ethically, such a situation would be impossible to simulate. The
behavioural measure in this study - the simulation of a stranger abduction - is the nearest ethical measurement to project a child's ability to respond appropriately to such threats. To the writer's knowledge, this study is one of only four and the first British study, which has used the simulation technique in relation to child abduction.

- As this study involves new areas of inquiry, it contributes to empirical knowledge. It also sheds further light on which Programme concepts are best understood by children.
- Previous evaluations of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme have already provided valuable information for educationalists and social workers on policy and practice matters (Sigurdson et al 1986; Hamilton 1989; Hazzard et al 1991). This evaluation makes a further contribution to the effectiveness of this Programme in particular, and to the field of child protection in general.
- As it is Lothian Regional Educational Council policy that the implementation of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme in schools involves in-service training for teachers, a related spin-off may be that the greater awareness of the problem by teachers will provide better protection for children.

Definition of the Problem

Concern by professionals in Lothian Region for children who were abducted and the increased reporting of child sexual abuse are the primary reasons which precipitated the decision to utilise and evaluate a school-based prevention programme. Additional considerations included :-

- The time required to investigate such cases.
- The long-term effects suffered by many victims.
- The lack of resources to treat victims.
- The stress experienced by social workers in this work.
- The problems of working in an area with many unresolved conflicts which have surrounded practice issues over the years.
Moreover, there is a paucity of research as to how children can best protect themselves from child abduction and sexual abuse, which children are most likely to be at risk of abduction, resulting in an ever growing social problem which can have dire human costs (Finkelhor 1986).

Programmes which aim to teach children how to protect themselves from sexual assault are gradually being adopted from America and developed in Britain. Children, parents and teachers feel very positive about them. An expanding body of research literature is available which is beginning to answer questions about prevention programme effectiveness. According to Conte & Fogarty (1989), some unanswered questions remain which include:

"do children learn the prevention concepts, are they able to generalise this knowledge to new situations, and can they apply the prevention strategies in potentially dangerous situations in the real world? " (p.7).

It is these issues which constitute the main areas of inquiry in this study and are detailed in the research questions which follow.

**The Research Questions**

1. Is there any difference in the gain in mean knowledge scores between the experimental and control group?

2. Is there any difference in the gain in mean knowledge scores between the experimental and control group between children of different:
   i) background characteristics?
   ii) ability ratings?
   iii) behavioural scores?
   iv) cognitive styles?

3. Is there any difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to predict sexual assault as a likely consequence of stranger abduction?

4. Is there any difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to attribute fault appropriately for sexual assault?
5. Is there any difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group?

6. Is there any difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group between children of different:
   i) background characteristics?
   ii) ability ratings?
   iii) behavioural scores?
   iv) cognitive styles?

These six research questions formed the null hypotheses.

The other research questions examined:

7. What characteristics make children vulnerable to abduction?

8. Does the simulation method desensitise children to approaches by strangers?

9. What are the children's perceptions of a stranger?

10. What are the children's views of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme?

11. What are the parents' views of child sexual abuse prevention programmes?

12. Are children able to generalise knowledge and skills from the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme to real life situations?

It is acknowledged that the last research question could not be tested. However, given the incidence of sexual abuse, the writer followed the children through for fifteen months to assess if any of the Programme strategies were used in potential or actual dangerous situations.

Study Organisation

At the outset of this study, contact was made with experts and researchers (see Appendix 1) in the child sexual abuse prevention field to obtain details of the current state of knowledge and any proposed research studies. The first chapter has described the aims of the study. The significance of the problem and justification for its investigation have been explained. The research questions have been detailed. The
second chapter, presented in two parts, addresses the literature and has been drawn from two main bodies of the social sciences. The theoretical frameworks considered in part one of the Literature Review are those of sexual abuse and sexual abuse prevention. Part two, focuses on the field of education and, in particular, the areas of cognitive development, social learning and self-efficacy theories and their relevance for child abduction and sexual abuse prevention curricula. These theories are the key paradigms which drive this study, directly inform the research aims as well as being compatible with the age of the subjects in this study.

Chapter Three describes the theories and objectives which have shaped child sexual abuse prevention programmes. A description of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme follows. The teaching methods are then described before concluding with a discussion on the importance of the role of evaluation in child sexual abuse prevention programmes. Chapter Four describes the research design and methods. Chapters Five, Six, Seven and Eight present the analyses of the data.

The limitations of the study, an examination of the implications of the findings and recommendations for future research are presented in Chapter Nine. Chapter Ten concludes the thesis with an examination of the wider issues which emerge from the key findings of the study and includes a discussion of the locus of prevention programmes in a global strategy of child sexual abuse prevention.

Part one of the Literature Review follows.
"We took thousands of years to discover child abuse. Maybe there will be a backlash, because it is difficult to detect and expensive to investigate. But there are subtle ramifications to the non-discovery of child sexual abuse that we must be aware of. Unfortunately, for a long time, we simply did not listen to the child in pain" (Rust 1986 p.19).

Introduction

The above quotation is a reminder that child sexual abuse has been ignored in the past and it has taken a long time for the voices of victims to be heard. However, as many victims played a major role in the recognition of sexual abuse as a phenomenon and the subsequent development of child sexual abuse prevention programmes, their contribution to our understanding of this problem has been considerable. Therefore, to understand more fully the genesis of child sexual abuse educational programmes and the rationale for their usage, it is necessary to have some understanding of the wider areas of child sexual abuse which have informed and caused concern over the years. Consequently, the Literature Review is presented in two parts. Part one is in two sections. Section one addresses the following areas of the literature :-

- Child abuse: History and background.
- Emergence of the child sexual field.
- Definitional issues.
- Summary of definitional issues.
- Incidence rates of child sexual abuse.
- Incidence rates of child sexual abuse in Great Britain.
- Incidence of abduction.
- Children who sexually abuse.
A Summary of the extent of the problem.
A Effects of child sexual abuse.
A Theories of sexual abuse.
A Summary of the effects of child sexual abuse.

Section two covers the sexual abuse prevention literature as it relates to the research aims of this study and examines the following topics:

A Rationale for prevention.
A Emergence of the prevention field.
A Children most at risk.
A Victimisation process.
A Summary of children most at risk.
A Evaluation of prevention programmes.
A Knowledge studies.
A Programme comparisons.
A Touch discrimination.
A Skills acquisition.
A Behavioural evaluations.
A Evaluations relevant to this study.
A Generalisation of Programme strategies.
A Unanticipated consequences.
A Disclosures.
A Parental involvement in general prevention programmes.
A Parental involvement in child abuse prevention programmes.
A Parental involvement in child sexual abuse prevention programmes.
A Summary of evaluation findings.
A The contribution of this study to the literature
A A comprehensive strategy for preventing child sexual abuse.

Section two of the Review focuses on the literature relating to the cognitive development of children and its implications for child sexual abuse prevention curricula.
SECTION ONE - CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Child Abuse: History and Background

Lynch (1985), in her literature review, 'Child Abuse Before Kempe,' noted physicians being aware as early as the third century that those caring for children were capable of physical abuse, rejection and neglect of their charges. As early as 1946, John Caffey, a radiologist, became concerned about children with abnormal bone fractures. His study, for a medical journal, suggested that such fractures could be attributed to intentional abuse. The article was published without any reference to deliberate abuse, although inferences to this effect could be drawn by those reading the study.

The phenomenon of child abuse began to be accepted following the publication of an article by Kempe et al (1962). This publication was a landmark in the recognition of child abuse as a serious contemporary social problem. Kempe & Helfer (1968) subsequently expanded the ideas presented in Kempe's earlier article to the professional and public communities. As a result, child protective services, parent support groups and legislation to stiffen punishment for abusers began to emerge along with a new emphasis upon treatment and theory regarding this phenomenon.

The problem of the physical abuse of children has not disappeared and the 1980's witnessed three major inquiries in Britain by the London Boroughs of Brent (1985) -'A Child in Trust', Lambeth (1987) -'Whose Child' and Greenwich (1987) -'A Child in Mind', which were the focus of much public and professional concern.

Emergence of the Child Sexual Abuse Field

During the late seventies, frequent articles emerged in the literature which primarily addressed the problem of incest. The increase in awareness of sexual abuse began to have an impact on reporting. The actual rate of child sexual abuse remains unknown, but some studies
(Peters et al 1986; Russel 1983) indicated that it was far more common than previously estimated. There was also evidence that it could leave victims with an aftermath of psychological, social and emotional problems (Daugherty 1986).

Butler (1986) asserted that a major agent influencing recognition of child sexual abuse as a phenomenon was the rise of the Feminist Movement. A conference in 1971 of New York Radical Feminists brought attention to women's experiences of rape. Recommendations stemming from the conference included psychological and physical self defence and education for children in schools. More important, was a redefining of sexual abuse by feminists. Unlike child welfare workers, these feminists began to connect the concept of power and gender issues to sexual abuse. Their view was that sexual abuse was primarily a male behaviour, a consequence of male socialisation, which tacitly sanctioned violence against those less powerful i.e. women and children.

Definitional Issues

According to Schultz (1982), the protection of children's sexual integrity has emerged slowly and incrementally over several hundred years in both criminal and protective social services. According to Mrazek & Kempe (1981) whether such behaviour has been defined as abuse, has been dependent on the societal values of the period (e.g. rape within marriage which has only recently been accepted as an offence in Scotland) or cultural norms (e.g. the Kiwai of New Guinea which require young males to be sodomised during puberty rites). Furthermore, sexual behaviour which has in some cases been defined as normal at one period or another in history, has occasionally later been considered as immoral, then as criminal, and later still, as psychopathological.

The wider field of child abuse is an area replete with vague and inconsistent definitions (Besharov 1981; Leventhal 1982). The former asserted that definitions used in this field cause many problems in interpretation and synthesis of findings because:
"(i) they lack comparability,  
(ii) they are imprecise causing problems with measurement reliability,  
(iii) they lack taxonomic delineation: there are many types of child abuse and studies tend to lump them all together without allowance for, or studying differences, on this dimension e.g. some definitions combine sexual and physical abuse, despite clear differences between them (p. 48)."

The term child sexual abuse is used widely by professional and lay people with the implicit, if not explicit, understanding that the term has the same meaning for all. As a result of this myth, many statistics or comments about child sexual abuse are accepted as if the phenomenon being described is uniquely defined. However, as noted by Atteberry-Bennett & Repucci (1986):

"A review of the literature suggests that total agreement, even where sexual intercourse has taken place between an adult and child, does not exist" (p.1).

Mrazek & Mrazek (1980) expanded this debate and asserted that it may be even harder to define child sexual abuse as the term is often interchanged with terms like pornography, exhibitionism, touching, intercourse, molestation and child rape. Other writers, (e.g. Conte et al 1989; Courtois & Watts 1982), noted a huge variability in the sexual behaviours researchers included in their definitions. With no standardised definition, Lafontaine (1988) suggested that the common usage of the label 'child sexual abuse' conceals the different meanings which may be attached to it.

The issues surrounding the definition of child sexual abuse in Britain are similarly problematic to those described by American authors. Indeed, the countries which make up Great Britain operate under separate legal frameworks and statutes, and thus, operate under totally different philosophies and definitions. For example, in Scotland the philosophy is one of a 'Welfare Model' under The Children's Hearing system whereas, in England, it is a 'Justice Model' in a Juvenile Court. To further complicate matters, in Scotland, the definition of sexual abuse (for the same offence) differs between the systems to protect children and prosecute offenders and two different levels of proof are also required. To elaborate, a hearing before a sheriff or judge under the rules of evidence for The Children's Hearing system requires a
level of proof stated as "on the balance of probabilities." On the other hand, a trial (also before a sheriff or judge) to convict a perpetrator requires a level of proof stated as "beyond all reasonable doubt." Consequently, what may be defined as sexual abuse in the legal system which protects children in Scotland, may fail to reach the rigorous requirements in the criminal system to convict a perpetrator. In the writer's experience, this conflict has caused many victims to feel confused and bewildered.

Another complicating factor in defining child sexual abuse in Scotland is that, other than incest, no such specific category exists for making a referral to the Reporter to the Children's Hearing. Thus, all such cases are referred under one of the following four legal grounds:

i) Through lack of parental care he/she is falling into bad associations or is exposed to moral danger; or

ii) The lack of care as aforesaid is likely to cause him/her unnecessary suffering or seriously impair his health or development; or

iii) Any of the offences mentioned in Schedule I of the Children and Young Persons (Scotland) Act 1937 has been committed in respect of him/her or in respect of a child who is a member of the same household; or

iv) The child, being a female, is a member of the same household as a female in respect of whom an offence which constitutes the crime of incest has been committed by a member of that household."

There is no category for children who have been abducted.

Another difficulty with defining sexual abuse in Scotland (and this also applies in the British context) is that a major part of the responsibility for protecting children 'at risk' lies with Child Protection Committees. These Committees have been established under Government Guidelines. They largely depend on the goodwill of local authorities for their operation and the resources to carry out their responsibilities, one of which is the overview of children on their 'At Risk Registers.' Unfortunately, there is no agreed criterion/criteria for the registration
of children who have been sexually abused. From an English perspective, it was noted by Butler-Sloss (1988) in 'The Report of the Inquiry into Child Abuse in Cleveland' that both legal and medical definitions were too restrictive, at times relying too much on physical sequela to the incident to register children on these registers.

According to Finkelhor (1986), it is also important to note that the definition of sexual abuse may also vary across four dimensions:

i) the nature of the relationship between participants and whether or not they are living together,

ii) the types of sexual act involved suggests that the type of act is likely to have a considerable differential impact on the child,

iii) information on the ages and relative developmental level of the participants,

iv) where possible, the familial, community and cultural context in which the abuse occurred.

For example one of the most widely referenced definitions by Schecter & Roberge (1976) described sexual abuse as:

"The involvement of dependent, developmentally immature children and adolescents in sexual activities that they do not fully comprehend, or are unable to give informed consent to, and that violate the social taboos of family roles" (p.154).

It is worth noting that this definition does not include children who sexually abuse other children; yet, as will be demonstrated later in this Review, they form a sizable population of abusers.

Summary of Definitional Issues

What has emerged is that it is difficult to both categorise and define sexual abuse. Furthermore, sexual abuse occurs across several dimensions within different legal and cultural norms. This lack of shared definition has profound implications for our knowledge and understanding of the entire field of child sexual abuse because problem solutions are frequently determined on the basis of problem definition (Caplan & Nelson 1973). In any field, unambiguous definitions and
clear descriptions of phenomena are critical for research. In the absence of a specific definition, professionals and researchers require careful descriptions of exactly which types of sexual abuse are being studied within which legal and cultural frameworks. One other important aspect of definitional issues is that the type of definition employed can affect the prevalence and incidence figures, the next topic under consideration.

**Incidence of Child Sexual Abuse**

As described previously, the incidence of child sexual abuse is ill-defined and the size of the problem difficult to estimate because figures depend very much on the way in which they are produced. They are not only affected by the definition of abuse but also by the sources of information and methods of research used. Therefore, the difficulties of establishing anything like an accurate assessment are formidable. The characteristics of the problem itself present barriers to research: the sexual abuse of children is normally a clandestine activity without adult witnesses. It is, therefore, virtually impossible to obtain a truly accurate picture of the problem. Furthermore, many victims are unwilling or unable to talk for various reasons - fear, shame, guilt and the quite justifiable feeling that they may not be believed or that, if believed, they will be seen as somehow tainted by the experience. The exposure of sexual abuse disturbs widely held and deeply felt convictions: many people would prefer not to know or not to tell what they know. Few people can be entirely neutral about sexual abuse.

Estimates of both the incidence (number of cases per year) and prevalence (proportion of the population affected) vary considerably. Despite disagreement over its actual incidence, there is almost unanimous agreement that sexual abuse is the fastest growing form of child abuse (Finkelhor 1986; NSPCC 1989; Lothian Regional Council Annual Report to the Children's Hearing 1990/91). Estimates of the scale of the problem in the United States and Britain have tended to come from either cases reported to various agencies or survey studies of adults. There are limitations to the reliability of both these sources.
Regarding referrals of cases to various agencies, it is recognised that large numbers go unreported each year. Some of the reasons for this are to be found in the difficulties in documenting abuse: without physical evidence and/or adult witnesses a child may not be believed or evidence may not hold up in court. Furthermore, the suspicion may be so vague that it is not reported, while family pressures may also cause children to retract when a complaint has been valid (Summit 1983). In addition, according to MacFarlane & Waterman (1986), preschool children may not be able to communicate effectively about events or may be unaware that the behaviour of the abuser is anything unusual. This would also be particularly relevant to children with disabilities.

Of the many surveys carried out in America, as noted in Chapter One, Crewdson (1988), recorded that 22% of respondents reported sexual victimisation as children - 27% of women and 16% of men. Surveys, partly because of definitional differences, sampling and interview format have yielded a wide range of prevalence estimates in the United States. Peters et al (1986) found that estimates of sexual abuse varied across studies from 6 - 62%. The situation is compounded in that response rates to surveys may also affect results giving different prevalence rates. Two perhaps valid, but somewhat contradictory hypotheses, concerning surveys response rates are that:

i) fewer victims respond due to the difficulty of recounting their experiences, and,

ii) more victims participate due to their desire to tell their story.

These methodological difficulties mean that there can be an over- or under-representation of victims.

A final, serious source of inaccuracy in surveys, which is probably unavoidable, lies in the assumptions about sexual abuse which are taken for granted. These affect the methods used in a survey. The first assumption is that sexual abuse is randomly distributed among the population or it is assumed that each individual has the same chance as anyone else of being abused. A random sample of individuals would thus reflect the prevalence rate in the population as a whole.
The second assumption follows from the first. If sexual abuse affects individuals, then a random survey will only record a few individuals in each locality as though incidents of sexual abuse were evenly distributed geographically. However, in the writer's experience, siblings of a victim are more likely to have been abused. Moreover, reports in the press have also shown that numerous children in a specific locality can be involved in abuse by paedophiles. From time to time, there is a scandal involving many children abused in residential institutions such as children's homes or schools, sometimes over many years. Recording only a few individuals in any area makes it inevitable that some clusters of abused individuals will also be missed.

Estimates of the incidence of child sexual abuse in the United States such as Bander et al (1982) have been based on documented cases. Reviewing reports received by the American Humane Association's Clearing-House (1981) on Child Abuse, they concluded the problem affects 10.4% of American families each year. The accuracy of this estimate was called into question by Finkelhor (1984) who pointed out that in 1978 (the year of data collection) only thirty-one states submitted information. As highlighted by Russell (1983), the problem is compounded because of under-reporting - although 16% of her random sample experienced intra-familial abuse and 31% experienced abuse outwith the family before the age of eighteen, only 2% and 6% of the incidents respectively were officially reported.

Additional doubts regarding the accuracy of incident rates have been raised by other researchers. Groth et al (1982b) surveyed convicted sex offenders and concluded that these men commit many more crimes than they were actually apprehended for. In a similar, but more recent study, Conte et al (1989) reported that convicted sex offenders had abused between one and forty children, with an average of seven per offender. However, as surmised by Abel et al (1987), there are problems in studying only convicted sexual offenders as the data obtained may differ from the tendencies of those offenders who are not convicted. Despite guarantees of anonymity, there is also potential that incarcerated subjects will misrepresent their offences due to fears of being denied parole.
Incidence of Child Sexual Abuse in Great Britain

The problems which have bedevilled consistency and comparative analyses in the American studies are no better in Britain. In fact, the situation appears worse. Unlike America, there is no mandatory reporting laws, no National Child Abuse Register, no nationally agreed criteria for those children who appear on Local Authority 'At Risk' Registers and no Government overview of the problem. With a view to establishing existing difficulties, seven sources of incidence and prevalence figures in Britain have been examined:


iii) Childline Figures (1.9.91 - 29.2.92).


i) Beezley-Mrazek, Lynch & Bentovim Study (1983)

Beezley-Mrazek et al's (1983) study drew data from several hundred questionnaire returns from a number of different professional groups. Despite a low response rate of 39%, ranging from 16% for family doctors to 56% for police surgeons, it is important as it is one of the few British surveys. The total number of cases of sexual abuse reported for the year 1.6.77 to 31.5.78 was 1,072. Police surgeons saw the largest percentage of cases - 81% of the total; child psychiatrists - 15%; paediatricians - 3%; and family doctors - 1%. This weighting in favour of police surgeons inevitably skewed the results. Moreover, the majority of cases reported involved actual or attempted intercourse. This would not necessarily, however, be representative of the type of abuse suffered nor would it indicate the true size of the problem of child sexual abuse. Extrapolation to the general population, however, revealed an annual incidence of over 1,500 cases per

---

2 The Police and Social Work Departments do not share co-terminus boundaries.
year, that is an incidence of about one case per 6,000 children per year, and about three per 1,000 over childhood age.

ii) Baker & Duncan (1985) Study
This study, the most comprehensive of child sexual abuse in Britain, showed the average prevalence rate was 10% - 12% female, 8% male. The survey was retrospective with the inherent problems previously described. It also used a very wide definition of abuse, including exhibitionism and sexual remarks, resulting in a higher incident rate of stranger abuse.

iii) Childline Figures (1/9/91 - 29/2/92)
This report from Childline (Scotland) showed that 7,843 children were counselled on a variety of social problems. Of these, 1,098 (14%) related to sexual abuse. In cases where children were willing to disclose where they were calling from, 104 enquiries were received from children in Lothian Region.

iv) Scottish Criminal Statistics (1989/90)
The fourth source of data for incidence rates has been obtained from the Scottish Home and Health Department. In Appendix 2 a comparison of these statistics (Table A2:1) is made with the Lothian & Borders police figures. The data in Table A2:1 shows that from the nine Scottish Regions, of the five offences for plagium, (theft of a child - often used to alert the presiding sheriff or judge of the need to clear the court) three were in Lothian Region. Additionally, twenty nine (22%) of all abductions (this offence also includes adults) occurred in the Lothian & Borders police area. Caution is urged in the interpretation of these statistics as in each cases of multiple offences, every offence is recorded i.e. where a child has been abducted, sexually assaulted and murdered, three separate offences would be recorded.
The data in Table A2:2 (Appendix 2) show that approximately nine children were reported weekly as being possible victims of sexual assault. The reader is reminded that some the adult statistics (any person over sixteen) such as incest, will have started in childhood. Additionally, fourteen children were reported as having been abducted. These figures also cause one to speculate that some training on how to avoid sexual assault might have reduced these figures. What the statistics do not tell us, however, is the relationship of the perpetrator to the victim as the police were unable to provide this information.

vi) Lothian and Strathclyde Regions' Child Protection Registers
In the absence of nationally agreed criteria, registration on Child Protection Registers tends to be inconsistent. The route to registration is via a case conference and can be problematic in child sexual abuse cases for the following reasons:-

- The evidence is often not available to register a child and while suspicions may remain, many children in the writer’s experience do not proceed to registration. On the other hand, a child is just as likely to be registered on grounds of suspicion only.

- Some professionals, particularly general practitioners will not call a case conference (James, Womack & Strauss 1978) or, are reluctant to do so, less they compromise the Hippocratic Oath. This situation continues, despite the fact the British Medical Association has issued guidelines advising that where a child is deemed to be 'at risk', the oath should be compromised.

- There is evidence from more than one source (Dunning & Boddy 1989; Taylor 1988) of bias towards the reporting of child abuse in lower socio-economic groups. In the study by Taylor (1988) which explored how various professionals reached the decision that a child was being abused, it was rarely the case that 'primary danger cues', - that is the physical condition and behaviour of the child, determined such judgements. More often than not, it was
'secondary danger cues' - a great deal of social workers' attention was directed at the economic and social conditions of the family concerned.

- Lastly, it is unknown in the writer's twenty-two years experience of working in the field of child abuse for the police to call a case conference where a child has been abducted by a stranger. If the child is found alive their home is deemed to be a safe place for them. For this reason, these children neither appear on a Child Protection Register nor in referrals to the Reporter to the Children's Hearing.

Despite these limitations, Lothian Region's Child Protection Register showed a steady increase of children being registered for sexual abuse (Lothian Region Child Protection Committee Annual Report 1993); sexual abuse constituted 183 (23%) of the 796 children registered. In contrast, the neighbouring local authority, Strathclyde, the largest in Britain, has had to deal with a fivefold increase in child abuse cases in five years (Glasgow Herald 3.8.91). Of the 1,724 children on the Register, 328 were recorded as having been, or suspected of having been, sexually abused. The highest number of registrations for sexual abuse was of primary school-aged children. The age range included 95 children under the age of four, 118 aged between five and ten, and 115 aged between eleven and sixteen.

vii) The Reporter to the Children's Hearing in Lothian Region
As already discussed under definitional issues, with the exception of incest, no specific category of sexual abuse exists of referral to the Reporter for sexual assault. Referrals are made under one of the four categories previously outlined on page 13. Additionally, as the system of referrals is not yet computerised, no refined analyses were available. Despite this, it is significant that the 1988/89 Annual Report of the Children's Hearing (Lothian Regional Council) showed the total for these four categories to be well over a thousand:
"and yet again showing an increase in the previous year's total, are the highest yet recorded" (p.6).

For the first time, the following year's report (Lothian Regional Council 1989/90) gave a breakdown of child abuse cases. The data revealed that 261 cases of alleged sexual abuse were referred to the Reporter, constituting almost a quarter of the 1090 alleged cases of child abuse. According to the 1990/91 Report (Lothian Regional Council) 429 reports of child sexual abuse were referred, showing an increase of 65% from the previous year. No further analyses of these referrals were available.

Having reviewed the studies in America and Great Britain, it can be concluded that in the absence of a reliable data base, it is difficult to gauge how readily the figures on child sexual abuse can be extrapolated to the population in general. Considerable variation exists amongst prevalence studies, depending on the methodology employed. In looking for trends in incidence figures, there exists the danger that bias in reporting might wrongly locate the problem in only one sector of the population. One thing the studies do demonstrate, however, is that child sexual abuse is not a minor problem and that reporting is on the increase.

Incidence of Abduction

A related crime against children which has received considerable attention in recent years is that of abduction. It received nationwide publicity in Britain following the disappearances, subsequent sexual assaults and murders of Caroline Hogg and Susan Maxwell in Lothian & Borders Region, and Sarah Harper, in Leeds. A fairly recent abduction and sexual assault in Lothian & Borders of a six year old child was described by Lord Fraser as a "horrific, appalling case" (Independent 11/8/90). A life sentence was passed for the first time in Scotland for the abduction and sexual assault of a child. The media continues to report regularly on other abductions e.g. Gemma Lawrence (aged seven), who was abducted from a holiday caravan and sexually assaulted (Scotsman 14/2/91) and Simon Jones (aged four),
who was abducted and imprisoned in a men's hostel (Independent 12/6/91).

Abduction may involve an estranged parent or a complete stranger. In the United States, it was estimated that at least 150,000 children are kidnapped annually, 50,000 of whom were abducted by strangers (Mackey 1983). No British figures are available. In Britain, in their sample of 2,019 males and females aged over fifteen years, Baker and Duncan (1985) found a prevalence rate of 51% of stranger abuse, 43% males and 56% females (albeit they used a wider definition of sexual assault than many of the American studies). Furthermore, in a survey of young people and crime in Edinburgh involving 1150 children aged eleven to fourteen years, Anderson et al (1990) threw further light on the problem of approaches by strangers. The findings revealed:

"Of a total sample of 406 girls 26% had experience of importuning. We have also seen that, on the most recent occasion, 38% of the men concerned were known to the victim. On this basis, one in ten of our total sample had been importuned by a man known to a girl, while more than one in six had been importuned by a stranger" (p.53).

While this in itself is worrying, the researchers further reported that less than one in five (18.5%) incidents were reported to the police. This concurs with the projected figures of the British Crime Survey (Hough & Mayhew 1985) which estimated that only one in five sexual offences are reported to the police. However, some caution is urged in the interpretation of these statistics as an exceptionally wide definition of sexual assault was used which included categories under harassment which do not constitute a sexual offence in Scotland.

Another source of data on abduction - the Scottish Criminal Statistics (Appendix 2 - Table A2:1) showed an omnibus total of 130 abductions in the year 1990. However, not only does the figure include adults who were abducted, but the relationship of the perpetrator is unknown. As an important aside, the Metropolitan Police do not have a computerised system to deal specifically with missing children. A survey carried out by the National Children's Home revealed that 61%

---

3 Importuning was defined as whether during the previous nine months subjects had "felt frightened by men doing any of the following things: Touching you or trying to touch you? Asking you to touch them? Trying to get you to go somewhere with them? Indecently exposing themselves to you?"
of children in their night shelters were not known to police (BBC Newsnight 21/2/90). Thus, there is scant evidence of the incidence of abduction in Britain.

Following the recent abduction and murder of Achlaq Ahmed whilst his father and uncle watched a cricket match (Independent 27/7/93) and an attempted abduction of a child locally, Lothian Borders Police issued a warning to parents (BBC Reporting Scotland 28/7/93). As well as asking parents to be more vigilant in the supervision of their children, the statement confirmed an increase in reported abductions of children - ten - during the previous ten months in the Lothian & Borders area.

Although the risk of abduction needs to be put into perspective, according to a recent survey (Elliot 1993) of 1,000 parents questioned, the latter felt their children were more at risk from abduction than from drugs, alcohol, horror videos or violence on television. The survey, 'How Safe Are Our Children,' reported that in London, 98% of parents rated abduction more highly than any other fear, whilst 96% of parents in country areas did likewise.

From the review of the limited data on abduction, the two British studies (which used a wide definition of abuse) appear to suggest that the possibility of abuse by a stranger may be more commonplace than previously suggested in the American literature. Furthermore, although parental fears of abduction may well be unfounded relative to other behaviours which could adversely affect their children's health, the only British survey found that abduction is a subject, about which, parents have deep concerns.

**Children Who Sexually Abuse**

In spite of all the difficulties in collecting accurate standardised statistics, a variety of research studies have provided some information about sexual abuse perpetrated by children and young people. The results display a striking consistency. Finkelhor (1979), in his retrospective survey of adults concerning abusive experiences in
childhood, reported that 33.6% of those who abused girls and 39.1% of those who abused boys were between the ages of ten and nineteen.

From a British perspective, in a study in Northern Ireland (Royal Belfast Hospital for Sick Children 1990), conducted between January and December 1987, the researchers concluded that in a sample of 408 established cases of sexual abuse, 36.1% involved a teenage perpetrator. In another study, Hengller (1989) estimated that 36% of child sexual abuse cases involved a juvenile perpetrator. Furthermore, in a study of sexual abuse investigations in Liverpool, carried out between 1989-90, Horne et al (1991) found that 34.3% of allegations involved children or young persons abusing another child or young person. The findings showed 35% of children aged eight to twelve years and 59% thirteen to seventeen years. Lastly, in a study by Monck et al (1991) 15% - 20% of cases of intra-familial abuse involved a child or young person as the perpetrator. Whilst this is a lower rate than the other studies, unlike the others, cases of abuse outwith the family were excluded.

In conclusion, the data from these studies has provided evidence that children form a sizable population of abusers including children in the same age range as those in this study who also constitute a primary target population for prevention programmes.

Summary of the Extent of the Problem

The research findings relating to the incidence and prevalence rates of child sexual abuse lead to the conclusion that child sexual abuse is a serious and growing problem. In an effort to estimate the hidden incidence, Tsai & Wagner (1978) stated that this problem is probably five to ten times the reported rates. As referred to earlier in the Review, this is also supported in the findings of the British Crime Survey (Hough & Mayhew 1985). Consequently, there is a large hidden problem.

Rates of incidence are not, however, entirely objective. It is difficult, therefore, to extrapolate from any one study to the population at large. Incidence figures, which tend to be lower than prevalence figures, are
likely to be biased towards reporting in the lower socio-economic groups. They may also under-represent sexual abuse which has less overt signs than other forms of abuse and is therefore less likely to be reported. Prevalence studies also suffer from methodological problems; in surveys of sexual abuse, there may be an over- or under-representation of victims. Moreover, many of the sources which record incident and prevalence rates of sexual abuse in Britain are skewed in favour of intra-familial abuse. Additionally, sexual abuse by young people, including children in the same age range as those in this study, may be more commonplace than previously thought.

Whilst noting their shortcomings, the data sources in Britain, Scotland and Lothian Region all show an increase in the incidence rates of sexual abuse. As confirmed by Waterhouse & Cairnie (1989):

"People may dispute exact figures and percentages, they may highlight the pain and injustice suffered by innocent families in an insensitive system, but few could still surely doubt that child sexual abuse is occurring on a sufficiently worrying scale as to warrant urgent professional action" (p.33).

In relation to abduction, the data on incident and prevalence rates in Britain are sparse. With the proviso that these surveys included a very wide definition of sexual abuse, approaches by strangers, specifically in Lothian Region, may be more commonplace than previously thought (Anderson et al 1990; Baker & Duncan 1985). Despite the data limitations, stranger abduction is an issue which causes parents real concern even though the risk to their children does not justify the level of their fears. Nevertheless, abduction is a very serious offence against children, more often than not, resulting in the sexual assault and death of a child.

Effects of Child Sexual Abuse

In light of the potential numbers of children involved, the nature of the abuse and the lack of knowledge into the activities of child sexual abusers, in terms of the outcome for victims Daugherty (1986) stated:

"our answer to this question is shockingly simple - we don't know! But fortunately we are finding out" (p.4).
She cited a number of reasons for our lack of knowledge concerning the effects of child sexual abuse victimisation:-

- Difficulties in identifying victims.
- Lack of systematic methods for classifying, recording and reporting incidents.
- Limited efforts to follow the progress of former victims on a long term basis.

Butler (1986) postulated that knowledge of immediate effects comes from descriptions of the problems encountered by victims identified as children and from retrospective reports of adults victimised as children. While physical trauma or sexually transmissible disease may result from abuse, behavioural and psychological effects are more often recognised in children. These include:-

- Feelings of confusion e.g. fear; anxiety; anger; shame; guilt.\(^4\)
- Sleep and eating disturbances e.g. nightmares; anorexia.
- Physical complaints e.g. irritability; aggressiveness; enuresis; encopresis; regression; acting-out behaviours; rebelliousness.
- Running away and antisocial acts.

Groth et al (1982) found that the majority of child molesters they worked with had been sexually abused as children and concluded that feelings of powerlessness as a victim are sometimes overcome by becoming the aggressor. Surveys have also made a contribution to our knowledge of the long term effects of abuse. Studies by Briere & Runtz (1988) and Stein et al (1988) have demonstrated that the association reported by many clinicians between a history of having been sexually abused and later psychological and social problems is not simply an artefact of retrospective studies of clinical populations. An examination of the general population of individuals who have been sexually abused, most of whom have never sought help, revealed that the risk for mental health impairment in this group is significantly greater (often two to three times higher) than for others in the

\(^4\) This can include responsibility for both the event happening and subsequent family break-up, and in the writer's experience can seriously inhibit victim recovery.
population. The risk is particularly high for outcomes such as depression, alcohol or drug abuse, anxiety disorders, sexual disorders and suicidal behaviour. The findings have also shown that victims of sexual abuse are about two to four times more likely to experience later additional assaults as adults compared to people who have not been abused.

The important issue for the development of treatment strategies is how childhood experiences, such as the traumatic experience of sexual abuse, lead to these adult disorders. From a mental health standpoint, it is crucial to make sense of the processes between childhood and adulthood because these constitute the window for treatment.

Over and above emotional and psychological consequences, victims, especially those subjected to various forms of intercourse, may have very understandable fears about physical injury, pregnancy, venereal disease HIV and AIDS. Vass (1987) observed that the focus of the Government’s AIDS education programme to encourage ‘safe sex’ and responsible choice of sexual partner offers little comfort to those who have little or no choice in the matter and are, consequently, exposed to extremely unsafe sex with potentially promiscuous abusers.

Butler (1986) asserted the effects of sexual abuse may be tempered by :-
- The prior emotional stability of the child and family;
- Intensity, duration, frequency and nature of the abuse;
- Child’s age and developmental stage;
- Relationship of victim to perpetrator e.g. intra-familial abuse versus stranger abuse and the context of disclosure e.g. when, how, and if abuse is disclosed;
- The reaction of other family members and the community to disclosure.

Theories of Sexual Abuse

Browne & Finkelhor (1984) have proposed the most comprehensive conceptual framework to date for understanding the effects of child sexual abuse, termed 'The Traumagenic Model.' As they noted:
"The experience of sexual abuse can be analyzed in terms of four trauma-causative factors, or traumagenic dynamics, traumatic sexualisation, stigmatisation, betrayal and powerlessness. These traumagenic dynamics are generalized dynamics not necessarily unique to sexual abuse; they occur in other kinds of trauma, but the conjunction of these four dynamics make the trauma of sexual abuse unique, different from other childhood traumas such as the divorce of a child’s parents or even being the victim of other physical child abuse" (p.180).

They postulated that these dynamics alter the child's emotional and cognitive orientation to the world and distort the victim's self concept. Briefly, "Traumatic Sexualisation" refers to the traumatic and sexual nature of the abuse with resultant psychological impact and behavioural manifestations mainly concerning sexually related problems. The dynamics of "Stigmatisation" are the offenders' blaming and denigrating the victim; the child being pressured to maintain secrecy; the shocked reactions of others to the disclosure and the stereotyping of the victim as "damaged goods". The impact of stigmatisation is believed to include lowered self-esteem. "Betrayal" refers to the betrayal of the child's trust and vulnerability; the violation of the expectation that others will provide care and protection by being guardians. The manifestations are believed to include depression, anger and mistrust of authority figures. In the dynamics of "Powerlessness," the territory of the child's body is invaded and the child is forced to participate in sexual acts. This vulnerability continues over time, during which the child cannot protect him/herself and is often unable to make others believe that the abuse is occurring. This is believed, among other effects, to result in helplessness, a lowered sense of efficacy, and a feeling of being trapped.

The "Traumagenic Model", while extremely helpful, has not been tested by systematic research, although most of the effects have been observed by other authors.

**Summary of the Effects of Sexual Abuse**

Although a clear majority of studies on child sexual abuse concluded its effects are harmful, there are a host of problems with this research. Definitions of sexual abuse lack precision and comparability, making it
difficult to draw conclusions across studies. As Mrazek & Mrazek (1981) noted, two types of samples comprise much of the systematic research conducted on sexual abuse "deviant adult patients (e.g. psychiatric patients) and college students." The former group has inherent problems as "they are selected, retrospective in nature, and causality cannot be inferred from them." The latter group are "biased in terms of intelligence, social class and personal motivation and their data also is retrospective in nature" (p.236). Hence, conclusions drawn from both groups must be limited due to their lack of representativeness. According to Mrazek & Mrazek (1981), although case reports make up a sizeable proportion of the literature, because they are retrospective, only limited conclusions can be drawn from their findings.

Problems with research design in child sexual abuse to evaluate the effect of its impact include the lack of standardised outcome measures, inability to infer cause and effect relationships and the lack of control groups. These problems have led reviewers (e.g. Henderson 1983; Manarino & Cohen 1986) to note that, based on the existing literature, very little can be definitely concluded about the effects of sexual abuse. Due to the lack of knowledge and a confusion of both the causes and long term effects of sexual abuse, the subject remains to some extent still unexplored. Better studies (both short term and longitudinal) preferably with matched controls and standardised instruments are needed.

SECTION TWO - CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION

Rationale for Prevention

The rationale for prevention is drawn from the acknowledgement that a social problem exists. This is borne out in the incidence rates of sexual abuse at international, national and local level and the consequential human costs experienced by many victims. In terms of incidence rates, it is estimated that sexual abuse affects as many as 22% of all children in the United States (Crewdson 1988) compared with 10% in Great Britain (Baker & Duncan 1985).
The early conceptualisation of child abuse prevention drew heavily upon standard medical practice. According to Clark & Leavell (1965), prevention in the context of health planning occurs at three levels:

i) **Primary prevention** - targeting services to the general population with the objective of stopping any new reports of a given disease or condition.

ii) **Secondary prevention** - targeting specific high risk groups in order to avoid the continued spread of the disease or condition.

iii) **Tertiary prevention** - targeting services to victims of the disease or condition with the intent of minimising its impact or negative consequences.

For the purpose of this study, the theoretical framework falls within that of primary prevention. As part of a primary prevention programme, children need to be informed of the problem of sexual assault and of ways to prevent it. The aims are aptly summed up by Plummer (1986) as:

"an active intervention plan comprised of various components with the ultimate goal of avoiding a negative outcome, in this case, sexual abuse" (p.3).

The conventional metaphor is that of providing a universal "inoculation" of knowledge which injects skills into children's cognitive systems and subsequently strengthens their abilities to ward off physical or psychological hazards.

**Emergence of the Prevention Field**

Focus upon prevention education for sexual abuse did not occur until the mid to late seventies as professionals in America began to realise the magnitude of the problem. In 1975, several rape crisis centres began offering prevention talks for adolescents but the major focus was on rape by strangers. In 1977, The National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect established four centres for the treatment of abuse. As these and other centres flourished, the question of how to prevent abuse began to be raised widely in the professional community. A major breakthrough in prevention came when Anderson (1979) formulated the idea of the 'Touch Continuum' - touch could be good, bad or
confusing. This concept is a part of most programmes today and was initially helpful in providing a balance so as not to frighten children about touch or being touched (Plummer 1986). However, this approach has not been without its critics since much sexual abuse initially involves non-abusive touching. Two major realities about sexual abuse which underpin almost all prevention programmes emerged:

"strangers were not the primary danger, and abuse was neither rare or harmless" (Fay 1986 p.98).

In 1979, in America, for the first time attention focused upon sexual abuse prevention at a national conference of NCCAN (National Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect). At this conference, the play, 'Touch' (Illusion Theatre 1979), was first presented. This was perhaps the first major attempt to combine prevention information with an entertaining medium.

In 1980, NCCAN subsequently funded six demonstration projects to test and refine methods of presenting sexual abuse information directly to school children. The monies for these projects carried a stipulation that these programmes must be conducted within schools, rather than in the community. Thus, the roots of school-based prevention programmes were planted and endorsement for the projects at the federal level was implied (Plummer 1986). These projects had a ripple effect on their communities and at a state level. Finkelhor (1981) and Russell (1983) made significant contributions to the movement with their studies regarding the prevalence of abuse. As knowledge of the extent of the problem emerged from these studies, public opinion demanded action. Unfortunately, this meant some programmes were implemented before they had been evaluated.

The feminist contributions have raised consciousness on such issues as sexual violence, exploitation of women and children and the emotional damage resulting from sexual violence which have helped to change attitudes of victim acceptance of sexual abuse (Brownmiller 1985). As a result, there are now thousands of programmes, about 40 plays on the topic, between 400-500 curricula and hundreds of colouring and story books in North America. It was estimated that
within five years over one million children in the United States had been reached with sexual abuse prevention messages (Plummer 1986). Today, there are programmes for children in every state in America and programmes are currently being developed internationally.

The philosophy of empowering children to take responsibility for their own safety has not been without its critics because it places the responsibility for preventing abuse on the potential victims and thus the least powerful people involved (Conte 1987; Melton 1992). Instead, it is argued, the responsibility should be placed on the perpetrators of abuse and on society to protect children and not allow a situation to develop where sexual abuse is a common experience for children. This dilemma is compounded when, as in Leicestershire, those discharged with the care and protection of children on society's behalf, were convicted of sexually abusing children, estimated by police to involve over two hundred children (O'Sullivan & Jones 30/11/91). It is the writer's belief that as human values are difficult to change, even those who ultimately prefer societal or structural solutions will see, that in the absence of such changes, children should be offered some knowledge and skills to help protect themselves as part of an overall strategy in the prevention of child abduction and sexual abuse.

Children Most At Risk

Attempts to identify whether or not some children are more at risk of sexual abuse than others have initially met with some success. However, there are again difficulties in trying to identify high risk children as child sexual abuse normally takes place within a context of secrecy and risk factors are likewise veiled.

Whilst the clinical literature is clear that no age group is exempt from sexual abuse, researchers have shown that the problem most frequently affects girls between the ages of eight and thirteen (Anderson & Schaeffer 1979; Chandler 1982; Finkelhor 1983; Silbert & Pines 1981). Furthermore, Finkelhor (1979) found in his analyses of thirteen studies that the average age at which children had been sexually abused was between nine years and four months, and ten years and two months.
The findings in the American studies are confirmed in the British research where the mean age of the onset of abuse was eleven years for girls and twelve for boys (Baker & Duncan 1985). This would also support the need for personal safety training as a priority for children in this age group. Many clinicians have noted that frequently the abuse had been on-going for several years, especially in incest cases. Consequently, this causes the age at reporting (typically after the abuse has been discovered) to be artificially high (Adams-Tucker 1981).

Whilst previously quoted studies demonstrated that children per se are more likely to be abused by someone familiar to them, some studies have suggested that younger victims appeared to be more frequently abused by someone familiar to them while older children (over eight years) were at increased risks from strangers (De Jong et al 1983; Tilelli et al 1980). This pattern fits in with the child's development, gaining more autonomy and requiring less supervision as he/she gets older. More worrying, however, in a study by Forgione (1976), interviews with child molesters revealed the startling fact that molesting occurred whenever the opportunity presented itself. Thus, any unsupervised child may be considered a potential target for a molester.

On the question of whether it is possible to identify risk factors, a review of knowledge and research was promoted by The National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect in the United States (Finkelhor 1986). These findings demonstrated that being female carried a higher risk than being male (2.5 to 1). However, there is considerable agreement among professionals that there is an under reporting of boys (Swift 1979). This, coupled with clinical observations, has led some authors to believe that boys may be sexually abused as commonly as girls.

In general, the background factors that have shown the strongest connection to sexual abuse, both across and within studies, have been those relating to parents and families. These are:
Parental absence and unavailability (Finkelhor 1984; Russell 1986);
Poor relationships with parents (Miller 1976; Peters 1984);
Parental conflict (Finkelhor 1984; Gruber & Jones 1983; Peters 1984); and,
Presence of a stepfather (Gruber & Jones 1983; Russell 1986).

Finally, the position of children with disabilities highlights the relevance of power and sexuality and the propensity for this group to be even more vulnerable to abuse. These children are often more dependent and are offered fewer relative rights than non-disabled children. When they also have problems in communication, it is more difficult for them to claim the limited rights they do have. In addition, society tends to place such individuals in institutions where they are under the control of others and, as in families, there is limited opportunity for external monitoring of the children’s welfare. Furthermore, institutions differ from families in that they are likely to have a turn-over of staff and may attract those with a tendency to sexually abuse. In sum, these children may have less power to exercise their rights not to be sexually abused than non-disabled children and are probably the most vulnerable (Brown & Craft 1989; Sullivan et al 1987).

Victimisation Process

Much depends on the context in which children are victimised. Three studies from male perpetrators’ perceptions and one from those of the victims have been carried out in America. In relation to those studies involving perpetrators, the first study consisted of twenty offenders who formed part of the treatment population of a specialised sex offender programme (Conte et al 1989). The second consisted of seventy-two incarcerated child sexual offenders (Budin & Johnson 1989), and the third, fourteen perpetrators in a high security prison (Gilgun & Connor 1989). These studies give a better understanding of the modus operandi of offenders and the persistence and guile with which they approach children, as well as providing information on the
concepts which should be included in child sexual abuse prevention programmes. Given that all abusers in these studies were known, and since it is estimated that only about half a percent of abusers are convicted (RSPCC - 1988/89), care has to be taken about extrapolation of the findings of these studies to the population of offenders as a whole. Despite this, the findings are important.

Conte et al (1989) found that offenders had a particular child preference i.e. specific physical characteristics. These characteristics varied from one offender to another but offenders seem to prefer a child who is open and with whom a relationship can be built. Furthermore, the data suggested that offenders found characteristics of the child's behaviour, such as warmth, friendliness or vulnerability to be an attraction. These findings partly accord with those of Budin & Johnson (1989) who described perpetrators having a preference for a passive, quiet, troubled, lonely child from a broken home. Most importantly, in the study by Conte et al (1989) offenders stated that a child indicating that he or she would tell a specific adult about the assault had an impact on their behaviour i.e. they were less likely to proceed with the victimisation of this child. Clearly, this finding alone would support school-based prevention programmes.

Furthermore, Gilgun & Connor (1989) stated:

"abuse is related to the wishes and feelings of the perpetrators and that the children or adolescents did not exist as a person during the sexually abusive acts. Their best interest, their developmental level, and their needs and wants were not considered" (p.25).

Furthermore, these researchers concluded that during the sexual act perpetrators tended to view their victims as objects. They also suggested an inability on the perpetrator's part to empathise with the victim.

Examining the child's perspective of victimisation, Berliner & Conte (1990) interviewed twenty three children (aged ten to eighteen). There was evidence that perpetrators 'groom' the children by giving them

---

5 The aims and objectives of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme are described in Chapter Three. It is worth noting here, however, that the Programme has a philosophical base of building self-esteem and self-assertiveness skills in children.

6 This is also one of the primary aims of the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme.
attention and affection to engage them in a relationship before slowly initiating sexual contact for which the child is then made to feel responsible. Secrecy is maintained by encouraging the children's self-blame and by threatening that disclosure will result in withdrawal of the perpetrators' affection and in dire consequences for the children, their families and the perpetrators.

These findings again highlight the importance of children realising that they are not responsible for sexual abuse by an adult and the importance of evaluating whether sexual abuse prevention programmes achieve this goal. The reader is reminded that this is one of the research aims of this study, albeit that appropriate attribution of fault for sexual assault has been measured within the context of the stranger vignettes. Victim descriptions of the social contexts (particularly those involving ambiguous touching) in which children are sexually abused raise important questions about the relevance of school-based programmes which teach children about appropriate touch or how to seek help when assaulted. It would, therefore, seem necessary to understand which individuals assault which kind of children, in what circumstances, in order to ensure these areas were accurately targeted in educational programmes. This study contributes to this area of the literature in trying to identify vulnerability factors to abduction.

Most importantly, in light of offenders stating that a child indicating that he or she would tell a specific adult about the assault had an impact on their behaviour i.e. they were less likely to proceed with the victimisation of this child (Conte et al 1989), this concept should be integral to any prevention programme. However, whilst building self-esteem and self-assertiveness skills in children may go some way to help them avoid being abducted and/or sexually assaulted, there are early indications in the research findings (discussed later) that the very children offenders select and coerce as victims may not gain as much programme benefit as children who are assertive and have high self-esteem (Kraizer et al 1989).
Summary of Children Most at Risk

It can be concluded from this Review that efforts to prevent child abduction and sexual assault, should take the following factors into account:

- Unsupervised children over the age of eight are more at risk of abduction than younger children.
- Children most at risk for the onset of sexual abuse are between the ages of nine and twelve.
- Although girls are more at risk, boys can also be victims.\(^7\)
- Moreover, there is felt to be an under-reporting of boys.
- Background factors such as:
  (i) parental absence and unavailability,
  (ii) poor relationships with parents,
  (iii) parental conflict, and,
  (iv) presence of a stepfather,
  place children at higher risk.
- Children who are passive, quiet, lonely or troubled and from broken homes are particular targets for abusers.
- Children with disabilities are particularly vulnerable.

Caution is urged in the interpretation of these data, particularly those dealing with convicted offenders. With these reservations, it would appear that an appropriate response to children's vulnerability would be to 'blanket' children particularly those between the ages of eight and twelve with education in child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention. Particular attention should be paid to possible additional vulnerability in children from divorced families, those of single parents, and most importantly, those children with disabilities.

Evaluations of Prevention Programmes

Although child sexual abuse prevention programmes have common elements, their emphasis and effectiveness vary, as does the method of delivery and teaching methods e.g. behaviourally-based versus non-behaviourally based programmes. Some systematic means are

\(^7\) The reader should note that the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme aims to teach children that both boys and girls can be victims of sexual assault.
therefore required to evaluate and help the user discriminate between those materials which are beneficial and those which are less effective in teaching about the prevention of sexual abuse. This approach appears to be the newest direction of specialisation in the sexual abuse prevention field. A recent focus of research has been to explore how helpful programmes are and to determine if they effectively address differing cultural and educational needs regarding sexual abuse.

Conte Rosen & Saperstein (1986) pioneered work in this area with a review and analyses of the state of prevention programmes for the USA. Six aspects were considered:

(i) Prevention content.
(ii) Length of programme.
(iii) Occupation of trainer.
(iv) Prevention materials.
(v) Types of abuse covered.
(vi) Assertiveness and self-defence skills.

Three potential problem areas which Conte et al (1986) felt prevention programmes should address were:

i) The cognitive orientation of the training.
ii) Uncertainty about what prevention material should actually be taught.
iii) The need for quality assurance procedures.

This study focuses on the first area - that of the cognitive orientation of much of the training.

As with the programmes themselves, most evaluation studies have been carried out in the United States. To date, only four British studies, (Adams & Llewelyn 1989; Barret & Doherty 1989; Hamilton 1989; Mayes et al 1991) could be traced by the writer (Appendix 3 gives further details of key evaluation studies relevant to this study). A common problem of the evaluations is the choice of outcome measures for assessing programme effectiveness. For example, it is difficult to directly test the child's ability to resist assault as it would be inappropriate to put a child in a situation that fully corresponds with
an attempted assault. On the other hand, it is difficult to devise indirect measures for testing a child's ability to avoid assault. Different strategies have been attempted by researchers, such as those reviewed by Conte & Fogarty (1989) and Finkelhor & Strapko (1987) in their review of the evaluation studies. These reviews have been used as source material for this part of the Literature Review. Specific aspects of studies which are relevant to this part of the Literature Review are reported later under 'Evaluations relevant to this study'.

Knowledge Studies

Unlike the relatively rich body of empirical evidence surrounding the development of physical abuse and neglect prevention efforts, comparatively few child assault prevention programme evaluations have employed experimental or quasi-experimental research designs. In reporting their findings, the majority of researchers (see Appendix 3) have compared average performance by groups of children rather than exploring individual performance differences; furthermore, only a limited number of these evaluations have assessed simultaneously two or more methods of providing the information to students (Berrick et al 1991; Woods & Dean 1985; Wurtele et al 1986).

The studies listed in Appendix 3 almost universally found that children acquired some prevention concepts after exposure to the programmes. Thirty-one out of the thirty-two studies concurred with this finding. The only study which did not find post-test gains was undertaken by Miltenberger & Thiesse-Duffy (1988). They compared the interventions of parent instruction with the book Red Flag/Green Flag colouring book (Williams 1980), with and without verbal rehearsal, to teach four to seven year old children (24 children - thirteen, aged 4-5 years, and eleven, aged 6-7 years). The researchers found that training with the prevention book did not produce changes in personal safety knowledge whether or not additional instructions or verbal rehearsal was used.

In the study carried out by Mayes et al (1991) in Glasgow, the
researchers had a sample of 120 children with equal sex ratio, 10 from each of two primary classes (Primary 2, aged 6 years, and Primary 6 children, aged 10/11 years) in six schools. The responses of three schools (experimental group) who had volunteered to teach the 'Kidscape' Programme (Elliot 1986) were compared with three schools (control group) who had been matched for religious denomination, size of school and socio-economic status of families.

The 'Kidscape' Programme (Elliot 1986) aims to increase primary age children's knowledge of ways of keeping safe in four types of situations - 'bullying', 'approaches by strangers', 'inappropriate intimacy' by known adults' and 'pressure to keep 'bad' secrets with such known adults'. Assessments of the children's knowledge were made on three occasions - before, immediately after and 2/3 months following the teaching of the Programme to the experimental group (60 children) and on corresponding occasions for the control group (60 children). Using a picture-story technique, children were required to make judgements of the relative safety or danger of a child in a variety of situations, and to subsequently explain their judgements.

On the pre-test measure, the researchers found that the responses of the children in the experimental group to be safer than those of the control group and this difference persisted throughout the three phases of testing. The researchers concluded that this may be attributable to important cultural differences or differences in attitude within the schools that chose to use the Programme compared with those that did not, which was not considered at the time of matching the schools. After 'Kidscape' training a significant improvement in the rated safety of the children in the experimental group's responses in all the themes was reported. However, a similar significant improvement was also found in the responses of the control group. The researchers attributed this improvement to pre-test sensitisation.

Significant debate has occurred over the potential of child sexual abuse prevention programmes with the pre-school population. A central feature of this debate has been the finding by several researchers that young children learn significantly less than their older counterparts.
Borkin & Frank (1986), in a sub-sample of 83 children, found that only one of the three year olds and thirteen (43%) of the four and five year olds retained any of the information after only one week. Similarly, Gilbert et al (1989) found that between 25% and 65% of the 118 preschool children who participated in their study of seven different preschool curricula remained 'at risk' depending on the outcome measures of concern. The most dramatic increases was that most of the children indicated that they would encourage a fictional bunny to tell an adult if something troubled it. Of the respondents, 75% showed improvement or repeated the correct response in this area at the post-test.

The reader is reminded that offenders interviewed by Conte et al (1989) reported that a child indicating he or she would tell a specific adult about the assault does have an impact on perpetrators' behaviours. Additionally, Budin & Johnson (1989) found that perpetrators seek out passive, troubled or lonely children who can be counted on to maintain the secret of an abusive relationship. Regardless of the ability of child assault prevention programmes to convey all of the concepts targeted in these curricula, teaching younger children the simple task of telling an adult when a situation troubles them or presents potential danger, may justify retaining/amending these programmes for this age group. Other studies (Conte et al 1985; Lutter & Weisman 1985; Mayes et al 1991; Wurtele et al 1986) also confirmed the not unexpected fact that older children learn better than younger children.

In contrast, following an eight day programme for forty-four pre-school children, Fryer et al (1987a) found significant improvements in every dimension tested. Contrary to what one might expect, pre-school children and first graders (aged six) enhanced their scores equally, with the second graders (aged seven) having less notable gains. The key difference between this and other comparative studies was that this Programme was behaviourally-based. Of particular note, all thirty-three children in the experimental group indicated they would tell a responsible adult of the incident both when coerced and when asked to keep the encounter a secret.
Although the studies consistently reported significant learning in respect of older children, they also revealed that certain concepts were learned more easily than others. The facts about what is abuse, at least as conceptualised by the programmes, were learned relatively easily. Some studies (e.g. Conte et al 1985) have empirically supported the notion that children have an easier time learning concrete rather than abstract concepts with concepts which are familiar to them rather than concepts which lie outwith their own experience. This was confirmed in the study by Mayes et al (1991) in the 'Kidscape' evaluation. The researchers found that younger children (aged six) scored less well than older children (aged ten-eleven) on the four themes tested - 'bullying,' 'intimacy,' 'strangers,' and 'secrets.' Although children from both the control and experimental groups did better on the 'bullying' and 'stranger' themes and performed rather badly on the 'secrets' and 'intimacy' themes, younger children scored particularly badly with 'secrets.'

Daro et al (1986), Garbarino (1987) and Ostbloom et al (1987) all found that their subjects demonstrated an improved ability to distinguish among various types of touch and to recognize body parts. On the other hand, some concepts seemed more difficult to grasp, particularly the recognition that abuse could come from known adults (e.g. Ray 1984). Sigurdson et al (1986), evaluating the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme also reported that the most difficult concept to convey to children was the concept that the risk of sexual abuse is not only from strangers but also from those who are very close to them, usually relatives.

Other follow-up studies have revealed that knowledge gains are maintained at six week and three months (Downer 1984; Salawksy & Wurtele 1986; Wurtele et al 1986; Wurtele et al 1987). Further studies reported gains being retained at six month (Gallmeier et al 1988; Ray & Dietzel 1984). Other researchers conducting item-by-item follow-up analyses found more mixed results (Kolko et al 1987; Plummer 1984). The latter established that children maintained knowledge gains on most questions after eight months, but their responses shifted towards baseline levels on items assessing whether promises could sometimes
be broken, whether abusers could be known adults, whether sexual abuse was the same as getting "beat up" and whether abuse could be the child's fault. Another less encouraging result was Lutter & Weisman's (1985) finding that experimental - control differences had diminished at eighteen month follow-up, although these results should be interpreted cautiously since the sample had only fourteen subjects.

Several researchers have investigated whether review sessions or booster sessions are helpful in maintaining or increasing children's knowledge. Ray & Dietzel (1984) evaluated a booster 'shot' delivered before a one month follow-up, and Gallmeier et al (1988) evaluated a booster 'shot' delivered four months after the original programme. Unfortunately, the results of both studies are difficult to interpret because of measurement ceiling effects and analyses limitations. Nevertheless, in the study by Hazzard et al (1991), who evaluated the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, the researchers found that a one-session booster 'shot' further enhanced children's safety discrimination skills on the video measure used in the study.

Sigurdson et al (1986) and Hamilton (1989) also evaluating the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme reported that the girls scored higher than the boys, although neither of these studies had a control group. This finding was in contrast to studies by Ostbloom et al (1987) and Garbarino (1987) who reported that boys scored higher after programme implementation. Garbarino's finding is easily explained since he used a special issue of the 'Spiderman' Comic Book, a character with whom the boys were undoubtedly more familiar and with whom they could identify. In contrast, Mayes et al (1991) found no differences between the boys and girls in the sample. However, for studies in general, the gender differences will have to await further research as the majority of studies did not compare any differences between girls and boys.

A further criticism of many of these studies is that they have been conducted with relatively small samples in one or two schools resulting in potential problems with experimental-control contamination effects and generalisation of results. One of the
exceptions to this, is the study by Hazzard et al (1991) which is examined in more detail later in this Review.

Programme Comparisons

Programme comparisons have been made in only a few studies. Woods & Dean (1985), compared the 'Talking-About-Touching' - TAT (Committee for Children 1983) with the 'Spiderman' Comic Book (Rutt & Sallicrup 1984) approach, and found a greater increase in knowledge with children who had experienced the TAT Programme, a curriculum designed for children aged five to twelve years which has lessons on physical abuse and neglect as well as sexual abuse and environmental safety. The TAT Programme appeared to do better because it involved children to a much greater degree than the passive reading involved in the comic book exposure. Leake (1986a) compared the 'Child Abuse Prevention' (CAP) Programme (Anderson 1979) and 'No More Secrets' (NMS) Programme (Adams & Fay 1981). He reported that the CAP Programme was more effective than NMS in teaching fifth grade (aged ten) students to recognise and avoid child abuse and assault. He also found that there was a tendency for NMS to teach children to say "No" at inappropriate times. Once again, the different approach taken by the CAP presenters may have proven beneficial to the subjects involved. CAP actively involves the participants in role-play situations (and thus behaviourally-based learning) whereas NMS is a programme consisting of a short film followed by discussion.

Wurtele et al (1986) conducted a study where a programme of 'Behaviour Skill Training' (BST) was compared with exposure to the prevention film 'Touch'. Consistent with other studies which found more passive programmes less successful, they found that BST, which included role-playing, was more effective than the film. Although Conte et al (1985) did not do a comparative study, these researchers were disappointed that the children in their evaluation only seemed to have learned half of the concepts. They concluded that the short duration of the Programme was responsible for this. Thus, perhaps not surprisingly, it appears that programmes with more child
involvement, role-play and of longer duration, seem to be more effective.

In response to these findings, Kraizer (1987) developed a behaviourally-based programme called the 'Children Need to Know Personal Safety Programme.' It relies upon role-play to teach children the following concepts:

- Your body belongs to you.
- You have a right to speak up any time someone touches you in a way you don't like, that makes you feel uncomfortable or in a way you think is wrong.
- Speaking up effectively means, using your words, body language and eye contact.
- If a person doesn't stop after your first request say: "I'm going to tell if you don't stop."
- Tell and keep telling until someone listens and helps you.
- Touch should never be a secret.

Critical to this ten session Programme is the repeated application of various role-plays in which children are given an opportunity to respond to the range of plays frequently used by perpetrators to engage their victims such as bribery, emotional coercion, indifference, intimidation and threats. Evaluations of this approach have found it to be effective in strengthening a child's ability to resist abusive situations.

**Touch Discrimination**

Distinguishing between the types of touch that are appropriate for people in different roles and relationships is one way of explaining to children what types of physical contact are acceptable. However, as these are difficult concepts to operationalise, many programmes attempt to teach children to distinguish between 'good' and 'bad' touches.

A key component to programme evaluation of children's understanding of these concepts is the touch discrimination task. This
type of measure attempts to assess a child's ability to discriminate between 'good' - appropriate or nurturing touch, and 'bad' - inappropriate or sexually explicit touches. Several evaluations have found that older children are typically quite good at judging 'good' and 'bad' touches, even before attending a prevention programme (Miltenberger & Thiesse-Duffy 1988; Swan et al 1985). As children scored highly on these tasks before training, it is impossible to know what they learned from the programme. However, assessments of this kind do have the advantage of requiring a child to apply prevention knowledge rather than just reciting it. Although it is not certain that success on such measures is correlated with prevention behaviours in real life situations, results of behavioural assessments have been promising (Kolko et al 1987; Wurtele et al 1987).

Although discriminating inappropriate from appropriate touch may not be so difficult for most older children because of their cognitive abilities, there is reason to believe that very young children may have more difficulty, especially when asked to make this judgement based on intuition. If a 'bad' touch come from a 'good' person, the child may be inclined to interpret the touch as 'good' or appropriate in synchrony with the child's beliefs about this person. At the same time, if a sexual touch by an adult feels good to a child, the child is likely to label the touch a 'good touch' if the child is taught to discriminate touch only based on their feelings (de Young 1988). Research findings confirm that the attribution skills of young children (below the age of seven) are not sufficiently developed to benefit from child sexual abuse prevention programmes whose hallmarks are based only on the 'good/bad' touch continuum (de Young 1988; Gilbert et al 1989).

Skills Acquisition

Many programmes attempt to teach children strategies for verbally (and in some cases physically) resisting assault and summoning assistance. These strategies can be taught in a standard format as in other knowledge-based parts of programmes but there is also potential for them to be taught as skills that can be modelled, role-played, and rehearsed, presenting opportunities for skill-based outcome measures.
The most common method used to measure this has been the presentation of vignettes of different scenarios to children who are then asked how they would respond in such situations. Many of these vignettes are no more than one line statements, whilst others more fully describe situations to which the child can respond. Even more realistic is the use of dolls, puppets or videos of various scenarios. These methods require the child to state how the character in the scenario should act, or how the child would act, if he/she were in that situation. The skill-based measurements appear to be less confusing than the touch concepts measures.

Prevention education programmes, including 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No', typically teach children to follow three strategies in a dangerous or sexually abusive situation. Children are taught to:

i) say "No",
ii) get away from the assailant or dangerous situation, and,
iii) report the incident to a trusted adult.

Many evaluations have assessed the learning of these skills using multiple choice, true/false or yes/no questions (Binder & McNeil 1987; Conte et al 1986; Plummer 1984; Wolfe et al 1986). Another method of assessing the three behavioural rules has involved presenting scenarios including appropriate and inappropriate touch and asking the child what should be done in a such a situation using different presentations (Borkin & Frank 1986; Kenning et al 1987; Kolko et al 1987; Swan et al 1985; Thiesse-Duffy et al 1987; Wurtele et al 1987; Wurtele et al 1989).

A central theme in many sexual abuse prevention curricula is teaching children to respond assertively to other children and to adults. In one assertiveness measure developed by Downer (1984), children's responses to a puppet acting out a situation were measured. She assessed the effectiveness of 'Talking about Touching', (TAT) Children's knowledge was assessed via a twenty item multiple choice knowledge questionnaire. In addition, she interviewed about a third of the children using puppets and incomplete stories in order to assess their knowledge. Ratings were scored according to the child's assertive
tone of voice, body language and verbal message while resisting the
pleas, promises, cajoles, bribes and threats of the puppet. Children who
received the TAT scored significantly higher on both measures at
post-test than children in the control group (Downer 1984). Another
study, using a similar format to assess gains in assertiveness also found
significantly more assertive responses at post-test compared to pre-test
in a first and second grade (aged six-seven) sample (Kenning et al 1987).

Although measures describing children in various touching situations
require that children begin to apply their knowledge to new situations,
such vignettes may fall short of capturing 'real life' situations. Using a
video-tape of a dramatised set of vignettes describing potentially
abusive or dangerous situations may be one way of creating more
realistic scenarios which describe the dynamics between the child and
offender and thereby display more of the complexity of abusive
situations.\footnote{The study by Hazzard et al (1991) involved a video-tape measure and is reported in the section which examines 'Evaluations Relevant to this Study'.} In the study by Swan et al (1985), a video-tape of five stories was presented to assess skill learning, and children were asked:
"What should a person do who is touched in this way?" Children
reported that they would tell someone about the abuse significantly
more often after the prevention education programme, although no
increases in touch discrimination were found.

The results of these studies, which examined skill acquisition,
indicated that, although using puppets, verbal and video-taped
vignette measures, do not tell us exactly what a child might do in a
potentially abusive situation, they provide additional insight into
programme effectiveness.

\textbf{Behavioural Evaluations}

A significant problem facing researchers in the prevention field of
sexual abuse is to determine whether knowledge gains translate into
actual preventive behaviours. As with other prevention research, it is
difficult to measure the absence of a negative outcome such as abuse,
especially when a secondary goal is to encourage its early disclosure.
Most researchers have dealt with this dilemma by attempting to assess prevention skills (saying "No", leaving and telling an adult about abuse) on the assumption that children with these skills are more likely to be able to prevent abuse in the future.

From the evaluations completed to date, one of the most consistent recommendations is the need to provide children with opportunities to utilise the concepts they are being taught through role-play and simulating at-risk situations (e.g. Borkin & Frank 1986; Kolko et al 1989; Fryer et al 1987a & b). Wurtele et al (1987) found role-playing and participant modelling a more effective method for teaching safety concepts than experimenter modelling of prevention skills.

This approach has been taken further by Barrat & Doherty (1989) who asked children to role-play the potential victim of a bully. Although the scenario related to bullying rather than sexual abuse, it allowed the children actively to demonstrate the skills that were available to the children both before and after the programme.

The most direct measure of children's skills in avoiding abuse involves the use of research confederates who approach the children and ask for their assistance in a way which could lead to the child's abduction (Fryer et al 1987a & b; Peterson 1984; Poche et al 1981). These have direct relevance to this study and are reviewed (or, if already previously reported on), examined in more detail in the next section.

**Evaluations Relevant to this Study**

The studies examined are those which have either used the simulation method, evaluated the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme or relate to any of the other research aims as they provide the background to this study and directly inform the research questions.

The first study of relevance by Poche et al (1981) developed and evaluated a programme to teach pre-school children appropriate responses in the event of potentially dangerous situations. Self-protection was defined as reacting in a safe manner when approached
by a potential kidnapper or child molester.

In order to increase the probability that correct responses made in the training setting would occur in the natural environment, two techniques recommended by Stokes and Baer (1977) were used. The first technique was to make the training situation as much like the real situation as possible. The second was to use a cross-section of appropriate examples. The researchers refer to the work of Yeaton and Bailey (1978) who demonstrated the effectiveness of training in life-like settings on skills being transferable to real life situations.

In the study, modelling, behaviour rehearsal, and social reinforcement were used to teach self-protection in analogue situations on the school grounds. The participants were selected on the basis of daily availability and their performance in an analogue situation in which a "suspect" role-played by an adult confederate, approached and asked the child to leave. Children who readily agreed to leave with the suspect and thus appeared susceptible to the lure of an actual child molester were included in the study. Of nine children screened in this manner, all but one displayed susceptibility to the lures, and three met the availability criterion. These were one female and two male children, aged three to five, of normal intelligence and social skills. The written informed consent of these children's parents was obtained to conduct the training and measurements. Parents also received information on their child's performance and progress at the end of the training programme.

Training took place in three locations within 50 feet of the school building. Measurement took place in these three locations as well as in several locations on a pavement ranging from 150 to 400 feet from the school and shielded from view by small trees and shrubs. The suspects were selected to resemble the typical molesters arrested in the local area, that is, males, both black and white, aged twenty to thirty-five.

Suspects used one of three lures :-
(i) A simple request for the child to go with the molester.

(ii) A request to leave with the implication that an authority figure e.g. the child's parents or teachers approved of the child's leaving.

(iii) A request to leave with the promise of an incentive.

Specifically, suspects used the following script to present the lures:

(i) Simple lure.
The suspect approached the child, said, "Hello," or "Hi, there," and engaged in small talk, for example, "Nice day, isn't it?" After the small talk, the suspect said, "How would you like to go with me and take a walk?" or "Would you like to go for a walk?"

(ii) Authority lure.
After small talk, suspect said, "Would you like to go with me for a walk? Your teacher said that it was all right for you to come with me."

(iii) Incentive lure.
After small talk, the suspect said, "I've got a nice surprise in my car. Would you like to come with me and see it?" The suspect did not specify the surprise.

Interviews with several parents of the children indicated they preferred that their child make a very brief verbal statement, so as not to offend the good intentions of a benevolent person, but not so long and detailed as to permit an actual molester to abduct the child. They also preferred that their children then quickly move from the vicinity of the suspect.

Based on these interviews, two target dimensions were delineated, one involving the child's movements. The following were the possible responses a child could make to a suspect. The numbers in parentheses indicate the safety rating given each responses, with the most appropriate combination of responses given a rating of 6 and the least appropriate given a rating of 0.
(i) **Goes away from suspect.**
The child moves toward the school building for a minimum distance of 20 feet within 3 seconds following either a verbal response or the lure. (Scored 4 if no vocalization, 5 if inappropriate vocalization, 6 if appropriate vocalization).  

(ii) **Stays near suspect.**
The child does not move away from the suspect or moves less than 20 feet away or takes longer than 3 seconds to move. (Scored 1 if no vocalization, 2 if inappropriate vocalisation, 3 if appropriate vocalisation).  

(iii) **Goes with suspect.**
The child moves any distance with the suspect away from the school building. (Scored 0 regardless of verbal response).  

The criterion response dimensions were those in which the child said "No, I have to ask my teacher" and then ran toward the school building within 3 seconds.  

The study proceeded on the assumption that a child need not understand the implications of the situation in terms of a possible abduction or physical harm. Therefore, no attempt was made to explain the possible consequences. Rather, the children were taught simply to respond appropriately to any request to leave the school made by a person other than their parents or teachers.  

At the beginning of every session, the child's teacher brought the child outdoors to a designated location and then pretended to have to return to the building for some reason. The teacher then hid from view near the location or inside the building and observed the child's motor responses. An adult played the role of a suspect and approached the child, using one of the three lures. A method was devised for preventing the child from actually leaving with the suspect although this is not explained.  

---

9 The child says nothing.  
10 The child says she or he will go with the suspect, or carries on small talk with the suspect or makes any other verbal response than the ones defined as appropriate.  
11 The child says "No, I have to go ask my teacher."
As soon as the child responded, whether correctly or incorrectly, the teacher quickly returned to the child, pretending to have accomplished the fictitious mission. The suspect quietly moved away, ending the session. The suspect served as the primary observer scoring the child's verbal responses as either appropriate, inappropriate, or no vocalization and motor responses as either goes with, stays near, or goes away from suspect. The teacher served as a reliability observer for the child's motor response, observing the movement and scoring the response in the same manner as the suspect. The suspect wore a tape recorder concealed on the body to record the child's verbal behaviour. The tape was scored by the teacher and compared with the observations made by the suspect. An agreement was defined as both observers scoring the child's verbal and motor responses identically for one session. Percentage agreement was computed on 80% of the sessions. Agreement was 100% for all sessions. Thus, in the scoring of the children's responses, there were no independent raters or observers.

In order to establish a baseline, observations were made of the child's responses to the approach of a suspect in three outdoor locations within 50 feet of the school building and in the community setting. All three types of lures were used in the locations near the school and in the community to test susceptibility to particular lures or locations. In order to prevent an association between going outdoor with the approach of a suspect, the children were taken outdoors for several days during which no suspect appeared.

As soon as the child had responded to the test lure, training commenced. Training consisted of modelling, behaviour rehearsal, and social reinforcement. Two adult trainers joined the child and acted out a scene in which one trainer, (the "suspect"), approached the other trainer, (the "child"), and used one of the three lures. The trainer played the role of the child then modelled the desired verbal and motor target behaviours. Next, the child was asked to rehearse the same scene with the "suspect" and to respond in the same way as the model. Finally, the child's responses were followed by positive social reinforcement if they were correct. Social reinforcement was occasionally paired with material and activity reinforces (e.g. stickers,
playing on the swings). If the child's responses were only partly correct or incorrect, the trainer used instructions and additional modelling and rehearsal until the child performed the responses correctly once. Responses were trained to only one lure per day. Training for each lure ended when the responses were assessed and correctly performed the next day.

When responses to the first lure were mastered, responses to the second and third lures were tested, and, if incorrect, were modelled and rehearsed. The exact location of each session on the school grounds was also varied by approximately 75 feet for the same reason. Sessions lasted approximately 15 min. Training ended when the child correctly responded at least once to each of the three lures over the three days.

After training was completed, observations were made in the community setting to determine if the correct responses made during training would be performed in a novel and more naturalistic situation. Measurement trails in the community setting were set up in the same manner as those near the school. That is, the teacher brought the child out on the pavement as though going for a walk, and then left the child to return to the building for some fictitious mission. Each of the three lures was tested on a separate day.

Approximately twelve weeks after training, one observation per child was made again in the community setting in order to ascertain the durability of correct responding. During training, all the children acquired the appropriate verbal and motor responses to all three types of lures, with a safety rating of 6. Correct responses to the first lure were mastered in one to three training sessions. Responses to the second and third lures were acquired in one or two sessions. Thus, training was completed in five to six sessions, or approximately 90 min per child.

The findings showed that the children displayed susceptibility to the lures of suspects before training. After training, the children displayed a substantial improvement in self-protective skills, from a pre-training safety rating near 0 to a post-training of 6. Further, the children's self-
protective responses generalized to novel suspects and locations. This improvement was fully maintained at least 3 months following training for one of the two children tested at that time. The researchers recommended that an increase the maintenance of safe responding, a "booster" training session might be conducted two or three months after formal training ends.

The researchers had hypothesized that the simple lure would be easier to resist than the authority or incentive lures, but this did not appear to be the case. However, the children did not respond differentially to the three different lures before or after training. It was not necessary to provide a rationale for responding in order to obtain good results. The children appeared sufficiently motivated to perform the responses without a detailed explanation of the potential danger of leaving with an abductor. However, despite these positive findings, some caution is warranted as the sample involved only three children.

In the study by Peterson (1984), the use of a widely distributed non-behavioural, discussion-oriented training manual, The Boy Scouts of America's 'Prepared for Today' Programme, was compared with a 'Safe at Home' Programme, a behavioural programme used by Peterson. Both manuals covered at least four major topic areas :-

(i) Self-care activities (two individual training modules focused on safely preparing snacks and on selection of safe and positive after-school activities).

(ii) Dealing with strangers (two individual training modules focused on how to answer the door and how to answer the telephone when a stranger called).

(iii) Handling emergencies (two individual training modules focused on how to treat a serious cut and how to react to a fire).

(iv) Looking after younger children (one individual training module focused on ways of safely and effectively "babysitting" a younger child).

These topic areas were selected as representative of areas of expressed parental concern (e.g. Peterson & Scissors 1983), including areas considered by some past researchers as important, and as a reasonable
sampling of problems to which unsupervised children might be exposed. This Review focuses on the results of the second topic area.

Participants were recruited from a community agency which sponsored a 'Big Brother, Big Sister' Programme. This Programme matched qualified volunteer adults with community children. Parents of prospective participants were randomly selected from a list of children aged eight-ten (because eight is the youngest age at which a child can legally be left unattended in Missouri) who were not yet matched with a 'big brother or big sister'. Six of the first eight parents contacted agreed to allow their child to participate. The majority of children were from lower socio-economic status families, all were attending regular public school classrooms, and four of the six children selected were from single parent families. Of the three boys and three girls who participated, all spent some time at home unsupervised by an adult.

The children were randomly assigned to groups :-

- **Training Group 1**
  (The 'Prepared for Today' group) was composed of a white 7½ year-old girl, a white 9 year-old boy, and a black 9 year-old girl.

- **Training Group 2**
  Was originally composed of a white 9 year-old girl, a black 8½ year-old boy, and a white 8½ year-old boy who lived in a rural area some 20 miles from the laboratory. Due to repeated transportation problems with training and testing, he was replaced by a white 10-year-old boy who missed training on two of the modules because of his late start in the programme.

Two male and four female undergraduate students served as experimenters. None had extensive experience with child care or training and none was aware of experimental hypotheses, of the existence of a second training manual, or of the exact content or method of testing. One male and two female undergraduate students served as observers and performed the testing. The three raters were randomly assigned testing data sheets on which the names and other identifying materials were covered. They believed they were rating the responses of many children each observed once rather than a few
children observed several times. In most cases a child rotated through the entire group of observers twice during the testing sequence so that the observer did not test the child two times back to back.

Training for both groups was broken into an eight week sequence and one follow-up training session five months after training had ceased. Each week of training involved two afternoon or early evening sessions with each child. One session was used for training only, a second session on a different day was used for testing. Training sessions were considered complete when the child had successfully completed the steps required by the manual (role-playing all six correct answers for the behavioural group several times and completing discussion of the problem for the discussion group), and the experimenter felt that the child understood the necessity for each step.

The criteria for answering the door and telephone safely were drawn from past research (Jones & Kazdin 1980), parental, teacher and school suggestions and from the experience of the researcher. Each response was then checked for external validity with relevant experts. It was then approved by a local police official who specialised in crime prevention. However, neither the criteria, nor who "the relevant experts" were are specified by the researcher. As it could be argued that using these criteria obtained from safety experts to some children's answers presented a bias a second method of scoring was imposed. Raters categorised children's individual responses to the problems and then a panel of twelve volunteer parents, drawn from university classes who sometimes left their child unattended, rated the children's responses (the researcher does not address the inherent bias in a 'middle-class' university sample of parents). The Panel agreed with the final listing of correct criteria to a large extent, with an average of 94% of the parents rating the criteria as correct (range 67%-100%) across items. Results of this second method were very similar to the first method of scoring; the correlation between children's responses scored by the Expert Rating method and the Panel.

Separate reliability statistics were calculated for each of the nine
problem situations, with consistently acceptable coding reliability. Cohen's (1960) Kappa was used as a conservative measure of agreement; it averaged 0.94 and ranged from 0.85 to 0.99. A comparison of the results from children receiving the two kinds of training indicated that the groups were comparable with one another in baseline, across the different training modules, and that neither group improved substantially in baseline. Following training, however, the discussion-oriented 'Prepared for Today' training demonstrated either no effect or a slight positive effect on children's responses in problematic situations, whereas the behavioural 'Safe at Home' training consistently resulted in abrupt and large increases in effective responding to home problems. The multiple-baseline design, at least for the latter group, demonstrated that training rather than any other external experiences was responsible for children's improved skills. The skills shown during training for both groups were maintained five months after training and where maintenance was incomplete, retraining in a single session increased the skill to the levels shown during training for both groups.

The two real world generalisation probes (involving only three of the original six children) typically demonstrated that children performed much the same in answering the telephone and the door as they had in the laboratory, although both groups demonstrated better performances on the telephone than they did on the door. It is of interest in the latter case that none of the children in the behavioural training group allowed the persistent stranger access to the house without contacting their mother, whereas two of the three discussion training children did ultimately allow the stranger inside without contacting a parent. All of the children neglected to try to take a message for the stranger.

Like the maintenance data, these data suggested that at least the behaviourally trained children acquired a set of skills that they could continue to use in the real world. The bad news concerning the generalisation data assessing the influence of training on other non-trained problems was that little benefit was seen for either training method on areas for which the child had not received explicit training. There was, therfore, no support for the speculation that the less
behaviourally specific and concrete method of training would show an advantage in cross-situational generalisation.

Several measures of children's self-reported fears were taken at the end of each teaching session. These measures were collected for each testing session to evaluate whether or not a training module resulted in abrupt increases or decreases in self-reported fear or confidence. No such changes were noted. In fact, no large-scale changes were noted across the 10 measurement occasions, although a slight decrease of anxiety was seen on most of the measure. For the most part, these measures suggested mild improvement in children's self-report of general fears and fears of specific home safety situations as a result of both kind of training. They do not support the concern that such training may sensitise children of this age or cause them to worry more about their safety.

Furthermore, because the cost for both training programmes was equivalent in terms of the paraprofessionals' time, effort, and reinforce employed, this comparison would suggest the superiority of the behavioural methods used in past studies dealing with child safety (e.g. Jones & Kazdin 1980; Rosenbaum et al 1981). Although with only three participants per group, generality cannot be assured, the consistency within the behavioural group and the comparability of these results to past behavioural studies suggest a general superiority for most participants of the behavioural approach.

The most telling criticism of the behavioural training method might be that although the children clearly improved their skill levels, they did not uniformly reach 100% correct responding following training. There are two or three potential responses to such a criticism. First, although each child did not emit all six correct responses during each post training testing session, no child in the behavioural group, behaviourally or verbally, suggested a single dangerous response (e.g. no child had allowed a stranger into the home - responses which were seen prior to training), and, to a great extent, children responded near to the 100% correct level. Second, some of the less-than-full criteria responding may represent a measurement artifact. For example, each
behaviourally trained child at least once neglected to ask to take a message for the persistent stranger at the door, probably because they had already inquired what the stranger wanted and they had been taught to call their parent in the event that the stranger persisted. Thus, less than criteria level responding does not necessarily mean that the child responded incorrectly.

Future work in this field will be challenged by the task of keeping the responses sufficiently flexible to deal with a stranger who does not always give the same cues and yet using criteria in which each trained behaviour is a necessary part of the whole. Finally, it could be argued that if the children could acquire four or five of six correct responses within one hour of training, only a small amount of additional training should be required to reach 100% of the trained responses. Future research will also need to deal with the issue of diminishing cost-effectiveness, noting if, and when, additional training for a few additional responses is a logical solution. The best overall answer to such criticisms might be that the children's safety behaviours were obviously improved and greatly enhanced by the behavioural training and that less than 100% of criterion responding may be acceptable in this preliminary study, with better performance as a reasonable goal for future work in this area.

Future research is needed to assess other limitations of this method. In particular, larger samples are required as the experimental group again only involved three children. Furthermore, it is unclear whether younger children could acquire this information so rapidly or if training in large groups would be feasible. It would be useful to assess ways of involving parents in the training of their own children or of evolving methods methods by which older children could train themselves. Finally, it is important to continue to attempt to develop training methods that will promote better cross-situational generalisation and maintenance.

The studies by Fryer et al (1987a & b) also used a behavioural assessment of change through the use of the simulation of a stranger abduction. The programme, (reported earlier in this Review) assessed
a section of the 'Children Need To Know Personal Safety Training' Programme which was presented to children aged five to seven years who were randomly assigned to an experimental or control group. Twenty-three children participated in the Programme initially and formed the experimental group while twenty-one non-participating children from the same grades formed the control group and were given the Programme at a later date. The experimental group participated in an eight day block of twenty minute daily sessions of the Programme. Children were taught four concrete rules to follow if approached by a stranger if they were not with a caretaking adult.

These rules were :-

i) Stay at an arm's length away.
ii) Don't talk or answer questions.
iii) Don't take anything.
iv) Don't go anywhere.

The day before and after the Programme, each child was sent on an errand by the teacher. On completion of the Programme, children were given a questionnaire and then took part in a simulation of a potentially abusive situation. Attached to the 'stranger' (a member of the research team) was a hidden camera and wireless-microphone which produced an audio-visual recording of the encounter. This was scored by four of the research team members. A straight forward pass/fail rating was awarded the child based on performance during the simulation. It connoted simply whether or not the child agreed to the stranger's request. Inter-rater reliability was 1.0 (total reliability) among the research team members. Thus, there were no completely independent raters in this study.

The experience involved the children meeting a research assistant posing as a stranger who asked for the child's assistance in performing a task which involved his/her leaving the school building with the 'stranger'. If the child agreed, he/she was told that the 'stranger' would come for his/her help later. After going back to their class they were told that their help was no longer needed. However, the children were not informed that they had had a simulated encounter. A question
not addressed by these researchers is how they managed to ensure the subjects did not come into contact with each other. There was no difference between the two groups in the pre-test with about half the children in each group agreeing to accompany the 'stranger.' In contrast, in the post-test fewer experimental than control subjects failed the simulation. There was no change in the control group whilst 78% of the experimental group refused to go with the stranger. Furthermore, self-esteem and personal safety knowledge were related to compliance rates in the experimental group.

Fryer et al (1987b) carried out a six month follow-up study with thirty of their original forty-four children. They found that all the children who had undergone the Programme and were successful on the first simulation were successful in the second. Furthermore, the children who had previously been in the control group and who were subsequently trained, performed successfully in the final simulation. Re-teaching of the prevention Programme to four of the children who had earlier failed the simulation resulted in success for only two of the children i.e. two children still failed the simulation. The researchers concluded that the testing showed children had developed the ability to avoid stranger abduction of the type used but that children may still be susceptible to lures not specifically included in the training. Whilst the methods used in this evaluation have been questioned by Conte (1987) with regard to possible desensitisation of children and by Melton (1992), as "inherently deceptive and invasive" (p.174), the results further confirm the utility of a behaviourally-based curriculum.

In the Fryer et al (1987b) study, the findings further highlighted the need to look carefully at particular children's characteristics and needs, in order that a prevention programme will be successful for all children. The children with the lowest self-esteem scores benefited least from the intervention. Thus, the children who benefited most from the intervention were those with higher self-esteem, and the appropriate behaviour of these children on the simulation test was matched by an increased understanding and awareness of the issues involved. On the other hand, the least able children showed no evidence of any increase in appropriate behaviour or understanding.
Such a result might give rise to questions about the value of widespread programmes, as they may only be effective for those groups most able to protect themselves and less likely to be exposed to risk.

Nevertheless, the studies by Fryer et al (1987a & b) are important because several components that led to the success of this Programme may be of value in providing effective sexual abuse prevention programmes particularly for younger children: -

- The Programme taught specific, concrete rules and steps to follow through the use of role-play techniques. These rules may be easier for young children to comprehend than the less concrete 'good touch/bad touch' idea (with some bad touches feeling good).

- The touch concept is often taught by means of puppet shows or other sorts of passive-learning techniques whilst this study examined a programme utilising a behaviourally-based curriculum.

Wurtele et al (1987), in reviewing the reasons for the apparent successful outcomes of the Fryer et al studies (1987a & b), suggested four reasons why passive learning does not work with young children: -

i) Pre-school children who were taught self-protective skills through modelling and active rehearsal, learned these skills better than did a control group who passively watched an experimenter model the skills.

ii) The pre-testing and post-testing may have "set up" and then reinforced the skills taught by the Programme. The control students were approached by a 'stranger' twice before the Programme and none of these pupils agreed to accompany the 'stranger' after the Programme. Perhaps they were able to reflect on their own experience and the repetition of the event increased the retention of the skills.

iii) A few children were less able than the others to learn the skills. This finding highlights the need to assess which children may need additional instruction to make a prevention programme more meaningful to them.
iv) The researchers showed that it is possible to provide a meaningful "in vivo" test of the effectiveness of a programme.

According to Conte (1987), "in-vivo" assessment raises further ethical questions and is limited to stranger abduction scenarios, which, according to statistics, represent a small proportion of the potentially sexually abusive encounters faced by children. Fryer et al. (1987a) stated that "only 1 of the 44 children expressed even minor anxiety about the situation". This concern took the form of the child's straightforward request that a member of the research team investigate the activities of the 'stranger' in the hallway. A researcher spoke with the child later that day and then "stringently observed" the child during the next two weeks. What is not clear, however, is whether or not participation in such a simulation will desensitise children to talking to, or going with, strangers. Certainly, the simulation may have had no long term effect on the children in this way but until this can be unequivocally demonstrated, then such techniques must be considered risky. This study examines this issue.

The quasi-experimental design by Fryer et al. (1987a & b) employing two comparison groups randomly assigned enabled isolation of the effect of the Programme. In addition, examination of the sequence of outcome by case also speaks strongly for the validity of the simulation as a measure of programme effectiveness in reducing vulnerability. There were three children in the control group whose performance went from pass to fail in the first two simulations. This suggested that, in the absence of intervention, future safety based on a single passed simulation cannot be assumed. In contrast, none of the children who participated in the Programme went from pass to fail; all adhered to the pass-pass pattern. The intervention then can be seen as both a teacher and reinforcer of the skills required to resist stranger abduction and abuse and the outcome of the simulation is clearly not a random event. Examination of the sequence of simulation outcome by case reveals another important phenomenon. Six months after Programme participation, retention of skills was total. All of the children who passed the simulation immediately after instruction in the previous year passed the final simulation. Most exhibited strict adherence to the
four basic rules upon which the 'safety with strangers' portion of the curriculum of the Programme is founded (Kraizer 1987). They seemed no less prepared than students who had just undergone instruction. This evidence of retention of skills raises new questions about the need for periodic retraining. Further research which assessed retention for a period longer than six months is needed to prescribe an ongoing programme of prevention of abuse for children. This said, the protection derived from a single, intense, experiential intervention does not appear to be short-lived.

There is, however, a negative aspect of this finding. The two children who failed the third simulation had also failed the two preceding simulations. Even more disturbing is the fact that they, along with the two other experimental group members who failed the second simulation after having participated in the Programme, received a second block of instruction, attending along with control group students. There may, therefore, be a small percentage of children who do not profit significantly, even from repeated exposure to prevention programming. Individual attention to their specific needs appears to require further research.

Finally, the delicacy of the staging of simulations was demonstrated by one problem encountered. Due to scheduling difficulties, the simulations for three of the children had to be performed in the afternoon of the day of the third simulation. Simulations for the other children had taken place during the morning. Every effort had been made to schedule simulations consecutively for the students in a manner that precluded their interaction and insured a consistency of the scenario. Protracted process can become disruptive to school operations as can be restriction of student and staff movement in designated areas, availability of support personnel, etc. While these life-like simulations represent a meaningful advance in the measurement of risk to stranger abduction and abuse of children, they are sensitive to subtle variations in protocol and their further refinement is appropriate substance for future research.

Although these evaluations have enhanced understanding of what can
be accomplished from well-conceived prevention programming, only one (Peterson 1984) of the three studies reviewed which included the simulation of a stranger abduction, has involved independent raters.

The first reported study to evaluate the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme was conducted in Canada by Sigurdson, Doig & Strang (1986). The researchers examined the effectiveness of the Programme using a quasi experimental design. A questionnaire was developed and tested to determine children's base level of knowledge. A school with a cross section of town and rural children, with differing socio-economic background, participated in the study. The study consisted of a knowledge pretest, a structured video interactive classroom preventative programme, and a post-test measure of change. The sample consisted of students in fourth, fifth and sixth grades, aged nine to thirteen years. The questionnaire consisted of forty-five questions. The Programme took four weeks to complete.

The results indicated that while most children have a basic level of self-protective knowledge and assertiveness, they can, in a classroom setting, learn significant and additional facts about avoiding sexual assault. Eight of twenty nine knowledge questions elicited a large change in responses (mostly from female students), suggesting increased awareness of self protection. When asked about their feeling with regard to the Programme, 97% of the children stated that they enjoyed it. Hamilton (1989), also evaluating the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme also utilising a pre-post design, found increases in personal safety knowledge in the post-test knowledge scores in the random sample of 32 children drawn from a sample of 172. However, neither of these studies had a control group.

The research by Hazzard et al (1991) is one of the more reliable studies in the evaluation of child sexual prevention programmes in general, and the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, in particular. Using a three session adaptation of the Programme,12 eight schools, grouped

---

12 The 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme consists of key and supplementary lessons (30 hours in total) and three fifteen minute inter-active videos (see Chapter Three). In this study the children received three one hour long sessions led by a female mental health professional with expertise in child abuse. Each session consisted of the fifteen minute videos, group discussion and role-play.
into two sets of four schools with each set matched in terms of ethnic composition and achievement level, were randomly assigned to one of four conditions:

i) Teacher and child training - fourth grade students (aged eight - nine) teachers attended a six-hour workshop on child sexual abuse, where the children in their classrooms participated in the sexual abuse prevention curriculum (n=6 classrooms).

ii) Child training - teachers did not receive training but third and fourth grade students (aged eight - nine) classrooms participated in the sexual abuse prevention curriculum (n=13 classrooms).

iii) Teacher training - teachers attended the six-hour workshop. The children received no training.

iv) A delayed training control group. Children in their classrooms participated in the sexual abuse prevention curriculum six weeks after post-testing (n=8 classrooms).

Only data from Conditions 1, 2, and 4 are reported since the children in Condition 3 were not assessed. Programme impact was assessed using a knowledge scale, the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC) (Spielberger 1973), a videotape vignettes measure, a parent questionnaire and disclosure data. Demographic data and previous education about sexual abuse were also obtained from children during pretesting.

The knowledge scale ('What I Need To Know About Touching') was a 25 item measure developed after pilot testing which included some items from previous scales (Plummer 1984; Wurtele et al 1986). The scale assessed children's knowledge about sexual abuse prevention using a yes, no, I don't know response format (see Appendix 4). Correct answers received one point and incorrect answers 0. On the sub-sample of 113 children in the control group, the measures internal consistency coefficient was 0.75 by Cronbach's alpha. The two-week test-retest reliability was 0.77.

The knowledge questionnaire and the STAIC (Spielberger 1973) were administered by a research assistant one week before the Programme started and at one and six weeks after the Programme had been taught.
The videotape vignettes measure ('What Would You Do?') was developed by the researchers to assess:

(i) children's ability to discriminate between situations which are likely or unlikely to be abusive, and,

(ii) children's ability to utilise primary prevention skills in potentially abusive situations.

The potentially abusive scenes were:

- A female babysitter asking to join a boy in taking a bath and threatening to tell his parents that he stole money from her purse if he does not comply;
- A male relative telling a girl at bedtime not to tell anyone about their secret touching game;
- A male stranger offering to pay a boy $5.00 to fold some flyers at the stranger's home; and,
- A teenage neighbour asking a girl to come help him rake leaves in his backyard and touching her shoulders and hips suggestively.

The low risk situations were:

- An aunt offering to scratch her nephew's back while both watching television; and,
- A stranger asking a child in a park if she would like to join him and a group of other children playing soccer.

In all the scenes, children were age eight to eleven. In three of the scenes, the main characters were caucasian.

At post-testing, (one week) the video-tape measure was individually administered by a trained research assistant to four to six children randomly selected from the experimental (n=85) and control group (n=38). The videotape stimulus tape contained six 30 second scenes which were not shown or discussed in the Prevention Programme. Four were potentially abusive scenes and two were scenes with no clear risk of abuse. At follow-up (six weeks), four to six different children, randomly selected from each experimental group, completed the
'What Would You Do Measure?'

After watching each scene, the child was asked :-
(i) Do you think this situation is safe or unsafe?
(ii) Why? (if the child said unsafe)
(iii) If this was happening to you, what would you say?
(iv) What would you do?

Content coding of children's responses yielded a safety discrimination score and a prevention skills score for each child, each with an interrater reliability coefficient of 0.89. The safety discrimination score, potentially ranged from 0 to 22, with higher scores reflecting more accurate discrimination of safe versus unsafe scenes as well as greater ability to identify risk indicators in unsafe scenes. The prevention skills score, potentially ranged from 0 to 22, reflected whether children stated they would say no assertively, leave, and tell an adult in unsafe situations, with higher scores indicating more skills.

After each scene, the child was also asked to rate how he or she would feel in a similar situation on six 4-point scales. Three scales assessed positive feelings (happy, relaxed, sure of myself) and three scales assessed negative feelings (scared, mad, sad). Four composite scores were derived :-
(i) Positive reactions to safe scenes;
(ii) Negative reactions to safe scenes;
(iii) Positive reactions to unsafe scenes; and,
(iv) Negative reactions to unsafe scenes.

These scales were designed to assess whether children's emotional reactions to scenes were congruent with their safety ratings, as a further measure of potential negative Programme effects. For example, if children in the experimental group had more negative emotional reactions to safe scenes, one might conclude that children were overgeneralising prevention messages and consequently experiencing undue emotional distress.

The parental questionnaire to obtain information about the impact of
the Programme on children's emotional state and behaviour was completed one to two weeks after the Programme. At this time, the children in the control group had participated in the pre and post-testing only, whereas the experimental group had received the Programme. Questionnaires were returned by only 46% of the parents, including 140 in the experimental and 84 parents in the control group. Disclosure data was obtained by trainers completing a report form immediately after the Programme sessions whereas teachers and social workers completed forms after the follow-up, so that delayed disclosures could be included.

In the one-year follow-up, the two schools in Condition 1 (teacher and child training) and two schools in Condition 2 (child training) were asked to participate; due to time constraints one of the schools in Condition 2 declined. Of the 311 children who participated in the original Programme, 103 were available for follow-up. These children (now fourth and fifth graders) participated in a single session booster shot facilitated by a trained mental health professional which included the video 'Yes You Can Say No' (Committee for Children 1986).

All of the children had completed the 'What I Know About Touching' during the six-week follow-up the previous year. Fifty-eight children were randomly assigned to Group A and completed the knowledge scale again; the remaining forty-five children (Group B) completed the knowledge scale after the booster. Similarly, a sub-sample of 30 randomly selected children from Group A who had never seen the 'What Would You Do' video vignettes measure completed it before the booster and a sub-sample of twenty-five other children from Group B completed it after the booster programme. These two groups of children were compared to seventy-eight other children who had completed the video vignettes at the six-week follow-up the previous year.

The major analyses were at first conducted using all three levels of treatment condition. Since there was no significant difference in any of the analyses between Condition 1 (teacher and child training) and 2 (child training), these conditions were combined into one treatment
condition, n=286) and contrasted with the control condition (n =113).

The results of this comprehensive evaluation showed that :-

- The most frequent source of previous education on child sexual abuse was parents, with 68% of the children reporting that parents had talked to them about this topic. In fact, 33% of the children reported that parents had talked to them on at least three occasions about sexual abuse. Fifty-three percent of children reported seeing at least one television programme about sexual abuse and 32% reported reading at least one book, magazine or comic book about sexual abuse. However the correlations between total previous education and pre, post and follow-up scores on the knowledge or anxiety measures were non-significant.

- The experimental group’s scores increased significantly from pre to post-testing and these gains were maintained at six week follow-up, whereas the control group’s scores increased only slightly each time. Of note, fourth graders were more knowledgeable than third graders and regardless of condition, girls scores were slightly higher than boys at post-testing and follow-up.

- In the analysis of children's emotional responses to the Prevention Programme, there were no differences between the experimental and control group. In fact, the means in the sample (29.7 for the experimental and 29.9 for the control group) were slightly lower than the means for Spielberger's (1973) original normative sample (girls = 30.7; boys = 31.0). Moreover, there was no difference in the frequency of the parents in the experimental and control groups' reports of potential side effects. The only negative reactions reported by more than 5% of the overall sample were increased fears of stranger (13%) and embarrassment (7%).

- Two sets of t tests were computed on the video vignettes dependent measures. First, children's scores in the experimental group were compared to children's scores in the control group at post-testing. The same procedure was conducted at the 6-week follow-up. The experimental group had higher safety
discrimination scores than the control group and demonstrated better ability to differentiate between safe and unsafe situations at post-testing and follow-up. This result was also confirmed by the greater confusion demonstrated by the control group's emotional ratings of safe scenes. However, the experimental group's prevention skills scores did not significantly differ from those of the control group's responses to abusive video scenes, where both groups gave approximately two of the three correct responses (say "No", tell an adult). The researchers speculated that this may be attributable to children being taught these responses to a variety of problematic situations, such as dealing with a bully. They further note, as Miltenberger et al (1988) found when they compared children's verbal responses and role-play responses to abduction scenarios, that children's verbal responses may underestimate their behavioural responses. Pearson correlation coefficients were also computed to determine how children's scores on the video measure were related to other dependent measures. Safety discrimination and prevention skills scores were not significantly correlated with knowledge or anxiety scores at post-testing.

- Children who participated in the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme retained, and in fact slightly increased, their knowledge over the one-year period. Also, contrary to the findings of other researchers (e.g. Plummer 1984) there was no decline of knowledge in any individual knowledge items. Children also retained safety discrimination and prevention skills on the video vignettes measure over the one-year period.

- Over 5% of the total sample disclosed on-going or past abuse - among the 526 children who had permission to participate, there were 8 (1.5%) disclosures of ongoing sexual abuse, 20 (3.8%) of past sexual abuse, 5 (0.9%) of on-going physical abuse and 1 (0.2%) of past physical abuse. Although follow-up information was not available on all disclosures, the researchers were not made aware of any disclosures which were subsequently felt to be false allegations by school personnel or Protective Services.

The results of this study confirm the findings of other studies which
assessed knowledge gains from the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme in particular (Hamilton 1989; Sigurdson et al 1986), and replication of other studies in general. In their most recent study, Wurtele et al (1989) demonstrated the superiority of prevention approaches teaching concrete rules and behavioural approaches to pre-school children, as opposed to programmes using affective based rules about touching. The study by Hazzard et al (1991) demonstrated that a curriculum incorporating an affective component, as well as concrete rules and behavioural rehearsal, does appear to be effective with upper primary school-aged children. Furthermore, retention of knowledge was also demonstrated. The researchers concluded that the improved knowledge scores could be attributable to one of four factors: -

i) Exposure to a prevention curriculum could increase children's interest in future available information in personal safety;

ii) Through exposure to prevention programmes, teachers and children may be encouraged to become more active in talking to their children about how to protect themselves;

iii) Scores may improve because of the maturation of children's overall cognitive reasoning skills; and/or

iv) Children may improve on the Measure as a result of repeated testing.

Generalisation of Programme Strategies

In the Hazzard et al (1991) study, there were two reports of children using strategies "to avoid dangerous situations involving strangers in cars" (p.132). This is the first evaluation to report children being able to generalise Programme strategies to real life situations.

As demonstrated in the Literature Review, one of the spin-offs of prevention programmes is that they may precipitate disclosures by children, the topic examined in the next section.

Disclosures

Prevention programmes are expected to create a language and environment for disclosures of abuse that already have occurred or are
currently ongoing. Again, very few evaluations have systematically assessed this goal which is sometimes considered a secondary prevention outcome.

In the study by Beland (1986), higher yearly disclosure rates in treatment schools (2.04 cases per school) were found than in control schools (0.63 cases per school). In contrast, another study involving 349 third and fourth graders (aged eight-nine), Kolko et al (1987) found no differences in disclosure rates between the two experimental groups and the control group. Approximately 7.5% of all subjects reported abuse. Gilbert et al (1989) also discovered no disclosures as a result of prevention training in their study of 118 pre-school children. Hamilton (1989) evaluating the ‘Feeling Yes, Feeling No’ Programme, noted that three (1.6%) children (aged eleven) disclosed abuse from an original sample of 184, two of these disclosures being made on a non-specific question on the research instrument being used for the pre-knowledge measure. Thus, from this overview of prevention programme effectiveness, it would appear that more studies should keep a systematic record of disclosure as one of the measurements of positive programme intervention.

Unanticipated Consequences

As attention to programmes aimed at empowering children to prevent their own sexual victimisation increases, so does the fear that these same programmes may be hastily instituted, harmful to children and may create a false sense of security in members of our society. Some researchers have attempted to address concerns that programme participation may be harmful to children by evaluating immediate behavioural changes or increases in fear and anxiety. Using these outcomes to measure effects, researchers have generally found positive results (Binder & McNeil 1987; Kenning et al 1987; Miltenberger & Thiesse-Duffy 1988; Swan et al 1985; Wolfe et al 1986; Wurtele et al 1986; Wurtele & Miller-Perrin (1987). For example, Wurtele et al (1986) and Wurtele & Miller-Perrin (1987) found no significant increases in behaviour problems of children between five and twelve recorded by parents after prevention programmes but did find a decrease in three of
eighteen specified problem behaviours. However, neither of these studies had a control group.

A further study by Kleemeier et al (1988) used a follow-up questionnaire with parents of primary school children who had participated in a sexual abuse prevention programme to determine its effectiveness. Although the investigators summarised their results as showing "few negative reactions" the data suggest otherwise. More than one third of the parents reported that their children showed anxiety and irritability, while 20% also described negative behavioural responses, such as rudeness to strangers, disobedience, reluctance to being touched and nightmares following the programme.

Gabarino (1987) found that after reading the 'Spiderman' Comic on sexual abuse prevention, a sizeable minority of children of both sexes and each of three grades (aged seven, nine and ten) reported that the comic worried or scared them (from 17% to 50%). The reason given most often for this anxiety was that they, the children, realised 'it' might happen to them. However, in respect of this finding, Haugaard & Repucci (1988) commented:

"At first glance this result may appear to be a negative side effect; certainly Garbarino appears to have interpreted it this way. However, it can also be interpreted as positive in that the comic book may have made a lasting impression on the children. As with fairy tales, the most enduring stories are frequently those that are somewhat disturbing to their young audience because they provide a warning about some harmful event that could happen" (p.138).

In comparison, Miltenberger & Thiesse-Duffy (1988) found no new behavioural problems, nightmares or other lasting emotional reactions according to parent reports but nearly a third were "a little more scared" and over two thirds were more cautious. Similarly, no significant increases in children's ratings on the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (Spielberger 1973) and adapted version of the Quay and Peterson's Problem Behaviour Checklist (using four sub-scales only: conduct disorders, anxiety withdrawal, attention problem and motor excess), completed by parents following implementation of the 'Talking About Touching' Curriculum (Kenning et al 1987).
In the study by Wurtele & Miller-Perrin (1987), designed to assess the negative consequences of prevention programmes, no increases in children's fears as reported by the child and parent were found. Three significant changes in pre- to post-test behavioural problems were found in parents' ratings in the study by Wurtele & Miller-Perrin (1987) but these were decreases.

A number of evaluations have also assessed children's more general reactions following programme implementation. Most children reported feeling "much safer" (64%) or "somewhat safer" and better able to take care of themselves (94%) after school-based training, while only 3% felt "somewhat more scared" (Binder & McNeil 1987). When children were asked if they liked the prevention programmes, most report enjoying them (Hamilton 1989; Sigurdson et al 1986; Swan et al 1985; Wolfe et al 1986).

The possibility that programmes could create an exaggerated suspiciousness in children about all touch has been explored by a number of researchers. By learning the lessons "too well" children might be inclined to see abuse when there is none, or avoid even nurturing touch. Evidence from evaluation studies is mixed. In one study (Plummer 1984), fifth graders (aged ten) at post-test did not report feeling more negatively about touch between people, but "overall, they were less willing to trust in, believe, obey and rely on any and all adults." A further study by Gilbert et al (1989) reported that following training, pre-school children had "an increase in the degree to which they associated ambiguous touches (tickling and bathing) and with feeling sad" and "a decrease in their association of these touches with happy feelings." Whether these findings represent a significant and permanent shift in these children's perceptions of touching, or an artifact of the particular methodologies, the issue of impact and the generalisation of the concepts they are presented with in these classes need further study.

Whilst no study has documented any lasting increased anxiety as a result of a child attending child assault prevention instruction, several have found children exhibiting some behaviours that suggest caution
is warranted in developing these programmes. Swan et al (1985) noted that following a presentation of the play 'Bubylonian Encounter,' 93% of the children recognised the potential within their own families for a coercive (i.e. non-violent) episode of child sexual abuse and 88% saw the potential for violent sexual assault. One interpretation of this finding is that the children successfully grasped one of the programmes key concepts: sexual abuse is not something that only involves strangers. On the other hand, the finding may also be interpreted as large numbers of children were questioning, perhaps to a degree which was unnecessary, the safety of their own homes.

A similar problem concerning the appropriateness of different types of touch arises from the specification in the programmes of the genital area as private and not to be seen or touched by others. In many programmes parents are excluded from this rule. However, incestuous perpetrators are known to use the excuse of bathing, toileting and health care for initiating sexual contact. For example, a study by Adams & Llewelyn (1989) has shown that the dangers from adults in toileting can be taught to children through puppet videos. The use of such an approach resulted in a significant change in children's descriptions of what is good touch. However, the results of this study need qualification since some touch which leads to sexual abuse can be very ambiguous. This concern is particularly relevant for younger children whose cognitive abilities are not sufficiently developed to cope with ambiguous touching.

This Review now considers the role of parents in educating their children in the wider areas of prevention as these have relevance to the research aims and objectives of this study, before considering those evaluations which examined parental views on child sexual abuse prevention programmes in particular.

Parental Involvement in General Prevention Programmes

Some researchers, intervening in several specific areas, have found it effective to include the child's parents in the intervention programme.
Roddick & Henggler (1980) found that while low achieving inner city adolescents made more initial academic achievement gains if assigned to a school-based academic intervention programme, those youngsters receiving a home-based programme demonstrated more long term gains. The authors suggested that:

"parental involvement .......... facilitates gains which continue in the absence of outside supervision" (p 1130).

Similar results were found by Embry (1982). He compared the effectiveness of symbolic training (which used the child's name incorporated within a Sesame Street story concerning street safety) and parental training in reducing pedestrian accidents involving pre-school children. Embry (1982) found that the symbolic training method decreased the number of times a child ran into the street for only one week. In contrast, the parent-teaching method decreased the children's street entry behaviour twelve-fold and maintained these results at six month follow-up. These findings suggested that where parents are involved in the intervention process, results tend to endure, possibly because the parents continue to maintain the intervention conditions beyond the period of teaching.

Other studies dealing with childhood obesity (Wiston, Bower & Eller 1983), and health beliefs (Hartman 1985), have found parent training to be an effective intervention strategy.

**Parental Involvement in Child Abuse Prevention Programmes**

Strengthening a parent's capacity to better care for his/her child is a common focus among child abuse and neglect prevention programmes (Daro 1988; Weiss & Jacobs 1988). While the content and structure of these programmes vary, critical service goals include:

- Increasing the parent's knowledge of child development and the demands of parenting;
- Enhancing the parent's skill in coping with the stresses of infant and child care;
- Enhancing parent-child bonding, emotional ties and communication;
Increasing the parent's skill in coping with the stress of caring for children with special needs;

Increasing the parent's knowledge about home and child management;

Reducing the burden of child care;

Increasing access to social and health services for all family members.

On balance, programmes which incorporate these objectives appear to rely on a mixture of therapeutic and supportive services. These services include :

- Common service elements for the child;
- Instruction in, or modelling of, basic child care techniques either through clinic-based classes or regular home visits;
- Identification and enhancement of the parent's system of formal and informal supports, and, if appropriate;
- Case management and advocacy services at the client and system levels.

However, traditionally parent education and enhancement services have not been viewed as methods for preventing sexual abuse. A certain degree of education for parents regarding this topic has been woven into the child assault prevention curricula. The majority of these efforts include at least one informational meeting with parents on a voluntary basis prior to the classroom presentation.

**Parental Involvement in Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Programmes**

In the Plowden Report (Central Advisory Council on Education 1967) Peaker (1964) of Her Majesty's Inspectorate, reviewed the evidence from the 'Government Social Survey of Parental Attitudes To Their Children's Education.' The survey covered more than 3,000 children in 173 schools. Peaker's analyses identified three chief variables affecting children's learning :

i) Parental encouragement;

ii) Home (that is, material) circumstance;

iii) Quality of schooling.
Peaker showed that variation in parental encouragement had much greater effect than the other two variables, separately, or combined.

The crucial role of parents in enhancing the education of their children has also been articulated in the 5-14 curriculum documents on Environmental Studies and Personal and Social Development (SOED 1993). In relation to helping their children prevent sexual abuse, parents appear to have a critical role. Finkelhor (1984) outlined this as:-

- Sexual abuse can begin very early in life and parents can be the only ones who are in a position to help very young children avoid potential abusive situations;
- There is no guarantee that anyone else will talk to children about sexual abuse if parents do not;
- Much abuse occurs within the family and it may be that children may be more inclined to heed warnings concerning their families if these come from a family member;
- In telling children about sexual abuse, parents are opening up channels of communication and consequently making children less vulnerable.

Thus, parents have the potential to play a vital role as educators, providing they themselves have been educated about sex education and sexual abuse in particular. The parental role in protecting children and their views on prevention programmes have been examined in a number of studies.

One of the largest and more thorough studies was carried out by Finkelhor in 1984. In a survey of 521 Boston parents, he discovered that 93% of the parents questioned had been exposed to a discussion of sexual abuse. He also found that parents had slight knowledge of the prevalence of child sexual abuse. Although these parents felt it was important to discuss this problem with their child only 29% reportedly had done so. When pressed further, many of these parents described their conversations in a way that suggested that they had spoken to their children about kidnapping while thinking that they were discussing sexual abuse. Finkelhor (1984) postulated that one reason for this finding is that parents were often warned as children about
kidnapping and thus have a vocabulary for sharing this warning with their children, whilst they are unsure of the proper method for raising the topic of sexual abuse.

Regarding recommended action, most parents emphasised to their children the need to get away from the person and tell someone what had happened. Finkelhor noted that the first strategy at least is more useful in dealing with approaches by strangers than attempts at abuse by someone known to the child. He questioned whether parents would have provided action strategies such as saying "No" assertively which, as demonstrated in the Literature Review, would be more relevant in the case of a friend or relative who is attempting abuse.

Finkelhor suggested four reasons why so many parents did not talk to their children about sexual abuse:

i) More than half (55%) of the parents felt that their child was not in danger. (This ran counter to the general belief expressed by parents in this study that one girl in ten was at risk of abuse);

ii) 95% of parents expressed a fear of frightening the child. (At the same time, however, almost all the parents had talked to their children about kidnapping - a much rarer occurrence);

iii) Over a third (36%) of the parents felt that their child was too young, the optimal age, they thought, was around nine years;

iv) The parents expressed difficulty in talking about sex generally.

Two surveys, Gilbert et al (1989) in California and Nibert et al (1988) in Ohio, examined the extent of parental communication with children about sexual abuse. Of the 116 parents in the California study, 81% of the parents of the third graders (aged eight) indicated that they had discussed sexual abuse with their children, and of the 223 parents in the Ohio study 64% of the parents said they had discussed the matter with their pre-school children. Both these findings are in sharp contrast to Finkelhor's (1984) findings in Boston. One possible explanation of these different findings is that there was considerable publicity surrounding the McMartin case in California at the time of the survey by Gilbert et al (1989) where charges of mass sexual abuse of pre-school children were made against school staff and both the publicity and
court trials resulted in heightened awareness by the general public of the problem.

The most consistent finding from evaluations is that they successfully encourage parents to talk with their children about sexual abuse (Swan et al 1985; Wurtele et al 1986; Daro et al 1986; Kolko et al 1987). In the survey by Wurtele et al (1986), 80% of parents noted that their children talked to them after the training. The writers noted that even when they had no specific parent education component, the Programmes prompted parents to talk to their children. Daro et al (1986) also found that two thirds of the parents discussed sexual abuse with their children following the Programme presentation. Furthermore, in a study (Wurtele et al 1992) which compared teachers and parents as instructors for pre-school children, those children who had been randomly assigned to the parent/teacher model scored better on personal safety issues than those children who had only parents or teachers as instructors.

Brassard et al (1983) also advocated the development of unique parent education programmes sponsored by local Parent-Teacher Associations and open to all parents in a community as an effective prevention strategy. They recommended that topics included in such a course might include :-

- The definition, description, prevalence and consequences of incest;
- Information on the intergenerational transmission of abuse;
- Sources of help for incest abusers and victims;
- Recognising signs of abuse in one's own children or other children;
- The responsibilities and rights of parents and children.

The need to involve parents is further supported, in the albeit limited research findings, on what perpetrators think is important in the prevention of child sexual abuse (Budin & Johnson 1989; Conte et al 1989). In identifying vulnerable victims, the writers noted that offenders tended to select children from broken homes. Therefore, any attempt to inform parents (and particularly single parents) of the
problem and bolster their parenting skills must be viewed positively. Furthermore, in the study by Budin & Johnson (1989), offenders specifically stated that involving parents in child sexual abuse prevention programmes would be of benefit to the children and increase their protection from such abuse.

According to Daro (1988), these findings suggested that enrolling parents as full partners in child sexual abuse prevention efforts requires more intensive programmes than currently are in place. It is also the writer's opinion and experience, having attended over three hundred parents evenings on the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, that the involvement of parents is a prerequisite for maximising programme benefit for children (Hamilton & Jackson 1992).

Summary of Evaluation Findings

Overall, it appears from the review of the literature that sexual abuse prevention education programmes evaluated to date, have generally achieved the goal of increasing the participant's knowledge of the prevention concepts viewed as important by the programme designers. Older children appear to learn the concepts better than younger children, because their cognitive development is more advanced and they have had more practice in the kind of group learning situations that the programmes utilise. Booster sessions are beneficial in helping children retain the information taught. The research literature revealed that it remains to be seen if these gains will be retained over a long time and whether these programmes will be useful to a large number of children in potential assault situations.

The studies suggested that curricula employing concrete concepts and an interactive learning experience, including rehearsal and modelling, are the most effective approaches (Fryer et al 1987a & b; Hazzard et al 1991; Peterson 1984; Poche 1981). The Literature Review illustrated that clear rules for what is, or is not appropriate action, were more easily understood by children and more effective than encouraging them to rely only on intuition (Wurtele 1989; Gilbert et al 1989). The research
evidence indicated that the problem was further compounded by manipulative perpetrators using deliberately ambiguous and confusing touches with children. As a result, the literature confirmed that role-play of inappropriate touches of genital areas are more easily taught to children than abstract concepts of 'confusing touch' (Conte & Fogarty 1989). This approach leaves few options for preventive programmes but to instruct children about the inappropriateness of genital contact to which ambiguous touches may lead. From victim reports, it is clear that often the sexual touch is not considered bad or inappropriate (Berliner & Conte 1990). This perception could be, because the gradual progression of touch from non-sexual to sexual desensitises the victim to the effects of the action. Consequently, the evidence confirmed that creating touch discrimination tasks complex enough to include the difficult and ambiguous situations victims can face, is a major challenge for programme makers.

Better designed studies employing quasi or experimental design have demonstrated that this learning is not simply a rote parroting of ideas, but that children can apply the concepts in imaginary situations and role-plays. These studies caution regarding the assumption that children will be able to translate the knowledge gained from prevention programmes into effective action when needed. At least four studies (Fryer et al 1987a & b; Peterson 1984; Poche 1981) suggested that learning translates into appropriate behaviour in the real world, although this and several other studies caution that the acquisition of new behaviours (i.e. assertiveness and the ability to say "No") is less reliable and less universal than the acquisition of ideas. Prevention programmes are thus powered by the idea that increasing children's knowledge about abuse, providing them with action alternatives such as giving them permission to say "No" and get help, and bringing the dangers of abuse to their attention may be important in preventing sexual victimisation.

In addition to these methodological limitations, the literature confirmed that few studies have systematically assessed key ethical and theoretical questions surrounding these programmes, such as the long-term effect of these interventions on :-
i) A child's attitude, or perception of, strangers.
ii) A teacher's willingness to have physical contact with a child.
iii) A child's fear of being abused by his or her parents or other family members.

This Review confirmed that despite the fact developmental differences among children demand different instructional formats and different goals, some programmes continue to use the same presentation for first (aged six) and fifth (aged ten) graders. The Review also highlighted that most prevention programmes have a foundation in anecdotal clinical information (Conte 1987) and therefore are based on several untested assumptions (Repucci & Haugard 1989). One of these assumptions is that we know what types of skills will lessen children's susceptibility to sexual abuse (even when research into the definition of child sexual abuse clearly suggests that it has many different forms). It is therefore probable that skills useful for preventing one type of abuse are not useful in preventing a different type, or that some skills may be useful for children of one age but not for children of another age. Clarity as to the specific skills and behaviours that prevention programmes should teach is needed. This clarity should be achieved by assessing what happens in abusive situations. However, the evidence confirmed that "in vivo" situations are difficult to construct because of various ethical problems, not the least of which, is that subjecting children to potentially sexual abusive situations is unacceptable.

A major gap identified in the Literature Review is that only one evaluation to date (Hazzard et al 1991) has tested whether any of these programmes actually achieve their ultimate goal of preventing abuse. Therefore, longitudinal evaluation studies are required if the claim of these programmes to actually prevent abuse is to be supported.

To document clearly the potential benefits of prevention programmes, the literature reaffirmed that additional studies are required. Such studies must utilize clearly described and replicable intervention procedures used, large samples of children, structured evaluation instruments, and a controlled experiment design as well as providing some measurement of whether these programmes actually prevent
abduction and/or sexual assault. Thus, this Review confirmed that the content and structure of prevention programmes and the methods used to assess their effectiveness must remain under constant revision. Underscoring all programme changes must be a commitment to evaluate the relationship of these programmes to later learning and to study how children, parents and teachers are coping with the increasing references to child abduction and sexual abuse in all aspects of their lives.

In addition, the Literature Review reaffirmed that child assault prevention programmes need to expand their explicit outcomes and develop a body of normative data. Knowledge regarding child sexual abuse, the need for a child to tell an adult if he or she is threatened or abused, and the need for a child to avoid risky situations are all important messages. Equally important, however, the research evidence confirmed the need to continue to develop accurate measures of the ability of these programmes to enhance positive self-awareness and solid decision-making skills. This is particularly highlighted in the studies which have used the simulation technique. There is also evidence to support that these programmes encourage disclosures of abuse.

To the extent that child assault prevention programmes mature into curricula which offer explicit opportunities for the development of personal and self-assertiveness skills, they can become programmes which prevent not only child abuse, but also lay foundation skills for teaching a host of other dilemmas children face in later life e.g. 'Drugwise Too 12-14' and HIV prevention education.

In respect of parents, there seems to be little in the way of education programmes aimed at the prevention of child sexual abuse. As reported in Chapter Three the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme is an exception to this as it provides both training material for parents and also an adult informational video-tape. Parents particularly need to be informed about child sexual abuse and about how best to equip children to act safely, or deal with such contingencies as they arise.
There is evidence, however, that adults generally tend to engage in a certain amount of denial; and if parents acknowledge that sexual abuse occurs, it is not their children who are potential victims. Evidence suggested that although parents are well informed about some aspects of sexual abuse, they have misconceptions about others. This is a serious situation as some of the studies (e.g. Hazzard et al 1991) show that parents are likely to be key informants of child sexual abuse prevention knowledge to their children.

The Review also demonstrated that many parents do not talk to their children about sexual abuse, being embarrassed themselves, or considering their children too young for such knowledge, or deciding that the issue is not of relevance to their situation. Moreover, if they do discuss the situation, they are likely to focus on encounters with strangers and 'kidnap', when in fact children are more likely to be abused by someone they know. Despite efforts to date, it is clear that a lot remains to be done in involving parents as informed partners in child sexual abuse prevention.

The Contribution of this Study to the Literature

This study contributes to the literature by building on the studies in the previous section 'Evaluations relevant to this study' in the following ways. In comparison with the:-

- Poche et al (1981) and Peterson(1984) studies, the sample in this study in the simulation exercise was considerably larger, - three children in the former studies compared with twenty-eight. Additionally, the simulation exercise took place outside of the school, a considerable distance from the children's homes and in a city context which, for most of the children, was an alien environment. Furthermore, the simulations were not only tape-recorded but also video-recorded;

- Sigurdson et al (1987) and Hamilton (1989) studies, in order to provide greater reliability for the comparison of knowledge gains this study had a control group; 13

- Fryer et al (1987a & b) evaluations, this study had originally been set up to involve fifty-five children in the simulation.

13 The reader is reminded that this study was set-up before Hazzard et al (1991) had reported.
exercise. In order to control for any major confounding variables, the study was conducted away from the schools as described earlier. In an effort to answer some of the criticism levelled at Fryer et al (1987a & b), this study examined whether the simulation method desensitised children to approaches by strangers;

- Hazzard et al (1991) evaluation, this study utilised a behavioural measure to measure the impact of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme. Furthermore, the follow-up period in this study to assess whether children were able to generalise Programme strategies to real life situations was fifteen months.

In comparison with those studies (Fryer et al 1987a & b; Peterson 1984; Poche 1981) specifically involving a simulation of stranger abduction, this study:

- Used lures which were unique to the staging of the simulation exercise and therefore required children to generalise across-situations as they had never been specifically rehearsed or modelled during the teaching of the Programme;
- Had British children as subjects;
- Was designed so that the simulation exercise would be rated by completely independent raters, thus being only the second such study and the first British study to do so;
- Provided detailed explanation of the safeguards to prevent a child leaving with the 'stranger' and the procedure for ensuring subjects did not come into contact with each other during the simulation exercise;
- Examined other possible vulnerability factors to abduction.

In comparison with any other study, to the best of the writer's knowledge, the stranger vignettes examine previously uncharted

14 Due to circumstances outwith the writer's control (fully explained in Chapter Four), the simulation exercise involved twenty-eight children.
15 Children in Lothian Region primary schools have a school rule that they are not allowed to leave the playground without the express permission of the Head Teacher or Designated Member of Staff.
16 Due to circumstances outwith the writer's control (fully explained in Chapter Four), this part of the research design had to be compromised.
ground in the field of child sexual abuse prevention by establishing in the paper and pencil exercise children's ability:

- To predict the appropriate behavioural responses to child abduction which also allowed a comparison to be made of the children's actual behavioural responses in the simulation exercise;
- To predict sexual assault a likely consequence of stranger abduction;
- To attribute appropriate blame for sexual assault.

In the examination of the last concept, the reader is reminded that there is some evidence that victims frequently internalise blame for sexual abuse. This also fits in with theory of "Stigmatisation" (Browne & Finkelhor 1984). Whilst the writer would acknowledge that most sexual abuse happens within the family, the stranger vignettes were the nearest ethical measurement the writer could use to test children's ability to attribute blame appropriately for sexual assault.

A Comprehensive Strategy for Preventing Child Sexual Abuse

From the evidence presented in the Literature Review, experience, and the areas of inquiry in this study, it is the writer's contention that sexual abuse prevention programmes can only form one part of an overall strategy in the prevention of child sexual abuse. Furthermore, a multi-disciplinary approach is essential to the delivery of school-based prevention programmes (Hamilton & Jackson 1992). It, therefore, is essential to consider the wider policies which would have to be in place to tackle this serious social problem before concluding part one of the Literature Review.

Programme effectiveness aside, it is clear from the consequences experienced by victims that a more expansive prevention policy is needed to ensure a reduction in the number of child abduction and sexual abuse cases. In developing an effective approach to preventing child sexual abuse, it is critical to begin with an overall model which highlights those personal and environmental factors which contribute to an increased likelihood for maltreatment. Such an approach has
two advantages. Firstly, it protects programme planners and policy makers from vesting too much in one specific prevention strategy. As child sexual abuse stems from multiple causes, it would be unrealistic to expect any intervention, no matter how well designed, to effectively prevent abuse on its own. Success in preventing this type of abuse, as well as other major types of maltreatment, rests on the development of a coordinated effort including numerous programmes, each addressing specific aspects of the problem. Secondly, the development of an overall model helps identify the breadth of factors and conditions one needs to consider in designing prevention strategies.

A series of suggestions have been provided in the research literature on the structure of a comprehensive approach to preventing child sexual abuse. The National Committee for Prevention of Child Sexual Abuse, along with a number of practitioners and policy makers working in the area of sexual victimisation (Cohn et al 1985), outlined a plan for preventing adults from becoming sexual abusers. This approach was based on eleven assumptions regarding the nature of the sexual abuse problem the current response system in America:

i) Child sexual abuse is a very complex problem with causal roots in a host of personal functioning problems and social conditions;

ii) Current knowledge is imperfect regarding the causes of sexual abuse, the characteristics of offenders, the characteristics of victims, and the most appropriate response system. While much more is known today than ten or even five years ago, programme planning continues to occur with less than ideal information;

iii) There is no clear profile of the average sexual abuse offender. Identified perpetrators come from all walks of life, all income groups, and all races. Similarly, there are no consistent features found in all victims. This reality underscores the need to allocate some resources towards blanketing children with prevention education;

iv) Offenders are not limited to adults. Research shows that perpetrators with the largest number of victims begin these behaviours as young adolescents;

---

17 These assumptions also apply in a British context.
v) Sexual fantasies and thought often precede abusive behaviours, suggesting that a critical opportunity for prevention is when these fantasies begin;

vi) Sexual abuse is not strictly a power issue. It involves sexual ideas, beliefs and preferences and, in some instances, confusion over appropriate sexual touching;

vii) In certain cases, sexual abuse occurs because children do not resist advances, often because they do not know that they have the right to say "No" or how best to exercise that right;

viii) Some sexual abuse exists because children are not in a safe environment. Parents have not insured that those adults having contact with their children are committed to treating them in a positive and non-abusive manner;

ix) Sexual abuse exists in part because of values and messages transmitted through the media. Violence, particularly against women, and the sexual dominance of men, sends a message that such behaviour is not only appropriate but that it is essential for sexual fulfilment. Further, in a society which lauds individual freedom, there is a general reluctance to articulate in clear and unambiguous language the inappropriateness of certain forms of sexual gratification;

x) Sexual abuse is deeply embedded in our society, in our values and in the way families are structured. American society values the family above all else and has established legal principles and normative values to limit the capacity of the state to intervene in the raising of children. Thus, children are viewed very much as the property of their parents, rather than a collective treasure for the entire community;

xi) Recognising the limitations of the current knowledge base, any plan to prevent child sexual abuse must be flexible enough to maximise the opportunities of adjusting the response in light of emerging clinical and non-clinical research findings.

With these parameters defining the planning framework, it thus becomes clear that a multifarious approach to preventing child sexual abuse is needed: one which simultaneously targets the potential victim, potential perpetrator and those aspects of the social fabric which
nurture abusive behaviours. Whilst the writer would acknowledge that child sexual abuse prevention programmes tackle only part of the problem, it is the writer's belief that they do have an important contribution to make as part of an overall strategy for the prevention of child abduction and sexual assault.

Stone (1986) has perhaps best encapsulated what the essence of prevention education should be and it appears an appropriate conclusion for this part of the Review:

"When prevention programs are appropriate to the child's age and development are presented in a safe and calm manner, children are not frightened - they are relieved. Most children live with the unexplained fear of strangers. So, having specific information about what an adult they know might do and what action they can take gives them more control" (p. 131).

This philosophy underscores the writer's personal beliefs and values gained from her experience of both working with abused children and teaching children prevention programmes. It also underpins the design of the strategy utilised to conduct this study.

Part two of the Literature Review examines the literature relating to the cognitive prerequisites of child sexual abuse prevention curricula and other areas of cognition which have relevance to the design of this study and the research aims.
"A cognitive strategy is an internally organised skill that selects and guides the internal processes involved in defining and solving novel problems. In other words it is a skill by means of which the learner manages his own thinking behaviour...... Cognitive strategies have as their objects the learner's own thought processes. Undoubtedly, the efficacy of an individual's cognitive strategies exerts a crucial effect upon the quality of his own thought" (Gagne & Briggs 1974 p.54).

Introduction

The above quotation by is a reminder of the complexity of cognitive development and the critical importance of cognitive strategies in mastering tasks. The cognitive strategies reviewed are those theoretical concepts which have particular relevance to educational programmes designed to promote child abduction and sexual abuse prevention. These are cognitive development, social learning, and self-efficacy theories. Consequently, part two of the Literature Review is presented in these three sections.

As demonstrated in part one of the Literature Review, cognitive development is considered important in the design of child sexual abuse prevention programmes since many of the incorporated concepts may not be commensurate with a child's age and stage of cognitive development. Within this context, section one therefore examines :-

- Requirements of prevention curricula.
- Cognitive requirements.
- Social and moral requirements.
- Cognitive style.
- Children's negative self-perceptions and cognitive enhancement strategies.
Summary of cognitive development theory and its implications for prevention curricula.

Section two specifically addresses learning by response consequences and the importance of behavioural rehearsal as these have particular relevance to a key area under investigation in this study - the stranger abduction simulation. A review of the literature on research which has used behavioural models of training to tackle childhood problems of vulnerability follows. This overview is undertaken to demonstrate the links between these findings and, as reported in part one of the Literature Review, the more successful evaluations of child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention programmes which have involved behaviourally-based training.

This is followed by an review of those studies which have examined the relationship of cognitive style and childhood vulnerability. A review of the studies on the identification of children with negative self-perceptions as well as those which considered cognitive strategies to assist self management behaviours are then discussed. It is felt the findings in these studies may shed light on the identification of vulnerable children, some of the concerns regarding gaps in child abduction and sexual abuse prevention programmes as well as informing the research questions. All of these topics have been encapsulated under one of the following headings :-

▲ Learning by response consequences.
▲ Comparative methods for tackling childhood vulnerability.
▲ Summary of social learning theory.

Section three describes self-efficacy theory as it is felt to be particularly pertinent in clarifying some of the the research questions and concerns in the literature regarding the stranger abduction simulation. The following areas of self-efficacy have therefore been specifically addressed :-

▲ Sources of self-efficacy information.
▲ Peers and self-efficacy.
▲ Development of self-appraisal skills.
A Summary of self-efficacy theory.
A Overview of relevant educational theory.

Cognitive development, social learning and self-efficacy theories are the key educational theoretical paradigms which drive this study, directly inform the research questions, as well as being appropriate for the age of the subjects in the study.

SECTION ONE - COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT THEORY

Requirements of Prevention Curricula

The work of Berrick & Gilbert (1991) and Finkelhor & Strapko (1987) form the source material for this review. Four aspects of cognitive development which have implications for the design of child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention programmes are examined. These are the:

(i) Cognitive requirements;
(ii) Social and moral requirements;
(iii) Cognitive style; and,
(iv) Children's negative self-perceptions and cognitive enhancement strategies.

Cognitive Requirements

As illustrated in the first part of the Literature Review, research has shown that not only are some prevention concepts easier to learn and remember than others, but, in general, younger children have greater difficulty in learning particular concepts than older children. This part of the review examines which concepts young children find most difficult to learn in child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention programmes, and whether this phenomenon can be explained, at least partly, by their limited cognitive capabilities.

Specific concepts examined include:-
a) The touch continuum;
b) Level of abstraction;
c) Multidimensional constructs;
d) Symbol translation;
e) Application of practical skills.

a) The Touch Continuum

Central to almost all sexual abuse prevention programmes is the touch continuum or the need for the child to differentiate between what is a safe ('good') and a not-safe ('bad') touch. A fundamental difficulty, which could prove problematic when a child attempts to use his/her knowledge, is that often abuse starts not with touching but with the building up of a relationship between the victim and the perpetrator (Berliner & Conte 1990; Budin & Johnson 1989; Conte et al 1989). One reason that a child is unable to apply differential skills is that the child does not recognise what is going on as abusive and thus feel a partner in the relationship. Consequently the child feels responsible and, therefore, unlikely to tell (Gilgun & Connor 1989).

Therefore, when prevention programmes attempt to teach children the difference between safe and unsafe touching, given that initially the touch or the abuse may feel good and the child may feel a partner in what is going on, the process becomes very complex. Young children, therefore, find it difficult to make these distinctions causing some researchers to question whether attempts should even be made to try to teach young children such concepts (Berrick & Gilbert 1991).

In terms of Piaget's (1963) theory of moral development for a pre-operational child (below seven years of age) morality is determined by the consequences, and not the intentions, of the actor. Additionally, an act is considered 'good' or 'bad' by consideration of the outcome of the act and not by the complex process which may have taken place before an outcome became apparent. Furthermore, according to de Young (1988):
"The attribution of character to the person, then, will be congruent with the child's evaluation of the outcomes of the person's behaviour" (p.63).

This principle has been widely supported in the child development literature (Bareboim 1981; Constanzo et al 1973; Gutkin 1972; Hebble 1971; Peevers & Secord 1973). These studies not only corroborated Piaget's hypothesis, but also confirmed that the ability to ascribe moral and attributional judgements to the intent of the person engaging in the behaviour does not develop until later childhood. So, as illustrated by de Young (1988) for a "preoperational" child, the adult who accidently breaks a toy is "bad" while the adult who gives the toy to him/her in order to manipulate the child into engaging in some kind of behaviour is "good". The subtleties of intent are obviously lost on young children. Thus, for the child who is being abused, this behaviour means that if an abuser is using 'gentle' means of abusing the child, then not only will the child not see this as bad, but furthermore, they will not see the perpetrator as in the wrong. When it comes to teaching children about 'good' and 'bad' touch therefore, questions must be raised as to whether the child is sufficiently cognitively mature to make such decisions.

Support for this line of argument also comes from looking at children's ability to see cause and effect relationships. Recent research by Coppens (1986) examined children's (aged three - eight years) understanding of safety and prevention. This competence was determined by responses to questions after viewing colour photos of safe and unsafe situations. Coppens found a steady improvement with age in the children's responses, but nevertheless, whilst more than half of the six - eight year-olds had a perfect safety score, only one child in this group had a perfect prevention score. Specifically, the mean percentage score on the safety task was 85% compared to 56% on the prevention task. Further, measures of causal reasoning appeared to be the main predictor of safety and prevention scores. However, a word of caution is warranted with respect to
the applicability of these results in the child sexual abuse field. The safe and unsafe situations which this study used all had foreseeable injury; the prevention efforts targeting potential sexually abusive situations may not. This caution could imply that children should not be taught prevention skills. In the writer's opinion, the questions instead ought to be about what can be done to make prevention education more effective.

A possible alternative to teaching younger children about the touch continuum, and a method which has met with success is that outlined by Wurtele (1987). She advocated that:

"rather than referring to different kinds of touches or resulting affective states, the emphasis is on protection of private parts. This concrete definition has been successfully employed with five and six year olds, but would have obvious limitations with older children" (p. 489).

Therefore, when individuals are looking at possible materials for use with children, one of the most important considerations they should look at is how concrete, as opposed to how abstract, the methods for teaching the child are, relative to the age and stage of cognitive development.

Additionally, in the course of their exposure to prevention curricula, children are called on to master abstractions, multidimensional constructs, symbolic representations and practical skills. These tasks place intellectual demands on children that are not always commensurate with their abilities, particularly those of the youngest participants.

b) **Level of Abstractions**

Much of the materials used in prevention curricula involve concepts that are moderately abstract such as :

- Secrets;
- Children's rights;
- Safe;
- Free;
- Intuition.
These tasks place intellectual demands on children that are not always consonant with their abilities. According to Piaget (1967), the "preoperational" child's thinking is restricted to concrete perceptions of the world in which actions are irreversible and objects invisible. Thus, the child's abstract understanding is markedly limited at this age. However, as children develop in the primary years and shift from the "preoperational" to the "operational" stage, their capacity for abstract thought increases (the process is gradual, and many children do not develop abstract thought processes until much later). The main characteristic of this stage of 'concrete' operations is that the child begins to think in terms of a set of interrelated principles rather than in single bits of knowledge.

In recent years, however, many critical reappraisals of Piaget's work have begun to appear in the literature. One of the most problematical areas of Piagetian theory is his selection of particular knowledge structures as the end-point of human cognitive development. This, together with Piaget's emphasis on scientific, rather than other kinds of thinking, has been increasingly questioned. Evidence from a number of studies has shown that cognitive performance at particular ages is very inconsistent (Gelman 1969; Siegel et al 1966). As a result, even theorists who basically support Piaget's stage approach e.g. Beilin (1980) now accept that the transition between stages may be longer and the differences less clear-cut than was originally thought.

Donaldson (1978), in particular, has criticised Piaget's claims that children below the age of concrete operations are incapable of logical thinking and are egocentric in that they are not responsive to others. Linked to children's ability to show logical thinking at earlier stages than Piaget has claimed, several studies have shown that it is possible to train children to carry out Piagetian tasks like conservation at ages below those specified by him (Gelman 1969; Siegel et al 1966). It has been demonstrated repeatedly that children often fail Piagetian tasks not because
they were incapable of the reasoning required but because the experimental conditions confused them (Bryant & Trebasso 1971; Donaldson 1978). Nevertheless, some of the concepts in child sexual abuse prevention programmes make formidable demands on young children's cognitive capacities which must be taken into account in their design and application.

The development of thought processes can be seen quite clearly by examining the notion of 'secrets' - a central concept in most prevention programmes. If one were to ask a pre-school child to define a secret, the child's response would probably focus on the description of a concrete action. That is, the child would probably say that secrets involve the act of whispering in someone's ear or cupping a hand over one's mouth. The content of the secret would be lost, especially if it had been communicated in audible tones. As children grow, they begin to comprehend the idea that a secret is more than an act of communicating words, rather they realise that it involves keeping something hidden or concealed regardless of how it is communicated. Thus, a perpetrator might tell a child of eight or nine in a normal voice that she should not reveal what has happened to anyone. Although the message is not whispered, the child is likely to understand that she has been told to keep a secret.

During middle childhood, formal schooling plays an increasingly important role in the development of children's thinking, particularly in the development of metacognition. Flavell (1985) observed that school-aged children gradually:

"learn more and more about what 'the game of thinking is like and about how it is supposed to be played' " (p102).

For example, children learn that "tasks and problems usually have solutions," that they usually have to "engage in some sort of cognitive activity to solve them," and that some problem-solving strategies are more effective than others. By the end of this period, children's thinking is much like that of adults.
The ideological principles on which many sexual abuse prevention curricula are also based on a set of fairly abstract ideas about 'children's rights'. These rights are typically classified as 'rights to be safe, strong and free' (Child Assault Prevention Training Center Preschool Curriculum undated). However, the message that children have certain rights is often not heard in the way that well-meaning adults intend. As one child development specialist (Bellum 1989) put it:

"To them, the word 'right' means the opposite of 'left' or 'wrong'."

Kohlberg (1963) suggested that "having a right" should be equated with children's understanding of "being right." The right to be "strong" is intended to communicate a sense of inner strength and psychological empowerment. This is a particularly difficult idea for children to grasp since on their understanding of the world through concrete activities and experiences, strength is viewed mainly in relation to physical force.

The right to be free is equally complicated. Does it mean free to eat ice cream or to go to sleep whenever they want? Indeed even for adults, what it means to be free - freedom from (coercion) or freedom to (realise one's potential) - is a long-standing subject of philosophical debate.

c) Multidimensional Constructs
Adults have the ability to perceive multidimensional aspects of their environment. However, research has shown that very young children are apt to think along only one dimension at a time (Abound 1985; Cowan 1978; Piaget 1963). Although Donaldson (1978) has demonstrated that children can perceive two characteristics simultaneously, their ability to do so is limited; moreover, they do not allow additional experience to enhance their initial perception. Instead, they tend to fixate either on the quality or quantity of an object as it is immediately observed (Elkind et al 1970; Smith 1979). This restricted form of perception thus creates possibilities for confusion in working with children, as prevention curricula contain many concepts
that are multidimensional.

The "touch continuum," for example, combines dimensions of physical and emotional experience that may confound its meaning for young children (de Young 1988). This continuum not only categorises the physical experience of touching but also connects that experience to one's emotions (i.e. "a good touch makes you feel good" and "a bad touch makes you feel bad" ('Children's Self-Help Project' 1983). The confusing touch is in the middle ground, with an equally perplexing definition. Confusing touches include either multiple emotions regarding a single event (e.g. "you feel good about it at first then you change your mind and you don't like it any more" ('Children's Self-Help Project' 1983; 'Talking About Touching' 1987) or a merging of the action with the actor (e.g. "you like what the person is doing, but you don't like the person" ('Children's Self-Help Project' 1983; 'Talking About Touching' 1987).

Cowan (1978) suggested that pre-school children experience emotions serially and singularly; the blending of emotional experience is not an accurate depiction of the young child's experience: the pre-school child loves her new dress or hates her shoes; she loves her mummy when she's nice and hates her when she's angry. Expressions of ambivalence are rare and not well understood by young children. Therefore, the mixed-up touch, which signifies two conflicting emotions about a single experience or person, is difficult for the young child to comprehend.

Just as younger children experience emotions singularly, they also have great difficulty perceiving multiple character traits in individuals. Hartley & Hartley (1955) studied children's understanding of multiple class membership and found that young children believe these traits can be attached to only one object. For example, when children were asked if their mother was still a mother when she was at work, many responded
negatively, saying that the mother could not have two labels because she would then be two people. Thus, the tendency to think in multidimensional terms is not well suited for prevention messages that try to convey the multiple characteristics of offenders such as:

"There are two kinds of people who sexually abuse children: strangers and people you know. Most of the time it is someone the child knows. When someone in a kid's family sexually abuses a child, it is called incest" ('Children's Self-Help Project' 1983 p. vi-b-6).

In fact, most of the prevention curricula include multiple labels in their definitions of behaviour as the following examples demonstrate:

"Secrets can be 'good' or 'bad' " (Child Assault Prevention Programme' 1988).

"Safe touches are caring. They don't hurt our bodies or feelings" and/or, "They can be given by someone you don't want them from - regardless of how they feel" (Talking About Touching' p 11 1986).

"Unsafe touches hurt our bodies or feelings," and/or "They may not hurt our bodies or feelings, but are on our private parts" (Talking About Touching' 1986).

"You may want [a ? touch] at first but then change your mind" or, "You may like the person who's doing the touching, but you may not like how the touch feels" (Children's Self Help Project' 1983).

Not only are these concepts two-dimensional, but they include temporally separate aspects as well events that may occur at a later time. For example, yellow touches can turn to red touches; tickling may become sexual abuse (Williams 1980). These temporal eventualities represent a two-dimensional shift in thinking which school-aged children may be able to deal with, but which usually perplex pre-school children. Young children are similarly inept in making dispositional or temporal transitions with regard to character traits. As Kraizer (1986) observed:

"Young children are unable to reconcile a 'bad' touch occurring with 'good' people, that is, people they love" p.260.
Rholes & Rhuble (1984) examined children's understanding of the inconsistency of character disposition and action. Their work showed that pre-school children cannot anticipate the behaviour of others over time. In fact, the implications of their study suggested that a young child who is abused once may not be able to predict that the same offence could occur in the future.

One of the goals of many prevention curricula is to communicate the possibility that seemingly innocuous situations may transform into threatening events. Rholes & Rhuble (1984) also suggested that children are able to discern potential threats and to take preventive action that would stop an unsafe situation from occurring. However, this idea of anticipating danger is taken directly from women's self-defence training, which although appropriate for adults, is not altogether in keeping with the capacities of young children.

Coppens (1986) investigated preschool children's ability to take preventive action that would stop an unsafe situation from occurring. In contrast, her findings show limited anticipatory behaviour indicating that children must first know that a situation is unsafe before they will act. This study confirmed Schultz & Mendelson's (1975) work, which noted that pre-school children have greater success in identifying factors that cause an effect than they have with identifying factors that prevent an event from occurring. Programmes that encourage children to "trust (their) funny feelings" and to act on the basis of emotional use do not fully appreciate the temporal dimensions of this task and the demand it places on children to evaluate a situation for potential danger and take preventive action ('Children's Self-Help Project' 1983; 'Talking About Touching' 1985; 1987; 'Touch Program' 1983).

d) Symbol Translation
During the pre-school years, children gradually begin to perceive material things and actions not only objectively but also in a representational fashion (Ault 1977). They "pretend" to drink
from a cup, talk on the telephone, or animate dolls as people. This behaviour has a clear connection to children's cognitive development: by internalising observations and experiences through symbolic play, they are simultaneously assimilating their experience. Although this early symbolic thinking is a stepping-stone to more challenging cognitive tasks, not all children are capable of translating some of the more advanced forms of symbolic representation employed in prevention curricula.

Returning to the touch continuum, red, yellow, and green lights are used to symbolize the different types of touching (Williams 1980). Depending on their age and experience, some children may be in the process of learning the absolute meaning of "red", "yellow", or "green". Others may have advanced to the point that they can understand the symbolic meaning of colours in relation to traffic safety. These children may be able to grasp the transformed concept:

"When we get a green light touch, we say Go! We want it to go on and on".

"A red light touch makes us feel bad and to a red light touch we say stop".

However, children's symbolic thought goes only as far as their experience. Specifically, the reason red, yellow, and green are considered constructive symbols for children is that it is assumed the traffic safety concepts have been mastered. In contrast, children run into problems when the symbols are beyond their personal experience. For example, one curriculum includes a "Heart," a "?", and a "No" touch ('Children's Self-Help Project' 1983). The question mark touch can be an intelligible symbol of the uncertainty that may be aroused by some forms of physical contact if children have mastered reading, writing, and of course, punctuation skills. However, when used with children who have not yet learned the alphabet, the symbolic message remains incomprehensible.
Application of Practical Skills

Beyond the introduction of new words and concepts, the teaching of practical skills is the centrepiece of many prevention programmes. Saying "No" to unsafe touches and exerting oneself in physical self-defence are among the key prevention techniques conveyed through classroom instruction. However, many experts question whether young children are able to learn these skills and apply them effectively (Bellum 1989). For example, questions have been raised regarding training in self-defence, which is based on a model for adults used by the 'Women Against Rape' Programme. Even where grown women are involved, few instructors attempt to teach self-defence in one lesson, partly out of misgivings about its inappropriate application (McGurn & Kelly 1984). There is also concern that training in self-defence might make some women overconfident of their abilities to combat an assailant, which could do them more harm than good (Convoy & Ritvoi 1982).

In some cases, instructors believe that training in self-defence for women depends largely on psychological preparation and is only in part a matter of physical techniques (Smith 1986).

These issues take on deeper meaning when young children, rather than adult women, are the subjects of self-defence training. Children simply do not possess the physical strength to defend themselves against adults. While these lessons are highly unlikely to increase safety, the potentially negative consequences of self-defence training - inappropriate use and overconfidence - loom more prominently for children than for adults. For example, brief exposure to these techniques in the classroom may suggest that the use of physical force is acceptable behaviour in the school playground. According to Berrick and Gilbert (1991), in one school in which they were involved, at the conclusion of a 'Child Assault Prevention' (CAP) presentation for third graders (aged eight) that taught self-defence, the children immediately began to try out their newly learned techniques on each other. The teacher was left with the task of breaking up these altercations and undoing the lesson that had
just been taught. Self-defence training thus delivers a message to children that they may effectively exercise abilities that in reality they do not possess. In this regard, it is a message that may create an unwarranted level of confidence. There is some evidence that children interpret this message in ways that could be hazardous to their well-being. Nibert et al (1988) asked pre-school children after exposure to a CAP Programme how they might react to various threatening circumstances. This study revealed that the children's primary response to one or more of the questions was to "hit or kick" a bully, a stranger, or a known abuser.

Social and Moral Requirements

The teaching of abstract concepts, symbolic representations, and certain practical skills places heavy demands on the cognitive abilities of young children to interpret prevention lessons and to apply them appropriately when at risk of being harmed. Beyond the constraints posed by their cognitive development, other developmental boundaries limit what young children can absorb from prevention curricula. Given their levels of social and moral development, lessons concerning, for example, guilt, bribes, rules about touching, and trust also require careful examination. Consequently, the next section reviews the following social and moral areas and examines their implications for the design of child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention curricula. Specific concepts examined include:

a) Guilt;
b) Threats and bribes;
c) Safety rules;
d) Trust and attachment.

a) Guilt ("It's Never the Child's Fault for Sexual Abuse")

Sexual abuse prevention training curricula instruct children that they should not feel guilty if they are abused. In contrast to this message, research on the egocentrism of young children suggested that they often do assign responsibility to themselves for events in which they are not involved (Elkind 1970; Kendall
1984; Piaget 1960b; 1963; Wallerstein & Kelly 1980). Because of this orientation, a few minutes of classroom instruction may not be enough to convince a pre-school child that he/she is not to blame for a sexual assault. Moreover, the child's relationship to the offender also affects his/her sentiments of guilt or shame (Berliner & Conte 1989). As demonstrated in part one of the Literature Review, most sexual abuse involves someone known to the child (Finkelhor 1986). Therefore, it is probable that the offender has a strong influence on the child's emotional experience of the abuse.

If the notion of assigning responsibility to others for an offence in which they are involved is difficult for children to grasp, it must be asked if such a strategy should be incorporated into prevention curricula. Some researchers in the field of prevention claim that although a young child may not fully comprehend the ideas guilt and blame, the training "plants a seed of knowledge" that can be referenced in later years (Los Angeles Times, 1988). However, whatever its long-range consequences, it is recognised that introducing the idea of culpability in a limited lesson may be counter-productive for young children in the short term.

McFarlane & Waterman (1986) indicated that although sexual molestation can be physically painful, much abuse of children in the early stages is characterised by fondling, petting, or exposure, which may not be perceived as a disagreeable experience. Additionally, recent work with sexual abuse victims reported that many children (perhaps even a majority) initially fail to recognise that they are being abused (Berliner & Conte 1989). By associating this behaviour with feelings of guilt, prevention curricula may inadvertently arouse the very emotions that they seek to relieve in young children. Moreover, this message was incorporated into curricula before it was recognised that some children were the perpetrators. What moral message is being given to actual and potential sexually abusive children?
As highlighted in part one of the Literature Review, this study makes a contribution to this area by investigating whether older children (aged ten) can attribute blame appropriately for sexual assault within the stranger vignettes. Whilst the writer acknowledges that this falls short of the majority of cases of sexual abuse, it nevertheless, will inform whether this concept is understood in this context and contribute to the beginning of a body of knowledge in this area.

b) Threats and Bribes

Certain other lessons may also be problematic for children in the early phases of their moral development. Kohlberg (1963) reported that young children's orientation to obedience shifted over time through a process of six stages of moral development. Two of these stages are discussed as they have relevance to the developmental areas being discussed in this review.

In the first stage of Kohlberg's (1963) theory, children primarily focus on punishment, obedience, and physical and material power (Rich & De Vitis 1985). Rules become understood in relation to the consequences of punishment by an authority figure. Thus, at this point in development, very few internal mechanisms for regulating behaviour had been acquired by the child. During Stage 2, the child's orientation shifts, not so much to avoid punishment as to obtain reward from others. Kohlberg's (1963) formulation, therefore, compliments Piaget's (1963) ground-breaking work on the process of moral development. Piaget also distinguished two stages of morality; the initial stage he called "heteronomous morality" and the later stage "autonomous morality." In the first stage, children were guided by externally imposed rules rather than by internalised standards or codes for regulating behaviour (Rosen 1983).

There is much discussion regarding the age at which children change their orientation to obedience (Bandura 1969; 1966). Kohlberg (1963) found that until the age of seven, moral
reasoning was the most pronounced development stage. The second stage only became more prominent at approximately age ten. Thereafter, more advanced stages dominated the child's thinking. Thus, if Kohlberg's (1963) model is correct, pre-school morality is governed by Stage 1, primary two children (aged six) are approaching Stage 2 (some have reached this stage), and primary three (aged 8) are firmly established in Stage 2 (a few will be in transition to Stage 3).

Sexual abuse prevention programmes typically instruct the class how to repel a sexual assault (say "No", run away, use self-defence) and to report the incident (tell someone). However, children who are developmentally in Kohlberg's (1963) first or second stages of morality are more likely to obey their primary caretakers to avoid punishment, or to gain rewards. Thus, bribes, threats, and strong admonitions from a closely related adult offender have an almost compelling influence on the behaviour of young children. In fact, there is evidence to suggest that children's compliance with rules is strongly related to their relationship with adult figures of authority (Morrison et al 1984). Piaget's (1963) conceptualisation of the developmental process also suggested that children's initial orientation to obedience may inhibit them from repelling a sexual assault or from defying the offender's cautions to secrecy. As he explained:

"Any act that shows obedience to rule or an adult, regardless of what he may command, is good .... The good, therefore, is rigidly defined by obedience .... This only points to (the child's) real defencelessness against his surroundings. The adult and the older child have complete power over him" (p.92).

Given a command not to tell by a close adult authority (i.e. the abuser) and a suggestion to tell in a brief presentation by a stranger or a teacher in the classroom, children are likely to obey the real authority in their lives. In the early stages of a child's development, authority is made legitimate by size, strength, and relationship (Damon 1988). Disobedience to authority is often followed by unpleasant consequences. The ability to distinguish between types of morality increases, of course, with age and
development (Tizak & Turiel 1984). As children move from pre-school to primary school, their orientation to obedience shifts from acceptance of adult rules as absolutes to greater reliance on their own reasoning (Cowan et al 1969). Such perspectives on moral development thus have specific relevance for the design of child abduction and sexual abuse prevention programmes when considering the age-range of children to be targeted and the concepts to be taught.

c) Safety Rules
Several studies have been undertaken to identify the extent to which:

- Children's sense of morality is dependent on their cognitive development, (Piaget, 1963);
- Whether it is learned behaviour (Bandura 1969; Keasey 1973; Kuhn 1973) or if, in fact;

Damon (1988) associated children's reasoning about justice with their logical reasoning based in 'concrete' operations. However, other studies (Nucci & Nucci 1982) showed that relationships between children and authority figures were actually multidimensional and dependent on the environmental context. The researchers also suggested that children as young as three were able to distinguish true moral transgressions from the breaking of conventional standards. Furthermore, they reported that moral transgressions could be described by their intrinsic value or by the consequences of the action, such as inflicting harm or pain on people. The development of such conventional moral standards form the basis for the practice of social norms (e.g. manners, dress code).

In contrast, Smetana & Braeges (1987), reported that children tended to view moral transgressions negatively, regardless of their age. In their studies, behaviours that broke conventional
standards elicited a more varied pattern of response in children. For example, Smetana (1984; 1985) showed that in the eyes of young children conventional transgressions were permissible in the absence of a clearly defined prohibition and that such rules defined the basic nature of conventional morality for children. Thus, these studies suggested that if children perceive an act as a true moral transgression, they are more likely to understand it as "wrong" (and may be more easily influenced to say "No", run away or report the incident to an adult). If they understand the behaviour only in terms of a 'social construct', they may be coaxed to abandon the rule when faced with persuasive arguments against its acceptability. Such insights have clear implications for the design and application of prevention curricula for young children.

Young children's perception of moral transgression and conventional morality comes into conflict when prevention programmes offer contradictory rules about touching ('Talking About Touching' 1985). This popular prevention curriculum for children of all ages uses the terms "safe" and "unsafe" touches to describe its touch continuum. "Unsafe touches" are first described as "touches which hurt our bodies or our feelings." The definition corresponds to the child's sense of moral transgression based on physical consequences. Other programmes also ask children to differentiate touches based on their intuition. If it "feels funny" ('Children's Self-Help Project-Preschoolers' undated) or if it is a touch "you don't like" (CAP 1983), the child is instructed to recognise the immoral act and report it. Here "unsafe touching" actually includes two definitions. The first has painful consequences and relates to a child's sense of basic morality. The second is based on conventional standards of morality as indicated in the following rule for behaviour:

"Today we are going to talk about another kind of unsafe touch - a touch to which you should always say "No!" Sometimes grown-ups try to touch children on their private body parts, or they try to make kids touch the grown up's private body parts. It is not okay for these people to touch kids' private parts unless it is for health reasons ..... There are
some things grownups can do, but children should not" (Talking About Touching 1985 p.9).

As sexual abuse does not necessarily cause pain (it may actually feel somewhat pleasurable for a time) the child may not perceive the act as an obvious moral transgression (Finkelhor 1986; Trudell & Whatley 1988).

With regard to rules against touching children's private parts, prevention programmes try to communicate a relative standard of conventional morality. These rules are justified not by the immediate consequences of behaviour but by the prescription of adult authorities. Not all touching of children's private parts involves sexual assault but when it does, the young victim encounters two contradictory rules of conventional morality - one prescribed by the curriculum presenter, the other prescribed by the perpetrator who insists that the behaviour is not wrong. The difficulty in teaching pre-school children about the ramifications of sexual abuse and ways to prevent it become strikingly clear, as de Young (1988) explained:

"If (children) are able to make only a moral judgement, that is, an assessment of the rightness or wrongness, the goodness or badness, of a situation on the basis of its outcomes and consequences, then in case of "gentle" molestation in which there is nonintrusive sexual contact, verbalisations expressing love and care, and no unsettling threats, children will not perceive this type of touch as bad" (p.64).

Programmes, therefore, that depend on the concept of a "touch continuum" that is beyond the understanding of many youngsters may result more in confusion than prevention.

Social rules that censure child sexual abuse will have a stronger impact on older subjects. As they advance through their primary school years, children become legalistic in their orientation (Cowan 1978). Conventional rules take on a new significance because they are sanctioned by the group, and group expectations play an important role in older children's lives. Prevention providers who tell older children that sexual activity with adults is wrong, clearly get their subject's attention; these
children want to conform to group standards of correct behaviour. But when providers say that such sexual activity is "against the law", they may be compelling some children to make very difficult decisions about loyalties to people close to them. Children whose orientation is legalistic would naturally assume that if sexual abuse is indeed illegal, the perpetrator will be imprisoned. If abused by a close relative or family friend, the child may be torn between doing the right thing by reporting the offence and remaining silent in order to protect the offender from going to jail.

**d) Trust and Attachment**

Forming and sustaining healthy attachments with adult carers is a major developmental hurdle in the pre-school years and is crucial to a child's social development throughout childhood (Cowan 1978). When children are warned about bad things that can happen to them it is important that the message itself does not cause harm by undermining their trust in their essential carers. In this regard, some of the messages conveyed through sexual abuse prevention workshops can be seen as having negative implications. For example, the following statements (all quoted in Berrick & Gilbert 1991 p.59) drawn from several prevention curricula do little to promote trust and attachment:

"People could do things that make you feel uncomfortable or could even hurt you. These people can be anyone; even people you know very well or people you love" (Lever unpublished).

"Sometimes, someone you know, a friend of your family, neighbour, cousin, may try to hurt or scare you by touching you in a way that is confusing or in a way which you do not like" (CAP 1988).

"We know there are two kinds of people who touch children in private parts of their bodies when they don't like it or it feels funny; strangers and people you know" ('Children's Self Help Project' undated).

Messages such as these reinforce children's sense of vulnerability in a dangerous world, a place where they are easily hurt and frightened. Children in pre-school through to primary three (aged 7) remain highly dependent on adults for meeting their most basic needs. Although the older children may rely
more on peers for social support than younger ones do, in this age-range all children depend on parents and primary carers for food, clothing, shelter, socialisation, and emotional support. In some respects, prevention programmes that promote children's rights and independence are at odds with the normal conditions of dependance, healthy growth and development appropriate for young people. Children should be encouraged to seek the help of adults when they are in trouble or in a vulnerable situation. Prevention lessons that emphasise telling a trusted adult support the idea that children can depend on adults for safety and assistance. According to Berrick & Gilbert (1991), a better way to phrase this idea would probably be a suggestion to "talk about it with someone you know"; this would move children away from possible confusion between "telling" and "tattling". Placing the emphasis on communication and mutual assistance between adult and child is an approach to prevention that sustains trust and attachment.

This review now examines another aspect of cognition - that of cognitive style.

Cognitive Style

Some research has been undertaken into the effects of :-

a) Cognitive style of problem-solving (Kagan 1964a; 1965b;1966);

b) Relationship of cognitive style and vulnerability to childhood accidents (Matheny 1980).

This review now examines the implications of these studies for sexual abuse prevention curricula.


A series of investigations into how children resolve problems (Kagan 1964a; 1965b; 1966) have demonstrated that, when the outcome is uncertain, differing cognitive styles can affect both the time taken and the success of response in problem-solving. Such findings have significant importance for the design and
use of prevention curricula for children.

According to Kagan et al (1964a), when faced with a challenging problem where the outcome is uncertain, children tend to respond impulsively, offering the first response that occurs to them without concern for accuracy and hence often get the answer wrong. In contrast, reflective children take time to read the question, to consider alternative answers, to persist in analysing difficult tasks and thus usually obtain the correct solution.

These studies confirm that individual differences in the effectiveness of children's problem-solving affect their ability to:

- generalise and select appropriate hypotheses, and,
- evaluate the quality of identified solutions.

In teaching the problem-solving sequence, Kagan et al (1964a) identified that children work through a four-stage process whose success completion is affected differently by the individual's cognitive style. This inductive reasoning process involves the children:

- decoding and comprehending the pattern,
- selecting the 'best' hypothesis,
- implementing the hypothesis and understanding the validity of the solution, and,
- reporting the solution to an external agent.

On the basis of such a complex process, Kagan et al (1966) predicted that impulsive children would make more errors than reflective children because of their inability to select the appropriate hypothesis. This prediction was tested and a tendency identified for children as young as six years of age to respond to inductive reasoning problems in reflective or impulsive ways, which affected differentially their ability to obtain the correct solution.¹⁸

¹⁸ It is an amended version of this test (reported in Chapter 4) which was used in this study as it was felt by the writer that it might shed light as to whether there is any relationship between cognitive style and vulnerability to stranger abduction.
Such findings have significant implications for the design and use of child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention curricula and for the identification of children who are likely to be vulnerable to such potentially dangerous situations as stranger abduction. Prevention curricula and 'at risk' identification procedures must take into account the limitations of an impulsive cognitive style in the nature of this problem and style of presentation adopted to promote cognitive enhancement.

b) Relationship of Cognitive Style and Vulnerability to Childhood Accidents (Matheny 1980).

Only one study by Matheny (1980), could be traced by the writer which looked specifically at children's cognitive style and vulnerability in childhood. This study examined the specific characteristics of children's affective behaviours between children's cognitive behavioural and accident proneness. In the study, a cognitive measure (Elkind & Weiss's (1967) visual-perceptual exploration test) was given to one hundred and sixty twin children at six years and related to levels of accidents recorded between six and nine years of age. The children were categorised into high, intermediate, and low-accident groups, and error scores from the test were found to be directly related to level of accident liability. This finding was especially highlighted when the data from the twin children were examined for twin pairs according to the co-twin method. As some accident-liable children seemed to have an accident style consisting of a constellation of behavioural characteristics that included cognitive aspects, it was suggested that psychologists in paediatric settings could help to detect and assess accident liabilities in children as a result of this study.

This review now examines two other relevant areas of cognition, children's negative self-perceptions and cognitive enhancement strategies.
Children's Negative Self-Perceptions and Cognitive Enhancement Strategies

Some research has been undertaken into the effects of :-

a) Children's negative self-perceptions (Meijers, cited in Meichenbaum 1977);


This review now examines the implications of these studies for sexual abuse prevention curricula.

a) Children's Negative Self-Perceptions
Meijers (cited in Meichenbaum 1977) used a retrospective study of students to illustrate the effects of negative informal dialogue in generating self-perception and withdrawn behaviour. In a subsequent study of 10 year-olds reactions to social stimuli presented by projective TAT-type studies of children interacting, he asked both social isolates and their outgoing counterparts, what was going on in the slides and what each child in the picture was thinking and feeling. Meijers further demonstrated the role of negative self-statement in providing socially isolated behaviour. Such an approach has considerable value in the identification and use of prevention curricula as it offers a strategy for establishing and overcoming the level of children's negative self-perceptions, particularly as has been demonstrated in part one of the Literature Review, many of these children may be the most vulnerable to sexual abuse.

b) Research Findings on Cognitive Enhancement Strategies
Specific research into the effectiveness of cognitive strategies in promoting problem-solving behaviour in children with learning difficulties and low self-esteem has been undertaken by Gottman et al (1974), Jabichuk & Smitilo (1968) and Meijers (1979) (all cited in Meichenbaum 1977). These studies are based on the self-management behaviour outlined by Skinner (1968)
and the cognitive strategies described by Gagne & Briggs (1974). They have significant value for prevention curricula design and use.

In a study of eight year old socially isolated children, Gottman et al (1974) illustrated how behaviour therapy procedures could be supplemented by cognitive therapy techniques to enhance cognition. This approach combined social modelling, rehearsal and communication, staff development to promote self-esteem, social integration and task application. Such a cognitive-behavioural process has significant implications for prevention curricula in that it could promote the social competence, self-esteem and inner strength of vulnerable children who are susceptible to stranger abduction and/or sexual abuse.

Jabichuk & Smeriglio (1976) also used a cognitive-behavioural approach to promote social interaction in pre-school children with low levels of social responsiveness. This approach used the medium of film to model appropriate social interaction situations and to illustrate the value of self and speech in promoting verbalisation. The value of soundtrack film as a medium for promoting social competence is thus of considerable value in prevention curricula, as demonstrated in part one of the Literature Review it is socially withdrawn children (Budin & Johnson 1989; Conte et al 1987) who are most vulnerable to sexual abuse and children who have low self-esteem (Kraizer 1986) who may be most vulnerable to stranger abduction.

Summary of Cognitive Development Theory and Its Implications for Prevention Curricula

The insights provided by this section of the Literature Review confirm that there are no simple recipes or formulae for understanding children's thinking at any point in their development. Understanding children's thinking is always a complex business that depends on the child's cognitive capacity and on a range of contextual and motivational variables, all of which interact with one another.
However, underlying the cognitive processes, it is assumed that all human beings, no matter their age, are motivated to make sense of the world surrounding them. These interpretations are affected by a number of factors, including maturation level, past experience and present expectations and needs. Additionally, children are more likely to process events, facts and concepts that fit into their already existing cognitive network which are not too discrepant from it and which overlap with their current cognitive processes.

This review has outlined key areas of cognitive development as they relate to the concepts in child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention curricula and has identified key problematic areas in their usage for young children. The findings of the evaluation studies reported in part one of the Literature Review have confirmed that younger children (aged three - seven) register relatively small gains in knowledge (Binder & McNeil 1986; Woods & Dean 1985). There is also evidence to suggest that many of the concepts in these programmes, with their genesis evolving primarily from adult concepts of sexual abuse, are not commensurate with the cognitive development of young children (Berrick & Gilbert 1991). Indeed, some of the concepts have not been examined to evaluate if older children have successfully grasped the concepts.

Most prevention programmes, based on feminist theory of sexual abuse, seek to empower children and teach them what they need to learn to protect themselves (these are discussed in more detail in the next chapter). Developmental theory explains a good deal about how children learn and what they may be able to learn at different ages. These theories offer somewhat incompatible prescriptions for prevention training. What children need to learn psychologically and physically, in order to protect themselves against abuse according to feminist theory, is not always what they may be ready and able to learn according to developmental theory.

Developmental theory and research also identify a number of important aspects of prevention curricula that are difficult for young children to grasp. With regard to cognitive development, the use of
abstract concepts and concepts that contain more than one dimension are problematic. This is not a trivial matter because many of the basic prevention lessons involve information that is relatively abstract and multidimensional and which must be taken into account in the design and use of prevention curricula.

As discussed earlier, programmes may create some confusion about "touching". Although many programmes try to communicate that touching falls along a continuum from good to bad, it is the bad that children seem to identify most readily with. Programme designers will have to look more critically at the way this message is delivered, and include other words to define the act of sexual assault.

In terms of multi-dimensional constructs, young children are inclined to follow a unidimensional model of thinking in which individuals are characterised by singular traits (Cowan 1978). In the writer's opinion, this calls into question the much used 'Stranger Danger' in Scottish schools taught to children aged five. For example, in the young child's mind a person who does "bad" things is a stranger, and a stranger must only do "bad" things. The 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme teaches children that strangers can be both "good" and "bad" and suggests its usage with children as young as six years. With age and development, children begin to assign more than one character trait to an individual. As they grow out of their "preoperational" constructs, children begin to understand that strangers may possess a range of characteristics. Until then, programmes will have a hard time explaining to young children that while some strangers are bad, others are indeed good.

In the area of moral development, the way young children interpret moral standards and their orientation toward obedience to adults suggests they would have a very difficult time putting into practice lessons about bribes and rules about touching. Programmes that provide children with simple prescriptions for their safety do not take into account the complexity of abuse, nor the subtlety of judgements involved in a child's response to potentially harmful situations. Finally, children's early attachments to carers are essential to their later
social development. From the point of view of empowerment and learning to protect themselves, it may be helpful to inform children that parents, relatives, and other adult figures in their lives could sexually molest them. With regard to the social needs to develop trust and feelings of security, these lessons could be counterproductive.

The insights provided by this section of this review have confirmed that the areas of cognition examined and research findings reported have considerable relevance for the design of child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention curricula. In respect of cognitive style, the results have significant implications for the design of these programmes and for the identification of children who are likely to be vulnerable to such potentially dangerous situations as stranger abduction. Prevention curricula and 'at risk' identification procedures must take into account the limitations of an impulsive cognitive style in the nature of this problem and style of presentation adopted to promote cognitive enhancement. This study makes a further contribution to the literature by examining whether there is any relationship between cognitive style and abduction.

To reiterate a key point, children who have low self esteem and are loners are very much at risk of molestation and abduction (Conte et al 1989; Kraizer 1986). Furthermore, evaluations of child sexual abuse prevention programmes have shown that these children may not gain as much from prevention programmes as assertive children (Fryer et al 1987b; Wurtele 1987). Consequently, the inclusion of cognitive enhancement strategies in child sexual abuse programmes, may not only fill a gap, but might also target and enhance the personal safety skills of some of the most vulnerable children.

Although developmental theory has important implications for the design of preventative curricula, this perspective has had relatively little influence on the prevention movement, particularly in children's programmes. A formidable task faces programme designers if these programmes are to be continued for use with younger children. Their cognitive abilities must be taken into account in the future design and use of prevention curricula. Furthermore, for these same
reasons, programmes currently in use in Scotland, e.g. ‘Stranger Danger’ need to be urgently reviewed.

Social learning theory which explains human behaviour not solely in cognitive terms but as a continuing reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioural and environmental determinates is now described as it has relevance to the stranger abduction simulation.

SECTION TWO - SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY

The part of the review specifically addresses:

△ Learning by response consequences and the importance of behavioural rehearsal as these have particular relevance to a key area of investigation - the stranger abduction simulation.

△ A review of the literature on the research which has used behavioural models of training to tackle childhood problems of vulnerability. This overview is undertaken to demonstrate the links between these findings and the more successful evaluations of child sexual abuse prevention programmes which involved behaviourally-based training.

Learning by Response Consequences

According to Bandura (1977), social learning theory emphasises the prominent roles played by vicarious, symbolic, and self-regulatory processes in psychological functioning. Social learning theory explains human behaviour in terms of a continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioural, and environmental determinants. Within the process of reciprocal determinism lies the opportunity for people to influence their destiny as well as the limits of self-direction. This conception of human functioning neither casts people into the role of powerless objects controlled by environmental forces nor free agents who can become whatever they choose. Both people and their environments are reciprocal determinants of each other. New response patterns can be acquired either by direct experience or by observation. This theory, therefore, has considerable implications for child sexual abuse curricula which uses behaviourally-based learning.
For Bandura, complex behaviours do not emerge as unitary patterns, but are formed through the integration of many constituent activities of differing origins. It is thus more advantageous to analyse the determinants of behavioural processes rather than to categorise behaviours as learned or innate or even to try to and apportion relative weights to these factors. The most rudimentary mode of learning, rooted in direct experience, results from the positive and negative effects that actions produce. This experimental form of learning has direct relevance to the simulation of the stranger abduction. Response consequences have several functions:

a) Informative;
b) Motivational;
c) Reinforcing;
d) Modelling;
e) Abstract modelling

A full understanding of learning by response consequences therefore requires detailed consideration of these functions.

a) Informative Function
In the course of learning, people not only perform responses but also notice the effects they produce. If a consequence of a behaviour is rewarding (i.e. a favourable outcome) to the person, that behaviour is likely to increase in strength. Similarly, behaving in a manner that avoids an unpleasant outcome leads to the reinforcement of behaviour, therefore making it unlikely to occur in similar circumstances. Cognitions are thus selectively strengthened or unconfirmed by the differential consequences accompanying the behavioural response (Dulany & O'Connell 1963).

Thus, there was an opportunity in this study to evaluate whether there are any differences behavioural responses of the two groups in the simulation of the stranger abduction and whether these were in any way influenced by knowledge of the consequences. These findings make a contribution to this part of the literature.
b) Motivational Function
Being able to anticipate enable humans to be motivated by prospective consequences. By representing foreseeable outcomes symbolically, people can convert future consequences into current motivators of behaviour. Most actions are thus largely under anticipatory control. The capacity to bring remote consequences to bear on current behaviour by anticipatory thought encourages foresightful behaviour. It does so by providing both stimuli for appropriate action and the sustaining inducements. Because anticipatory incentives increase the likelihood of the kind of behaviour that is ultimately reinforced time and time again, this type of incentive function has great utility.

c) Reinforcing Function
Explanation of reinforcement originally assumed that consequences increase behaviour automatically without conscious involvement. This view was challenged by the results of verbal learning experiments in which experimenters reinforced certain classes of words verbalised by participants and ignored all others (Spielberger & De Nike 1966) They found that reinforcing consequences were ineffective in modifying behaviour as long as participants were unaware of the reinforcement contingency but participants suddenly increased the appropriate behaviour when they discovered which responses would be rewarded.

d) Modelling
Most human behaviour is learned observationally through modelling.19 According to social learning theory, modelling influences learning principally through its informative function. During exposure to modelled behaviour, observers acquire mainly symbolic representations of the modelled activities which serve subsequently as guides for appropriate

19 The reader is informed that Part Two of the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme concentrates on behavioural-based learning through modelling both by using actors to show the desired behaviour in the videos and through role-play.
performances.

Attentional processes determine what is selectively observed in the profusion of modelling influences to which one is exposed and what is extracted from such exposures. Moreover, people cannot be influenced by observation of modelled behaviour if they do not remember it. Through the medium of symbols, transitory modelling experiences can be maintained in permanent memory and transferred into appropriate actions.

Social learning theory distinguishes between acquisition and performance because people do not enact everything they learn. They are more likely to adopt modelled behaviour if it results in outcomes they value than if it has unrewarding or punishing effects. In any given instance, then, the failure of an observer to match the behaviour of a model may result from any of the following: not observing the relevant activities, inadequately coding modelled events for memory representation, failing to retain what was learned, physical inability to perform, or experiencing insufficient incentives.

Having set the wider scene of how children learn through modelling, it is now proposed to examine the influence of abstract modelling as this has a direct bearing on a key area of inquiry in this study - the simulation of the stranger abduction.

e) Abstract Modelling
Much of the conduct being modelled at any given time is socially prescribed or highly functional; hence, it is adopted in essentially the same form as it is portrayed. Modelling influences, however, can create generative and innovative behaviour as well. Through a process of abstract modelling, observers derive the principles underlying specific performances for generating behaviour that goes beyond what they have seen or heard (Bandura 1971b; Zimmerman & Rosenthal 1974). Observers are

20 Thus, it could be anticipated that the children in the experimental group, who ought to be more aware of the consequences of stranger abduction than the control group, may show a different response in the simulation exercise.
later tested under conditions where they can behave in a way that is stylistically similar to the model's disposition, but they cannot mimic the specific responses observed because they must apply what they have learned to new or unfamiliar situations. In requiring the children to apply sets of rules in the untested simulation of the stranger abduction such demands were made of the children in the experimental group.

This review now examines the other area identified in this section - those studies which have looked at different models of training children for vulnerable situations given this also has direct relevance to the simulation of the stranger abduction.

**Comparative Methods for Tackling Childhood Vulnerability**

Prevention programmes directed at children also have been applied in different areas. Several investigations have evaluated programmes to teach self preservation skills. These behavioural programmes have tackled different facets of vulnerable childhood problems.

Using analogue situations, children have been trained to recognise emergencies such as fires and personal injury of others and to contact relevant authorities to report such emergencies (Jones & Kazdin 1980; Rosebaum et al 1981). Other programmes have increased children's ability to escape in case of fire (Jones et al 1981a & b and, as reported earlier, to avoid contact with 'strangers' who might be child molesters (Fryer et al 1987a & b; Peterson 1984; Poche et al 1981). These behavioural programmes have mostly been used with pre-school children to prepare them for later situations in which they may not have an adult available to intervene for them.

The following two studies, albeit with adult subjects, highlight the importance of rehearsal and modelling training in assertiveness training. The first study by McFall & Marston (1970) involved a standardised, semi-automated, behavioural rehearsal treatment procedure, and two variations of this procedure, (one with performance feedback and one without). These were compared with
two control procedures, a placebo therapy, and no-treatment condition, in training forty-two adult subjects to be more assertive. Behavioural, self-report, and psychophysiological laboratory measures, as well as unobtrusive "in vivo" assertive tests, revealed that the two behaviour rehearsal procedures resulted in significantly greater improvements in assertive performance than did the control conditions. There was a nonsignificant tendency for behavioural rehearsal coupled with performance feedback to show the strongest treatment effects.

In the other study, McFall & Twentyman (1973) reported the results of four experiments assessing the contributions of rehearsal, modelling, and coaching to an experimental assertion-training programme using seventy-two non-assertive adult subjects. The training components of rehearsal and coaching both made significant contributions to improved performance on self-report and behavioural assertion measures. However, symbolic modelling added little to the effects of rehearsal alone or rehearsal plus coaching. This result was found regardless of the particular type of assertive models employed (tactful versus abrupt) or the media employed in presenting the models (audiovisual versus auditory only). There were no differences among three modes of rehearsal examined: covert rehearsal, overt rehearsal, or a combination of covert and overt rehearsal. In the final experiment, there was evidence that the treatment effects transferred from the laboratory to real life situations.

These findings on adult subjects, nevertheless, concur with the albeit limited findings in those evaluations of child sexual abuse prevention programmes described in part one of the Literature Review (i.e. those programmes involving a behaviourally-based learning component have more effective outcomes than those which do not). Moreover, for the behavioural changes to generalise, the training should occur over persons and settings. Stokes & Baer (1974) found that when a greeting response was taught to retarded children by one trainer, the response did not generalise across experimenters. However, when a second experimenter trained the response, it generalised to over twenty members of the staff. Griffiths & Craighead (1972) similarly programmed generalisations across settings. A thirty-year old retarded
woman exhibited correct speech articulation in a non-training setting only after she was trained in two different settings. These studies suggested that by increasing the number of trainers and settings used when teaching specific skills, generalisation would increase. These findings have clear implications for child sexual abuse prevention curricula and the simulation of the stranger abduction.

Summary of Social Learning Theory

Section two of the Literature Review has provided insights into how social learning theory and the findings of research which examined behavioural models of training to tackle childhood problems of vulnerability have a contribution to make in the design and use of child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention curricula. The links between these findings and the more successful evaluations described in part one of the Literature Review of child sexual abuse prevention programmes which involved behaviourally-based training have been demonstrated.

Self-efficacy theory is now discussed as it has particular relevance to the simulation of the stranger abduction exercise.

SECTION THREE - SELF-EFFICACY THEORY

This section of the review examines how self-efficacy can be promoted in child sexual abuse prevention through detailing the:

▲ Sources of efficacy information;
▲ Effects of peers on the broadening and validation of self-efficacy;
▲ Development of self-efficacy skills.

Sources of Self-Efficacy Information

Self-efficacy is concerned with judgments about execution actions required to deal with prospective situations that contain many

21 Thus, it could be anticipated (providing the issue of desentisation is resolved) that the simulation exercise in its own right could be used as a strategy to enhance generalisation of skills.
ambiguous, unpredictable and often stressful, elements such as the simulation of the stranger abduction. Much psychological research is aimed at explaining how children gain knowledge of their social and physical environment. An equally important, but surprisingly little-studied problem, is how children come to know themselves, and how their self-percepts affect their psychosocial functioning. Among the different facets of self-knowledge, perhaps none is more central to people's everyday lives than conceptions of their personal efficacy. Such self-percepts affect not only the courses of action people pursue but their thought patterns and the emotional arousal they experience (Bandura 1977a; 1981).

According to the latter, self-knowledge is gained through information conveyed by either personal or socially mediated experiences, and judgments of one's own efficacy whether accurate or faulty, are based on five principal sources of information:

a) Performance Accomplishments;
b) Vicarious Experience;
c) Verbal Persuasion;
d) Emotional arousal;
e) Selective self-monitoring.

The following explanation of this theory is based on the work of Bandura (1977a).

a) **Performance Accomplishments**

Enactive attainments provide the most influential source of efficacy information because they are based on authentic mastery experiences. Successes raise efficacy appraisals; repeated failures lower them, especially if the failures occur early in the course of events and do not reflect lack of effort or adverse external circumstances. After a strong sense of efficacy is developed through repeated success, occasional failures are unlikely to have much effect on judgments of one's capabilities. Indeed, failures that are overcome by determined effort can instill a strong sense of self-efficacy through experience that one can eventually master even the most difficult obstacles.
b) Vicarious Experience
Efficacy appraisals also are partly influenced by vicarious experiences. Seeing others perform similar tasks successfully can raise efficacy expectations in observers that they too possess the capabilities to master comparable activities. They persuade themselves that if others can do it, they should be able to achieve at least some improvement in performance. By the same token, observing others perceived to be of similar competence fail despite high effort, lowers observers' judgments of their own capabilities (Brown & Inouye 1978).

There are several conditions under which efficacy appraisals are especially sensitive to vicarious information. Amount of prior experience is one such factor. Perceived efficacy can be readily changed by relevant influences when people have little previous experience on which to base evaluations of their personal competence. Lacking direct knowledge of their own capabilities, they rely more heavily on model indicators (Takata & Takata 1976). Although vicarious influences are generally weaker than direct personal experiences, they can produce significant enduring changes through their performance effects.

c) Verbal Persuasion
In attempts to influence human behaviour, verbal persuasion is widely used because of its ease and ready availability. People are led, through suggestion, into believing that they possess certain capabilities and that they can surmount their difficulties. Although social persuasion alone may be limited in its power to create enduring increases in self-efficacy, it can contribute to successful performance if the heightened appraisal is within realistic bounds. However, it is probably more difficult to produce enduring increases in perceived efficacy by persuasory means than to undermine it.

d) Emotional Arousal
Stressful and taxing situations generally elicit emotional reactions of varying intensities. Emotional arousal provides
another constituent source of efficacy information. People rely partly on their state of physiological arousal in judging their capabilities and vulnerability to stress. Because high arousal usually debilitates performance, individuals are more likely to expect success when they are not beset by aversive arousal than if they are tense and agitated. Fear reactions generate further fear through anticipatory self-arousal. By conjuring up fear-provoking thoughts about their ineptitude, people can rouse themselves to elevated levels of distress that produce the very dysfunctions they fear.

For people who generally find arousal enabling rather than debilitating, arousal will have different efficacy value than those for whom arousal causes excessive anxiety and mars performances. The judgemental process is complicated by the fact that it is not arousal per se, but its level, that usually serves as the performance indicator. As a general rule, moderate levels of arousal facilitate performance, whereas high levels disrupt it. This is especially true in complex activities requiring intricate organisation of behaviour such as in the stranger abduction simulation.22

What constitutes an optimal level of arousal depends not only on the nature of the task, but on causal inferences concerning the arousal. People vary in their judgmental sets. Those who are inclined to perceive their arousal as stemming from personal inadequacies are more likely to lower their perceived efficacy than those who regard their arousal as a common transitory reaction that even the most competent experience.

The efficacy formulation provides a unified conceptual, framework not only for studying the determinants and processes of fear arousal, but also for devising effective treatments and explaining their modes of operation. Results of a series of studies confirm that treatments relying on enactive, vicarious, or cognitive mastery experiences, increase the level, strength,

22 Thus, it could be anticipated that the simulation of the stranger abduction may cause high levels of arousal and anxiety in the children.
and generality of self-efficacy in coping with threats (Bandura & Adam 1977; Bandura et al 1977; Bandura et al 1980). The greater the perceived efficacy at the completion of treatment, the lower the fear arousal and the higher the performance accomplishments.

e) Selective Self-Monitoring
Selective self-monitoring can magnify percepts of self-efficacy if it is the personal successes that are especially noticed and remembered. Research on self-modelling provides evidence bearing on this enhancement effect (Dowrick 1977). In these studies children exhibiting gross deficits in psychomotor and social skills are helped, by a variety of aids, to perform at a level that exceeds their usual attainments. The hesitancies, mistakes, and external aids are then selectively deleted from the videotape recordings to show the children performing much more skilfully than they are normally capable of doing. After observing their videoing successes they display substantial improvement in performance compared to their baseline level activities that are filmed but not self-observed. Seeing oneself perform errorlessly can enhance proficiency; it provides further information on how to perform appropriately, and it strengthens self-beliefs that one can succeed.23

The review now examines the second area identified in this section.

Peers and Self-Efficacy

According to Bandura (1977a), the nature of children's efficacy-testing experiences changes substantially as they move increasingly into the larger community. It is in peer relationships that they both broaden the scope of, and make finer discriminations in self-knowledge of their interpersonal capabilities. Peers serve several important efficacy functions. Those who are most experienced and competent provide models of efficacious styles of behaviour. A vast amount of social

23 Such an opportunity was available to the sub-group of children who took part in the simulation exercise which was video-recorded 'blind' (see Chapter Four).
learning occurs, for better or for worse, among peers. In addition, peers provide the most informative points of reference for comparative efficacy appraisal and verification. Children are therefore especially sensitive to their relative standing among the peers with whom they affiliate on factors that determine prestige and popularity.

The different ways in which peers contribute to self-efficacy development require systematic examination. Peers are neither homogeneous nor selected indiscriminately. Of special research interest are the processes whereby selective peer association promotes self efficacy in particular directions, leaving other areas underdeveloped (Bandura & Walters 1959; Bullock & Merril 1980; Ellis & Lane 1963; Krauss 1964). The processes of influence are undoubtedly bidirectional-affiliation preferences affect the direction of efficacy development, and self-efficacy, in turn, partly determines choice of peer associates and activities.

Considering that peers serve as a major agency for the development and validation of self-efficacy, a related research issue concerns the effects of disrupted or impoverished peer relationships on the acquisition of self-percepts. It is worth noting that some of the most vulnerable children (loners with low self-esteem) to sexual abuse and abduction may also be denied the opportunity for enhancement of self efficacy through positive peer group relationships.24 The review now address the last area identified under self-efficacy.

**Development of Self-Appraisal Skills**

With development through exploratory experiences, tuition, and social comparison children gradually improve their self-appraisal skills. This enables them to make efficacy judgements on their own to guide their actions in any situation. How children learn to use diverse sources of information in developing a stable and accurate sense of personal efficacy is a matter of considerable interest.

---

24 Yet, it is the writer's experience of both conducting research and teaching the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme that children are extremely supportive and encouraging towards each other in personal safety matters.
Accurate appraisal of one's capabilities depends on a number of constituent skills that develop through direct and socially mediated experience. While engaging in activities children must attend simultaneously to multiple sources of efficacy information conveyed by the nature of the task, situational circumstances, characteristics of the performances, and conditional outcomes. This places heavy demands on ability to monitor ongoing events, to evaluate the causes of fluctuations in performances and outcomes, and to represent and retain efficacy information derived from many prior experiences under varying circumstances.

In micro-analyses of the degree of congruence between self-efficacy judgment and performance, self-efficacy is an accurate predictor of performance on threatening tasks regardless of whether coping efficacy is enhanced by enactive, vicarious, emotive, or cognitive means. Consistent with self-efficacy theory, enactive mastery serves as the most powerful vehicle of change. The most generalised durable changes are achieved by participant mastery methods using performance aids initially to establish successful functioning, then removing the external supports to authenticate personal efficacy, then lastly providing self-directed mastery to strengthen and generalise self percepts of coping efficacy.25

Summary of Self-Efficacy Theory

The insights offered by self-efficacy theory for the design and use of child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention curricula have been examined, particularly, the ways in which self-efficacy can be promoted through detailing the various sources of efficacy information. While engaging in activities children must attend simultaneously to multiple sources of efficacy information conveyed by the nature of the task, situational circumstances, characteristics of the performances, and conditional outcomes. Thus, it follows that the behaviourally-based component of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme offers the

25 It is worth noting here, that the children in the experimental group had opportunities for limited enactive mastery through the role-play in the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme. The simulation of the stranger abduction required them to transfer the information and skills learned from the Programme to an untested situation.
children in the experimental group opportunities to learn and enact their self-efficacy skills in personal safety. Furthermore, the simulation of the stranger abduction affords an additional opportunity to see if the children can transfer the skills learned into what was for all, a new, untested, and highly anxiety-provoking situation. According to Bandura (1981), in therapeutic applications of modelling

"what phobic thinking renders frightful, instructive modelling makes predictable and personally controllable"(p 208).

Furthermore, the videos, if used appropriately, offer opportunities to children who failed the simulation exercise to further enhance their self-efficacy skills.

**Overview of Relevant Educational Theory**

This review has outlined key areas of cognitive development as they relate to the concepts in child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention curricula and identified key problematic areas in their usage for young children. The findings of the evaluation studies reported in part one of the Literature Review confirmed that younger children (aged three - seven) register relatively small gains in knowledge (e.g. Binder & McNeil 1986; Woods & Dean 1985). Thus, there is evidence to suggest that many of the concepts in these programmes, with their genesis evolving primarily from adult concepts, are not commensurate with the cognitive development of young children. Indeed, some of the concepts which underpin these programmes have not been evaluated to see if older children can successfully grasp them.

Although developmental theory has important implications for the design of preventative curricula, this perspective has had relatively little influence on the prevention movement, particularly in children's programmes. A formidable task faces programme designers if these programmes are to continue to be used for younger children. Their cognitive abilities must be taken into account in the future design and use of prevention curricula. Furthermore, for these same
reasons, programmes currently in use in Scotland, e.g. 'Stranger Danger', need to be urgently reviewed.

In respect of cognitive style, the findings appear to have implications for the design and use of child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention curricula and for the identification of children who are likely to be vulnerable abduction. Prevention curricula and 'at risk' identification procedures must take into account the limitations of an impulsive cognitive style in the nature of this problem and the style of presentation adopted to promote cognitive enhancement. To reiterate a key point, children who have low self esteem and are loners are very much at risk of molestation and abduction. Furthermore, evaluations of child sexual abuse prevention programmes have shown that these children may not gain as much from these prevention programmes as assertive children. Consequently, the inclusion of the cognitive enhancement strategies described in this review in prevention programmes, will not only fill a gap, but may also target and enhance the personal safety skills of some of the most vulnerable children.

This part of the review has also provided insights into how the findings of research which have examined behavioural models of training to tackle childhood problems of vulnerability have a contribution to make in the design and use of child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention curricula. The links between these findings and the more successful evaluations described in part one of the Literature Review of child sexual abuse prevention programmes which involved behaviourally-based training have been demonstrated. The importance of self-efficacy in mastering difficult, vulnerable and threatening tasks as well as the opportunity to enhance self-efficacy through role-play, the use of video and peer-group enhancement have been discussed.

This study make a contribution to this part of the literature and on the design of child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention programmes by :-

- Assessing whether children are able to attribute appropriate blame for sexual assault in the stranger vignettes.
- Examining among other factors, whether there is any relationship between cognitive style and vulnerability to abduction.
- Evaluating the children's perceptions of a stranger ascertaining whether any differences in the behavioural responses of the two groups to the simulation of the stranger abduction were in any way influenced by knowledge of the consequences of their actions.
- Investigating whether the simulation of the stranger abduction led to high anxiety arousal in the children and if this had effect on their behaviour.

Having completed the Literature Review the following chapter examines in more detail the genesis of sexual abuse prevention programmes.
CHAPTER THREE

SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAMME THEORIES, THE ‘FEELING YES, FEELING NO’ PROGRAMME AND THE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION

"Some developmental theorists might suggest that the child’s primary means of development is obtained through active participation in the learning process. Children grasp new concepts more readily when offered an opportunity to explore ideas through expressive techniques such as role-playing, drawing pictures and talking about the experience; as a general rule children respond with more enthusiasm when engaged in active rather than passive learning" (Berrick e & Gilbert 1991 p.47).

Introduction

The above quotation illustrates the importance of providing varied teaching methods and experiences of active learning in the design of appropriate educational programmes. It also reinforces the research findings of the effectiveness of behaviourally-based learning. These issues are central to the debate on the utility of sexual abuse prevention programmes.

This chapter therefore examines the following topics :-

▲ Theories underpinning prevention programmes.
▲ Feminist theories.
▲ Aims of child sexual prevention programmes.
▲ Reasons for choosing the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme.
▲ The Programme - The package.
▲ Teaching objectives.
▲ Teaching methods.
▲ The importance of evaluation.

Theories Underpinning Prevention Programmes

Child abuse prevention strategies generally have been drawn from broad, causal theories of maltreatment. Common theoretical explanations for child abuse and neglect fall into three categories :-
i) Psychodynamic theories which suggest that parents would be less abusive if they better understood themselves and their role as parents;

ii) Learning theories which suggest that parents would be less abusive if they knew, more specifically, how best to care for their children;

iii) Environmental theories which suggest that parents would be less abusive if they had greater resources available to them in terms of material support or social support for a given set of actions (Daro 1988).

In articulating a theoretical framework for child sexual abuse, Finkelhor (1984) identified the following necessary preconditions:

- A motivated perpetrator;
- An ability to overcome internal inhibitions towards sexual abuse;
- An ability to overcome external or environmental barriers to sexual abuse; and,
- A victim unable to resist the abuse.

Preventing abuse, therefore, can be seen as a process of altering the potential perpetrator, the potential victim or the environment in which both exist. Responding to the multiple causal theories of maltreatment, the prevention of physical abuse and neglect has focused on altering parental behaviour and on providing parents under stress with a variety of opportunities to ease child-rearing burdens. The most common of these strategies include respite care, crisis lines, home visitor programmes, parenting education classes and support groups (Levine 1988; Weiss & Jacobs 1988). Political efforts to improve the social service safety net for families with the least material resources and to combat the environmental hazards children face are also viewed as vital and necessary components in any comprehensive child abuse prevention effort (Garbarino 1988; Pelton 1981).

In contrast, the prevention of child sexual abuse has centred on the provision of child assault prevention instructions in schools, a strategy aimed at altering the child's behaviour. This intervention provides
classroom-based instruction for children of all ages on how to protect themselves from sexual assault and what to do if they experience actual or potential abuse. Whilst in most cases these strategies include informational sessions for parents and school personnel, their primary focus is on the last of Finkelhor's preconditions that of strengthening the potential victim's capacity to resist assault.

Empowering children so that they are better able to protect themselves from harm has a certain parsimonious appeal: if successful, the approach avoids very costly and often intrusive interventions into the privacy of family life. Furthermore, incorporating this strategy in the context of an existing universal service system, namely primary and secondary education, offers the dual attraction of reaching large numbers of children at very low costs and avoiding many of the stigmas commonly associated with secondary prevention services. Rather than identifying a specific child or family as being at particular risk of maltreatment, these interventions assume all children are at equal risk and, therefore, in need of the instruction. Lastly, children who have been abused have a safe and supportive environment in which to disclose the abuse and from which to accept assistance.

Despite the laudable goals of this intervention and its intuitive appeal, many have questioned its ultimate utility in reducing sexual abuse rates (de Young 1988; Gilbert 1988; Haugaard & Repucci 1989). Others have gone so far as to suggest that the education of children about sexual abuse may be resistant to any prevention initiative regardless of its scope or content (Melton 1992).

Theories of sexual abuse prevention have been gleaned from public health care practices, traditional safety training, mental health care and treatment practices, rape crisis field, moral/religious training and from feminist analyses. However, as already discussed in the last chapter, there is a lack of any child developmental and/or educational theory, with particular reference to children's cognitive development.

The notion of the disease model and the immunisation approach to
the prevention of sexual abuse have been primarily borrowed from the fields of public and mental health. The theory is that by providing information and skills to recognise, resist and report abuse, it can possibly be prevented. Ideas about social competence skills have also been incorporated from the mental health arena in the form of assertiveness training, decision making skills, and using community resources. A component added to the sexual abuse prevention theory from the safety field is the idea that children can learn to apply a set of safety rules regarding potentially dangerous situations (Peterson 1984; Poche et al 1981). This idea has been expanded to include the possibility of sexual abuse as one of those situations and includes a governing set of rules to assess potentially dangerous situations. Unfortunately, in the writer's opinion, the complexity and transfer of such rules and concepts, especially the touch concept in intra-familial abuse, have not been fully addressed.

Concepts from morality and religious training are reflected in terms of much of the content taught regarding "good" and "bad" touches, checking inner feelings (the "No" feeling) that something is wrong, and the idea of guilt "You are not to blame", and the message that sometimes it is OK to say "no" to an adult. Such programmes are based on the assumption that the likelihood of an experience of sexual victimisation may be reduced by encouraging children to :-

- Discriminate between appropriate and inappropriate touching or provocative interactions involving physical touching;
- Better appreciate and understand personal safety requirements;
- Engage in those behaviours likely to discourage or avoid a potential abuser.

The greatest difficulty appears to be the depiction of the nature of sexual abuse at a level children can understand. As reported in the Literature Review, most of the definitions for children utilise the concept of three categories of touch by Anderson (1986) to explain sexual abuse which includes :-

- Good touch (hugs, light ticklings, and kisses);
- Bad touch (kicking, punching or otherwise causing physical pain);
Confusing touch (sexual contact and could leave the child confused because sexual contact may feel bad and it also may feel good).

The concept of 'touch' and the 'touch continuum' have been influential in a majority of the prevention materials examined the Literature Review. In addition to defining sexual abuse or "touching" in some form and describing possible offenders, nearly all prevention programmes attempt to establish three fundamental ideas:

i) A child's body is the child's "property" over which the child has control (often called body ownership);

ii) A child should trust his or her feelings or intuition as a way of determining whether or not certain touching is appropriate;

iii) A child who is approached or molested must take action, typically described as saying "No" to an abusive adult.

Theoretical or conceptual frameworks are not stated explicitly in most sexual abuse prevention programmes. However, the implicit conceptual framework underlying the majority of the prevention programmes described in the literature and in the materials reviewed is that of "empowerment". Empowerment is represented by the concepts previously referred to, that is, body ownership, trusting feelings and intuition, saying "No", and being assertive.

It is not surprising that empowerment is at the base of most of the child sexual abuse prevention programmes since many initial developers of the programmes had experience in rape crisis centres or centres for battered women, where empowerment has been a popular construct for enabling women to affect choices in their lives.

Feminist Theories

Prevention programmes based on feminist theory seek to empower children and teach them what they need to learn to protect themselves from sexual abuse. Cognitive and child developmental theories explains how children learn and what they may be able to understand at different ages. These theories offer somewhat incompatible prescriptions for prevention training. What children need to learn
psychologically and physically in order to protect themselves against abuse according to feminist theory is not always what they may be ready and able to learn according to cognitive and child developmental theories.

As reported in part two of the Literature Review, cognitive developmental theory and research underlines a number of important aspects of prevention curricula that are difficult for young children to grasp. In particular, the use of abstract concepts and concepts that contain more than one dimension are problematic for young children. This is not a trivial matter because many of the basic prevention lessons involve information that is relatively abstract and multidimensional.

In the area of moral development, the way young children interpret moral standards and their orientation toward obedience to adults suggest they would have a very difficult time putting into practice lessons about bribes and rules about touching. Programmes that provide children with simple prescriptions for their safety do not take into account the complexity of abuse, nor the subtlety of judgements involved in a child's response to potentially harmful situations. Finally, children's early attachments to carers are essential to their later social development. From the point of view of empowerment and learning to protect themselves, it may be helpful to inform children that parents, relatives, and other adult figures in their lives could sexually molest them. With regard to the social needs for developing trust and feelings of security, these lessons could be counterproductive. Although cognitive and child developmental theories have important implications for the design of prevention curricula, these perspectives have had relatively little influence on programmes aimed at children.

The term empowerment has appeared with increasing frequency in psychology and mental health literature over the past decade (Swift & Levin 1987). The concept has captured the imagination of scholars and social activists across multiple disciplines. However, empowerment has no clearly operationalised or consensual definition within the
mental health field. It has been suggested that the term "empowerment" has become a catchword among social activists and is applied to a host of political principles (Kautzer, cited in Swift & Levin 1987). This position also appears to be the case in the area of child sexual abuse prevention.

Empowerment has been discussed explicitly by several abuse prevention professionals (Butler 1986; Plummer 1986; Sanford 1980). The latter, in her 1980 book for parents on the prevention of child sexual abuse, asserted that:

"crimes of child sexual abuse are considered in the context of the great discrepancies between the victim's and the offender's power, knowledge and resources" (p.36).

Sanford postulated that the child's best defence against sexual abuse is a sense of his or her own power, knowledge of what contributes sexual abuse, and resources available for support and protection. She further asserted that since the offender plans on an imbalance in each of these areas, without this imbalance abuse cannot take place. Plummer (1986) maintained that if children can be informed about sexual abuse and ways to prevent it, they can sometimes be empowered to help avoid or interrupt their own victimisation. She further contended that it is an adult's responsibility to empower children so if all other prevention methods fail, children will have a last defence against sexual abuse and stated:

"those who are given knowledge, a sense of personal power, and a list of community resources will be enabled to assist in their own self protection" (p.4).

Butler (1986), similarly maintained that children must be allowed to feel more powerful in the world:

"Programmes that teach prevention within the framework of empowerment are premised on the belief that one primary reason children are abused and molested is because they are powerless. Children are potential victims because they are small, vulnerable, without many resources, and with insufficient information or skills to protect themselves" (p.8).

There have been no published research studies examining the effects of empowering children to ward off sexual abuse. In addition, no
research or discussion examining developmentally appropriate empowerment behaviours was found by the writer in the conceptual papers already examined on sexual abuse prevention education. It seems extremely problematic that key conceptual assumptions of child sexual abuse prevention programmes aimed at children are based on a construct that has been borrowed from the adult literature, has mixed conceptual support there, and has undergone little conceptual and no developmental analyses in the child sexual abuse literature.

Furthermore, in the writer's experience, there is a danger that children may be lulled into a false sense of security in feeling that they are in total control of such a situation if programme makers have achieved the correct balance in this area of the curriculum. This has been borne out by the writer in a previous study, (Hamilton 1989) when several boys responded in problem solving stranger vignettes that the male child should: "karate chop the stranger to death" or "run a four minute mile" when faced with a potentially dangerous situation. Thus, until further conceptual analyses and research has been conducted, aspects of child sexual abuse prevention programmes based solely on interpretations of empowerment should be used with extreme caution. With this reservation noted, some of the findings in this study shed light on this issue.

In addition to addressing sexual abuse or "touching" and the concepts related to empowerment (i.e. body ownership, trusting one's feelings or intuition, saying "No" and being assertive) most child sexual abuse prevention programmes include the redefinition of secrets, the availability of support systems, and the understanding that sexual abuse is not the child's fault or responsibility. Secrets are described as sometimes needing to be shared, not kept. The "secrets" concept is coupled with instruction about support systems, that is, the idea that children can turn to a range of persons for help.

The three most commonly taught concepts of "secrets", "support systems", and "victim innocence" purposely were differentiated from the previous ones dealing with "empowerment." They each concern behaviours related to trust and each promote disclosure.
Consideration of these three concepts and the empowerment-based concepts, already specified, give a picture of the complexities inherent in the materials with which children who may already be victims are presented. Children are taught not to be silent about sexual abuse, although perpetrators often demand secrecy. Children also are taught to tell someone they trust about the sexual abuse, and if that person does not believe them, to tell someone else. Children are asked to determine who they can trust, in the face of a betrayal of trust by at least one person they thought they could trust. They are taught that if children are sexually abused, it is not their fault or responsibility. Each of these concepts is essential to promoting disclosure, an essential goal of most sexual abuse education programmes.

In addition, children are taught or "empowered" to believe that they own their bodies, that they will intuitively know if they have been victimised, and that they should say "no" and be assertive to ward off sexual abuse. However, this approach may be problematic for children in an audience who are victims. They may feel overwhelmed, confused, and guilty by the content of prevention education programmes that attempt to teach them about empowerment and disclosure. Consequently teaching empowerment-based concepts may negatively affect the vulnerable children they were designed to protect.

Research in this area is sadly lacking and again highlights the problem when programmes have a wide appeal but their development has outstripped their evaluation e.g. a survey of over 260 school districts in the United States found that virtually all schools offer this type of instruction to both their elementary and high school students and that over 40% mandate the provision of a uniform curriculum (Daro et al 1988).

Having highlighted the formidable tasks and conflicts facing programme designers, the overall objectives of these programmes are now examined.
Aims of Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Programmes

As previously indicated, a plethora of books, films, professional presentations, videos, live theatres, puppet shows and classroom curricula for children and adults geared towards the prevention of child sexual abuse is now available. Materials have been created for use by a variety of potential consumers: parents, teachers, concerned community groups and mental health professionals.

This development has spawned the growth of companies, foundations and campaigning groups whose sole purpose is the development of educational materials and programmes for use by private and state schools. A large industry has been created, likely to be influenced by financial pressures to market and sell its products. As a result the educational programmes differ in length, content and presentation (for programme descriptions see Gilbert et al 1989 and Nelson & Clark 1986). Some are single half-hour sessions and others occupy several days or weeks. Despite these variations, the programmes generally share the same general philosophies and aims outlined by Finkelhor (1986) as :-

a) General Aims :
   • Direct instruction to the child on the distinction between 'good', 'bad' and 'questionable' touching;
   • The concept of body ownership and the rights of children to control who touches their bodies and where they are touched;
   • To educate children about the responsibilities and boundaries of parental care, of other caretakers, and of other adults;
   • To educate them about their own bodies and the nature and appropriateness of different relationships;
   • To teach them the extent and nature of their own rights and self-worth;
• The concept of keeping secrets and the importance of the child to tell if someone touches him or her even if that person tells the child not to reveal the incident;
• To develop children's self-confidence, knowledge and skills in order to empower them to assert and protect their rights and to seek the assistance of others when necessary.

b) **Specific Aims :-**
• To teach children about the existence and nature of child sexual abuse;
• To broaden children's awareness of who potential abusers may be, including people that they may know and like including members of their own family;
• To arm children with strategies to avoid abuse or to receive assistance if they are abused or are at risk of abuse. To encourage them to have confidence in taking such action.

Most of the programmes include some type of training or instruction for both parents and school personnel. These sessions cover a number of topics including a review of the materials to be presented to the children, a summary of the local procedures for reporting abuse, a discussion of what to do if you suspect a child has been mistreated, and a review of local services available to victims and their families.

**Reasons For Choosing the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme**

In 1987 a multi-disciplinary team of professionals in Lothian Region reviewed several child sexual abuse prevention programme (including three British programmes) with a view to piloting and evaluating an appropriate programme. After consideration and debate, the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme was chosen for the following reasons :-
• It has an appealing multi media format;
• It handles a difficult subject matter sensitively;
• It has a straightforward, easy to apply curriculum guide for teachers;
• The initial positive research findings (Sigurdson et al 1987); and,
The Curriculum focuses on the:-

i) cognitive;
ii) affective; and,
iii) behavioural domains of learning.

which according to Bloom (1956) are important areas in maximising learning opportunities for children.

It is the policy of Lothian Region Education Department that :-

i) Before receiving the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, all children receive a formal sex education programme to introduce them to normal, healthy, sexuality.

ii) The Programme involves parents as partners in their children's safety. To this end, Head Teachers at parents' evenings are backed by a multi-disciplinary team representing the Police, School Health and Social Work Departments to allow parents to have a knowledge of the Programme and an opportunity to raise any questions or anxieties.

The Programme - The Package

'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' is a sexual assault prevention programme claiming to be suitable for children aged six to twelve years. The Programme is divided into two sections, Section A for parents and professionals and Section B for children and their teachers.

Section A  (For Parents and Professional)

This section contains a 28 minute film titled 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No The Adult Film,' plus related written material which covers :-

- Guidelines for the facilitator;
- The nature and scope of sexual assault;
- Behavioural signs of the sexually assaulted child;
- What to do if a child discloses he or she has been sexually assaulted;
- The content of Section B;
- How to discuss sexual assault with children;
Bibliography.

Section B (For Children and their Teachers)
Section B is presented in three parts:

Part 1
Exercise 1: What Do I Feel?
Exercise 2: My Body.
Exercise 3: What's This All About?
The Film - Part 1.

Exercise 4: How I Say No, How I Say Yes.
Vocabulary.

Part 2
Exercise 1: Who Can I Tell? What Do I Want To Learn?
Exercise 2: Who Is A Stranger?
The Film - Part 2.
Exercise 3: What Is Sexual Assault?
Exercise 4: I Can Do It.
Vocabulary.

Part 3
Exercise 1: Sometimes Its Hard To Tell.
The Film - Part 3.
Exercise 2: What I Deserve To Hear.
Exercise 4: Wrapping It Up.
Vocabulary.
Bibliography.

Teaching Objectives

It is worth noting that many of the objectives focus on:

- Cognitive learning;
- Affective learning;
- The development of appropriate behaviours through role-play;
- The development of children's knowledge and skills through
  the use of the several different activities and media are also used
  across the whole curriculum.
These concepts fit into two key framework documents in the 5-14 Curriculum in Scottish schools - Personal and Social Development (SOED 1993) and Environmental Studies (SOED 1993), specifically the strand 'Healthy and Safe Living'. These also are compatible with the 5-14 English Language Curriculum (SOED 1992) as it involves listening, interpreting, the development of language and problem solving skills. In recognition of this structure, several schools have also used the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme to meet some of the requirements of the English Curriculum.

Teaching Methods

The Programme uses the following teaching methods :-

- **Expository Teaching**
  Here teaching is characterised by the imparting of information, explanations and instructions to the whole class;

- **Discursive Teaching**
  This stresses oral work in groups, initiation of ideas by children and guidance by the teacher although what sometimes passes for discursive teaching is in fact highly directed by the teacher;

- **Enquiry Teaching**
  This emphasises the creation of opportunities for choice by children, individual planning and development of themes, and individualised or group support from the teacher based on the provision of varied and appropriate resources;

- **Activity Teaching**
  This is characterised by the importance it places upon children realising their knowledge skills and dispositions across the whole curriculum through creative and practical endeavours, such as movement, mime, art, music, modelling and the manipulation of concrete materials.

The teaching methods involve the following activities and media :-

- Role play;
- Descriptive writing;
- Brainstorming;
Art work;
• Group discussion;
• Drama and music.
• Interactive video;

The 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, therefore, should be seen within the wider context of the total curriculum.

The Importance of Evaluation

According to Borg & Gall (1983):

"Educational evaluation is the process of making judgements about the merit, value or worth of educational programs, projects, materials and techniques" (p.733).

In general, there are two major questions asked in evaluation research:

i) How well have the aims and objectives of a programme been achieved?

ii) Are the aims and objectives worth achieving, and who says so?

Stufflebeam (1974) further analysed the question of objectives and their achievement into the following areas:

• Goals;
• Programme design;
• Processes of implementation;
• Outcomes.

This study is primarily concerned with outcomes, and in particular, whether certain programme goals have been achieved and if knowledge and skills can be transferred to the simulation exercise and generalised to the real world.

An evaluation component in child sexual abuse prevention programmes is essential for several well-founded reasons:-
These programmes have been developed by adults and are, at best, intuitive guesses as to what information and skills will keep children safe. Solid empirical evidence is needed to demonstrate their level of effectiveness;

Evaluation is important to measure the impact of the materials on children's knowledge and information levels. We need to know if the children are understanding and retaining the information and messages in the programme;

Any evaluation method must also include techniques for measuring skills. Knowing the concept is not enough, as the ultimate goal of a prevention programme is to change the behaviour of the children in certain situations. It is essential to assess if this goal is being met;

The use of the simulation technique, with the risk of attendant side-effects merits evaluation if such research methods are to be validated;

Evaluation should clarify which part(s) of the programme are most effective;

If we are to be in a position to request further funding for prevention programmes and, indeed, argue the case that these programmes are adopted as education policy and become part of the regular established curriculum in all schools, there must be the empirical body of research to support instinctive evidence that these programmes work, and that they are worth doing.

Given the aims of this study are to compare aspects of cognitive, behavioural and affective outcomes between a control and experimental group of children, using a standardised programme and summative evaluation, the basic prerequisites of a credible evaluation have been achieved.

The next chapter explains the methods to be used to carry out the evaluation and answer the research questions detailed in Chapter One.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS
OF THE STUDY

"Professionals working with child abuse are under considerable pressure to provide a safe environment for, and to help meet the immediate needs of vulnerable children. This demand for service often competes with the staffs' commitment to evaluation. The need to act tends to outweigh the desire for empirical evidence of program effectiveness. But programs that fail to demonstrate their effectiveness are ultimately vulnerable to public criticism and loss of support" (Pietrzak et al 1990 p.10).

Introduction

The above quotation is a timely reminder of the need for the systematic evaluation of child sexual abuse prevention educational programmes. As demonstrated in the Literature Review, this is a sensitive and contentious area of social policy where many issues remain unresolved. There is, therefore, a pressing demand for the evaluation of these programmes.

This chapter covers the following areas:

- Underpinning philosophies.
- Use of hypotheses in educational research.
- The research hypotheses.
- The research questions.
- The research design.
- Location.
- Characteristics of subjects.
- Sampling design and procedure.
- Parental consent.
- Methods.
- Piloting of instruments.
- Instrumentation.
- Simulation of the stranger abduction.
- Built-in safeguards.
Underpinning Philosophies

Positivism
Although positivism has been a recurrent theme in the history of western thought from the Ancient Greeks to the present day, it is historically associated with the nineteenth century French philosopher, Comte, who was the first thinker to use the word for a philosophical position (Beck 1979). Comte's definition of positivism can be explained in terms of his "Law of the Three Stages", according to which the human mind progresses from a theological stage through a metaphysical stage to a final positive stage (Acton 1975).

At the theological stage, the most primitive attempts are made to explain behaviour in terms of spiritual or supernatural entities. The metaphysical stage is only a modified version of the earlier stage and sets out to explain behaviour in terms of abstractions, essences or forces which Comte regarded as depersonalised beings of the earlier, theological stage. The final positive stage dispenses with theological and metaphysical concepts and turns to observation and reason as means of understanding behaviour. More simply, explanation proceeds by way of scientific description.

Comte's position led to a general doctrine of positivism which held that all genuine knowledge is based on sense experience and can only be advanced by means of observation and experiment. Following in the empiricist tradition, it limited inquiry and belief to what can be firmly established, thus abandoning metaphysical and speculative attempts to gain knowledge by reason alone. This approach is known as the normative paradigm. Since Comte, the term "positivism" has
been used in such different ways by philosophers and social scientists that it is difficult to assign it a precise and consistent meaning. Moreover, the term has also been applied to the doctrine of a school of philosophy known as "logical positivism". The central belief of the logical positivists is that the meaning of the statement is, or is given by, the method of its verification. It follows from this position that unverifiable statements are held to be meaningless, the utterances of traditional metaphysics and theology being included in this class.

There are two important points to consider when discussing scientific concepts. Firstly, they do not exist independently of man. They are man-made inventions enabling him to acquire some understanding of the apparent chaos of nature. Secondly, they are limited in number and in this way contrast with the infinite number of phenomena they are required to explain. Nonetheless, when the term "positivism" is used by philosophers and social scientists, a residual meaning is always present and this derives from an acceptance of natural science as the paradigm of human knowledge. This term, according to Giddens (1976), includes the following connected suppositions:

- The methodological procedures of natural science may be directly applied to the social sciences. Positivism here implies a particular stance concerning the social scientist as an observer of social reality;

- The end product of investigations by the social scientist can be formulated in terms parallel to those of natural science. This means that his analyses must be expressed in 'laws' or 'law-like' generalisations of the same kind that have been established in relation to natural phenomena.

Positivism here involves a definite view of social scientists as analysts or interpreters of their subject matter. It is this philosophy which constitutes the normative paradigm for the quantitative data in this study.

This approach is not without its critics. Two criticisms are commonly levelled at positivistic social science from within its own ranks. The first is that it fails to take account man's unique ability to interpret his
experiences and represent them to himself. Man can, and does, construct theories about himself and his world; moreover, he acts on these theories. In failing to recognise this, positivistic social science is said to ignore the profound differences between itself and the natural sciences. According to Giddens (1976), social science, unlike natural science:

"stands in a subject-subject relation to its field of study, not as a subject-object relation; it deals with a pre-interpreted world in which the meanings developed by active subjects actually enter the actual constitution or production of the world" (p.15).

Secondly, the findings of positivistic social science are often said to be so banal and trivial that they are of little consequence to those for whom they are intended, namely, teachers, nurses, social workers, counsellors, personnel managers, etc. The more effort, it seems, that the researcher puts into his scientific experimentation in the laboratory by restricting, simplifying and controlling variables, the more likely, according to Shipman (1972), he is to end up with a:

"pruned synthetic version of the whole, a constructed play of puppets in a restricted environment" (p.18).

Where positivism is less successful in its application to the study of human behaviour, is where the immense complexity of human nature and the elusive and intangible quality of social phenomena contrast strikingly with the order and regularity of the natural world. This point is nowhere more apparent than in the context of the classroom and school, where the problems of teaching, learning and human interaction present the researcher with a mammoth challenge. Taking this into account, the writer has included qualitative measures in this study which have been underpinned by a recognition of the importance of the phenomenological approach to research.

Phenomenology

Beginning in the second half of last century, the revolt against positivism occurred on a broad front, attracting some of the best intellectuals in Europe - philosophers, scientists, social critics and creative artists. Even today, opponents of positivism are made up of a
similar cross-section, including some from within the ranks of social scientists. Essentially, this revolt has been a reaction against the world picture projected by science which, it is contended, denigrates life and mind. The precise target of the anti-positivists' attack has been science's mechanistic and reductionist view of nature which, by definition, excludes notions of choice, freedom, individuality, and moral responsibility.

One of the earliest and most sustained attacks in the modern age came from Kierkegaard, the Danish philosopher, who developed 'Existentialism.' Kierkegaard was concerned with the individual and the need for him to fulfil himself to the highest level of development. According to Husserl (1967), phenomenology is a method which allows us to contact phenomena as we actually live them out and experience them:

"Natural knowledge begins with experience (Erfahrung) and remains with experience." (p.51).

In his desire to free people from their illusions, the illusion Kierkegaard was most concerned about was that of "objectivity". By this he meant the imposition of rules of behaviour and thought, and the making of a person into an observer set on discovering general laws governing human behaviour. The capacity for subjectivity, he argued, should be regained. This quality he regarded as the ability to consider one's own relationship to whatever constitutes the focus of inquiry.

Ions (1977) was also concerned with the dehumanising effects of the social sciences. He expressed serious concern at the way in which quantification and computation, assisted by statistical theory and method, were used. On this point, Ions (1977) wrote:

"The argument begins when we quantify the process and interpret the human act. In this respect, behavioural science represents a form of collectivism which runs parallel to other developments this century. However high-minded the intention, the result is depersonalisation, the effects of which can be felt at the level of the individual human being, not simply at the level of culture" (p.37).
His objection was not directed at quantification per se, but at quantification when it becomes an end in itself:

"a branch of mathematics rather than a humane study seeking to explore and elucidate the gritty circumstances of the human condition" (p. 38).

Another forceful critic of the objective consciousness was Roszak (1970) who wrote of its alienating effect in contemporary life. He believed that the justification for any intellectual activity lies in the effect it has on increasing our awareness and degree of consciousness. This increase, some claim, has been retarded in our time by the excessive influence the positivist paradigm has been allowed to exert on areas of intellectual life.

Other writers question the perspective adopted by positivist social science because it presents a misleading picture of the human being. Hampden-Turner (1970), for example, concluded that the social science view of man is biased in that it is conservative and must inevitably lead to the social scientist taking an equally conservative view of the human being and having to ignore other important qualities. This restricted image of man, he contended, came about because the social scientist concentrated on the repetitive, predictable and invariant aspects of the person; on "visible externalities" to the exclusion of the subjective world; and, at least as far as psychology is concerned, on the parts of the person in his endeavours to understand the whole.

In its broadest meaning, phenomenology is a theoretical point of view that advocates the study of direct experience taken at face value, and one which sees behaviour as determined by the phenomena of experience rather than by external, objective and physically described reality. Although phenomenologists differ amongst themselves on particular issues, there is fairly general agreement on the following points identified by Curtis & Mays (1978) as distinguishing features of their philosophical viewpoint:

- A belief in the importance, and in a sense the primacy, of subjective consciousness.
- An understanding of consciousness as active.
A claim that there are certain essential structures to consciousness of which we gain direct knowledge by a certain kind of reflection. Exactly what these structures are is a point about which phenomenologists have differed.

This philosophy is known as the interpretative paradigm. The primary task of the phenomenologist is to reveal the meaning of an event, that is, to understand the experiences of the participants. According to Knaack (1984), there are three general strategies which the phenomenologist utilises to understand the human experience from the person's perspective:

i) Phenomenological reduction which involves the individual in setting aside his/her preconceptions and presuppositions to more fully understand the meaning of the phenomenon to the individual involved in the experience.

ii) Imaginative variation which requires the individual to set aside his/her presuppositions to imagine the appearance of a phenomenon against the background of various meanings of experience.

iii) Interpretation - the articulation of meanings as they emerge in the phenomenon.

The researcher's task is to avoid categorising a phenomenon in the context of a known theory, concept, or personal preconceptions. However, there are significant differences between the interpretative and normative paradigms. Four of these differences described by Omery (1983) are:

i) The traditional scientific method is based on experimentation, whereas the phenomenological method adopts a descriptive strategy.

ii) The objective of the traditional method is causal analysis, whereas the objective of phenomenology is identification.

iii) The principle of thinking in the traditional method is calculative, whereas thinking in phenomenology is principally mediative.

iv) The predominant scientific approach adopts a statistical strategy and makes analyses more efficient. In contrast, the
phenomenological method, promotes an understanding of human beings, wherever they might dwell.

Quantitative methods also require researcher independence. On the other hand, phenomenological research recognises, identifies, and incorporates where appropriate, the biases of the researcher.

Critics, such as Giddens (1976), have wasted little time in pointing out what they regard as weaknesses in the newer qualitative perspectives. They argue that while it is undeniable that our understanding of the actions of our fellow-men necessarily requires knowledge of their intentions, this, surely, cannot be said to comprise the purpose of a social science. On this point, Giddens (1976) commented:

"No specific person can possess detailed knowledge of anything more than the particular sector of society in which he participates, so that there still remains the task of making into an explicit and comprehensive body of knowledge that which is only known in a partial way by lay actors themselves" (p.68).

While this more recent perspective has presented a model of man that is more in keeping with common experience, the method is by no means above reproof. Some critics have argued that advocates of an anti-positivistic stance have gone too far in abandoning scientific procedures of verification and in giving up hope of discovering useful generalisations about behaviour (Argyle 1978).

Bernstein's (1974) criticism was directed at the the overriding concern of phenomenologists with the meanings of situations and the ways in which these meanings are 'negotiated' by the actors involved. What is overlooked about such negotiated meanings, observed Bernstein, was that they:

"presuppose a structure of meanings and their history under a wider area of negotiation. Situated activities presuppose a situation; they presuppose relationships between situations; they presuppose sets of situations" (p.93).

Bernstein's point was that the very process whereby one interprets and defines a situation is itself a product of the circumstances in which one
is placed. Conceiving a social structure as external to ourselves helps us take its self-evident effects upon our daily lives into our understanding of the social behaviour going on about us.

According to Dixon (1973) the task of social science is to develop sets of concepts such as norms, expectations, positions and roles in order to formulate a generalised science of behaviour. Only in this way is it possible to move from the interpretation of one specific action or event to a theoretical explanation of behaviour. Cohen & Manion (1987) asserted that the particular value of scientific research in education is:

"it will enable educators to develop the kind of sound knowledge base that characterises other professions and disciplines; and one that will ensure for education a maturity and sense of progression it at present lacks" (p.44).

A characteristic of the phenomenological perspective - and one which makes it singularly attractive to the would-be educational researcher - is the way in which it 'fits' naturally to the kind of concentrated action found in classrooms and schools, an action characterised by:

"pupils and teachers ..... continually adjusting, reckoning, evaluating, bargaining, acting and changing " (Woods 1979 p.37).

It is the writer's opinion, that both the normative and a recognition of the underpinning philosophy of the interpretative paradigms have validity in this study. However as the interviews with the children were primarily semi-structured and diagnostic, a phenomenological approach in its purist form was not appropriate. Given the uniqueness of the area under inquiry in the simulation of the stranger abduction, this approach allowed a deeper insight not only into causal explanations and descriptions through presentation by numbers, but also the actual experience of children in the simulation exercise. Thus, the children had a voice in this study.

**Use of Hypotheses in Educational Research**

A tool of great importance to the social scientist is *the hypothesis*. It is from this instrument that much research proceeds, especially where cause-and-effect or concomitant relationships are being investigated.
The hypothesis has been defined by Kerlinger (1970) as a conjectural statement of the relations between two or more variables. More simply, it has been termed "an educated guess", though unlike an educated guess in that it is often the result of considerable study, reflective thinking and observation.

Kerlinger (1970) also identified two criteria for 'good' hypotheses. The first is that hypotheses are statements about the relations between variables; and the second, that hypotheses carry clear implications for testing the stated relations. To these, he adds two ancillary criteria: that hypotheses disclose compatibility with current knowledge and that they are expressed as economically as possible. He further identifies four reasons for the importance of hypotheses as tools of research. Firstly, they organise the efforts of the researcher enabling him/her to understand the problem with greater clarity and providing a framework for collecting, analysing and interpreting data. Secondly, they are, in Kerlinger's words, "the working instrument of theory". They can be deduced from theory or from other hypotheses. Thirdly, they can be tested, empirically or experimentally, thus resulting in confirmation or rejection. Lastly, hypotheses are powerful tools for the advancement of knowledge because, as Kerlinger explains, they enable man to get outside himself as well as playing a crucial part in the scientific method, particularly in educational research.

The Research Hypotheses

In order to answer the major research questions, six null hypotheses were developed :-

\[ H_{01} \] 'There will be no difference in the gain in mean knowledge scores between the experimental and control group.'

\[ H_{02} \] 'There will be no difference in the gain in mean knowledge scores between the experimental and control group between children of different :-
  
  i) background characteristics;
  
  ii) ability ratings;
  
  iii) behavioural scores;
  
  iv) cognitive styles.'
H₀₃  'There will be no difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to predict sexual assault as a likely consequence of stranger abduction.'

H₀₄  'There will be no difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to attribute fault appropriately for sexual assault.'

H₀₅  'There will be no difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group.'

H₀₆  'There will be no difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group between children of different:
   i) background characteristics;
   ii) ability ratings;
   iii) behavioural scores;
   iv) cognitive styles.'

The Research Questions

Six research questions were developed which investigated:

1. What characteristics make children vulnerable to abduction?
2. Does the simulation method desensitise children to approaches by strangers?
3. What are the children's perceptions of a stranger?
4. What are the children's views of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme?
5. What are the parents' views of child sexual abuse prevention programmes?
6. Are children able to generalise the knowledge and skills from the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme to real life situations?

The Research Design

The preferred design for this study would have been an experimental one to test whether Programme effect is present or absent. Two criteria,
according to Moore (1983), determine whether a study falls under the category of experimental research:

"The first is that the experimenter must have manipulative control over the independent variable ....... . The second is that the subjects must be randomly assigned, to different levels of the independent variable ....... " (p.162).

However, for practical and ethical reasons, Lothian Region Education Department would not sanction randomised assignment of children. Therefore, compromises had to be made in the research design. Van Dalen (1962), highlighting this problem in educational research, stated:

"employing randomisation procedures is not difficult but upsetting class schedules, getting scattered S's (subjects) to participate, and obtaining a sufficiently large enough sample to ensure that the laws of chance will always operate, cannot always be done. Under some circumstances, therefore, an E (experimenter) may have to use pre assembled groups, such as intact classes, for his experimental and control S's (subjects)" (pp.275-276).

As a result of the limitations imposed on this study, which were outwith the writer's control, the research design was set up as a non-equivalent, pre-test - post-test control group design. According to Campbell (1957) this comes under the omnibus title of "quasi-experimental design."

**Figure 4.1**

Schematic Drawing of the Research Design

As shown in Figure 4.1, both the experimental and control group received a pre- and post-knowledge test. Only the experimental group received the Programme. Consequently, this design helped to rule out some of the alternative explanations for any changes between the two groups. While this design can increase certainty regarding Programme effects, a major weakness is its inability to control the characteristics of
the treatment and comparison groups. If the two groups are not similar, any differences in their results could be attributed to the initial differences in their characteristics rather than the Programme under evaluation. This is addressed in the next section.

Location

This study took place in the Lothian Region of Scotland. The simulation of the stranger abduction took place outwith the school, in Edinburgh. The children were interviewed in their own schools.

Characteristics of Subjects

This study was conducted with two primary six classes. Further details of the subjects are illustrated in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL (E) or CONTROL (C)</th>
<th>AGE (IN YEARS)</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Primary 6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>8 - 9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Primary 6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8 - 9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The children, both male and female, were between eight and nine years at the outset of the study. They were mainly caucasian, primarily Christian, all were in mainstream schooling and had a range of different ability ratings and social backgrounds.

At the outset of the study, school staff in the control group had no experience of a child having been sexually abused.

Sampling Design and Procedure

Both schools were nominated by the Education department. One school already had the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme as part of
its curriculum; the other school, at the writer's request, was broadly matched with the first school on size, ability levels of the children, and the socio-economic backgrounds of the parents.

As part of a rolling programme, the control class was not scheduled to receive the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme for a further two years. On ethical grounds, it was agreed that following completion of the fieldwork, the children participating in the study from the control school would receive the Programme two years earlier than scheduled.

Given the imposed limitations on the research design, a non-random sample method was used. It is acknowledged that, in the absence of randomisation, some sample bias is unavoidable and the groups chosen may not be wholly representative of the population under study. In order to compensate for this inability to randomise subjects, the type of non-random sampling design used was that of "Purposive Sampling" described by Pietrzak et al (1991) as:

"You select a particular school to sample in evaluating the quality of your service delivery that the racial and socio-economic make-up of the subjects are typical of the population you serve" (p.199).

Such was the case in this study, but additional efforts were made to make the groups as similar as possible in an attempt to rule out as many alternative explanations for any changes as possible. Thus, in May 1990, all children in primary five (aged eight to nine) in both the experimental and control groups were eligible for inclusion in the study. The experimental school had a roll of thirty-five pupils, twenty-eight of whom constituted an intact class of fourteen boys and fourteen girls. The control school had a roll of fifty-six children.

All children at primary five level in both schools simultaneously sat the Edinburgh Reading Test (The Godfrey Thomson Unit 1981) to give an ability rating. The test was administered by the Class Teacher and scored by the Head Teacher. The mean scores for the twenty-eight children in the intact class in the experimental school were then compared with the scores of the fifty-six subjects in the control school. In order to make up the control class for the following year (primary 6
level), subjects were drawn at random until group equivalence and comparability were broadly achieved on such variables as gender and ability rating. At the end of the sampling procedure, the schools had been roughly matched on school size, socio-economic background of parents as well as both schools being in the same town, although their catchment areas served distinct communities. The children were also broadly matched on age, gender, ethnicity and ability ratings to try and control as many characteristics as possible. However, by the time of the data collection, one female child in the control school had moved schools. Unbeknown to the writer, at the point of sampling, bias was already present, in that, at the very least, three males in the control group had probably been sexually abused by a male member of staff.

**Parental Consent**

All parents were invited to an evening meeting in their respective schools in May 1990, attended by the Head Teachers, Class Teachers and the writer where the research aims, the standardised tests, and the research instruments were fully explained. The meeting also provided an opportunity for parents to raise any issues or anxieties. Overall, parents were extremely supportive of the study and were advised that they could have access to the standardised tests, measuring instruments and ratings for their child.

The evening meetings with parents were different between the two schools. The parents of the children in the experimental school saw the video 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' and also had an opportunity to hear about the curriculum and to raise any issues. Unfortunately, by necessity, the parents in the control school were denied this opportunity, but were advised that their school would be accelerated into the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme two years earlier than had been planned. Furthermore, after completion of the fieldwork, they would be invited to another meeting to view the Programme.

The proposal for the simulation of the stranger abduction and the built-in safeguards were fully explained to the parents although the
actual details i.e. where, when, and how, were not, as access was still being negotiated. (Unfortunately, the writer's request to use an Educational Farm had just been refused by the Committee. This had been unanticipated both by the writer and the Head Teachers who had attended and presented the case for access in person). Parents shared the view that if they knew the details of the proposed simulation they would be tempted to tell their child. Consequently, it was agreed that sometime in the session 1990/91 each child for whom written consent had been given would take part in the simulation of the stranger abduction. This would be videod and recorded 'blind' with built-in safeguards to ensure no child was placed at risk. (The procedure, as explained to parents, is detailed later in this chapter).

Any research in child abuse is by its very nature fraught with problems - serious consideration of related effects must be considered, e.g. a child disclosing abuse. In the writer's opinion, unconditional confidentiality cannot be guaranteed to subjects, particularly where subjects are minors. Consequently, parents were advised that should any child disclose abuse either on the research instruments or during interviews (as had happened in a similar study conducted by the writer) this would be reported to both them and the Head Teacher.

On the whole, parents were satisfied with these arrangements and showed great trust in the staff of their respective schools. Parents were further advised that they would receive information on their child's performance and progress and would also be given an opportunity to see the audio-visual recording of their child at a debriefing meeting the week after the exercise was completed. They were informed that their children would be debriefed as soon as was practical after the exercise was completed. They were informed that for any child participating, a written consent form would need to be completed. All parents gave written informed consent to their child being tested on the standardised instruments and completing the questionnaires. Only one parent refused to give consent to her child (a female) participating in the simulation of the stranger abduction, the reason given was that her husband had had "a bad experience of role-play."
Methods

Of the variety of tools for planning data collection, this study used the Information Collection Plan (I.C.P.) developed by Fink & Kosecoff (1978) in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2
Information Collection Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>TIME OF DATA COLLECTION</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATOR</th>
<th>MARKER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Reading Test</td>
<td>18th May 1990</td>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>(i) Match (E) and (C) Groups; (ii) Assessment of Ability Ratings</td>
<td>Class Teacher</td>
<td>Headteacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutter Behavioural Assessment</td>
<td>25th January 1991</td>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>Assessment of Behavioural Ratings</td>
<td>Class Teacher</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagan Cognitive Style Test</td>
<td>29th January 1991</td>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>Assessment of Reflectivity /Impulsivity Ratings</td>
<td>Headteacher</td>
<td>Headteacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Pre-Questionnaire</td>
<td>6th February 1991</td>
<td>Parents of All Subjects</td>
<td>(i) Demographic Profile (ii) Parental Advice on Stranger Abduction</td>
<td>Researcher (Sealed questionnaire delivered by each child via school)</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Pre-test</td>
<td>11th February 1991</td>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>Assessment of Knowledge Base-Line</td>
<td>Class Teacher</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Post - Questionnaire (E)</td>
<td>20th March 1991</td>
<td>Parents of All Subjects</td>
<td>Parental Views of Programme: (E) Parental Views of Personal Safety Programme per se (C)</td>
<td>Researcher (Sealed questionnaire delivered by each child via school)</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Post-test (Same as Pre-test)</td>
<td>22nd March 1991</td>
<td>All Subjects</td>
<td>Assessment of Knowledge Gains</td>
<td>Class Teacher</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Report Form</td>
<td>March 1991 - June 1992</td>
<td>Any Subject</td>
<td>Record of Any Subject Using The Programme</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation Of Stranger Abduction</td>
<td>April 1991</td>
<td>Random Sample of Subjects</td>
<td>Actual Behavioural Measurement</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Inter-Rater Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Interview Schedule</td>
<td>May 1991</td>
<td>Sub-Sample of Subjects Involved in the Simulation</td>
<td>Obtain Subjects' Views of Participation in Experiment</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>April 1992</td>
<td>Parents of Subjects in the Simulation</td>
<td>Record of Any Adverse/Positive Effects of the Simulation</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>April 1992</td>
<td>Class Teacher (E) + (C) Headteacher (E) + (C) Assistant Headteacher (C)</td>
<td>Record of Any Adverse/Positive Effects of the Simulation</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (E) = Experimental Group
* (C) = Control Group

The writer has extended the matrix to promote greater clarity of the research design. This approach was useful in conceptualising the data.
collection process, particularly as this study involved several standardised tests, numerous research instruments, a variety of different people as administrators and markers and four raters.

Piloting of Instruments

Knowledge Measurement
Both knowledge questionnaires were piloted in a school in a neighbouring town with a primary six class of twenty-one children. As a result, the following amendments were made for the children ;-) 

i) The instructions on pages one and two were numbered, sentences simplified and the outlay double spaced for easier reading and greater clarity.

ii) Some questions were reworded to remove perceived ambiguities.

iii) Drawings were added on pages six, eleven and thirteen to break the monotony of the questions. The preferred choice of drawings was cartoons. However, following advice from the teachers, it was felt that cartoons would be too distracting. A compromise was therefore made and in the post-test the children found the drawings "acceptable".

iv) On page nine of the questionnaire (the body parts), the format of the labels was changed from one line to two lines to allow for easier scanning.

Parental Questionnaires
The Parental Questionnaires were piloted with the parents of the children in the pilot school. They were revised in the following ways ;-) 

i) Following objections from three parents about the personal nature of the questions with regard to income, a covering letter was devised to advise parents that they need not answer any question they found too personal.

ii) Similar to the pre-test questionnaire for the children, the instructions on page one were simplified and double spaced for greater clarity.
Simulation of the Stranger Abduction

As the simulation of the stranger abduction was to be a 'blind' audio-visual record (involving the use of much technical equipment and access to specific premises) piloting could not be undertaken until the afternoon before the exercise was scheduled to start. Unfortunately, it proved impossible to get children as subjects on that day. Therefore, four adult subjects were tested 'blind' to give the 'strangers' a dummy run, check if the technical equipment was working satisfactorily, and if the subjects noticed either the camera or the microphones. The camera had been hidden between a row of display boards and the microphones were suspended in the ceiling concealed in the lighting. Although the test subjects did not spot the camera or microphones, greater care was taken to further conceal the camera in the row of display boards where it was hidden. A chair with a coat hanging over it was removed and a joining notice board was made in black cardboard and a hole was made to match the camera lens. A black cloth was used to cover the camera behind the notice boards and the person operating the camera made to wear black gloves.

On the morning of the first and third days of filming in both the experimental and control schools, two children, who had joined the experimental and control classes after the study had started, provided an opportunity to give the teachers a partial dummy run (the actual encounter in the room with the 'stranger' did not take place nor were the children video-recorded). Nevertheless, it allowed the checking of some of the technical arrangements. The children did not pick up either the camera or the microphones. However, the Class Teacher in the control school had to be asked to spend more time settling the children to the task in hand. Given the practical and ethical considerations involved, the arrangements for the piloting of the simulation exercise were felt to be a suitable compromise.

Interview Schedule

The structured Interview Schedule for those children involved in the simulation was not piloted as it related specifically to the children who had been involved in the simulation. However, the questions and wording were checked by senior staff in both the control and
experimental schools to ensure the questions were pitched at an appropriate developmental level for the children.

**Instrumentation**

Copies of all research instruments can be found in Appendix 4. and have been filed sequentially as per Information Collection Plan in Table 4.2. The standardised tests are explained before detailing the research instruments.

**Edinburgh Reading Test**

In the absence of Lothian Region authorising a standardised I.Q. test, the Edinburgh Reading Test (Stage 2) was used to:

"give a viable and reliable estimate of a child's ability .......which becomes more informative, however, when it is compared with the scores that other children have obtained" (The Godfrey Thomson Unit 1981 p.3).

This test, was administered to all fifty-five children by the Class Teachers in May 1990 and was scored by the Head Teachers. It was used to match classes in the control and experimental groups and to give a rating of each child's reading ability and comprehension skills. Also, the raw scores on each subject provided an ability rating to allow comparisons to be made on the knowledge and behavioural measures between the control and experimental groups and other cross-tabulations in the data analyses.

**Rutter Behavioural Questionnaire**

A standardised behavioural questionnaire, developed by Rutter (1967b), and further refined by Rutter et al (1970) in their major study in the Isle of Wight, was used. It includes a format for parents and teachers. The Rutter Scales have been used widely in clinical and educational research, with substantial data available on the robustness of the scales. (McGhee et al 1985; Thomson et al 1989; Venables et al 1983). In addition to the full-scale score, the scales yield separate sub-scores for aggressive/anti-social behaviour - (A), hyperactive behaviour - (H), neurotic behaviour - (N), and relationship problems - (R). The Rutter Questionnaire (1970) consists of a set of 26 behaviour descriptions each
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ranked on a 3 point scale of "certainly applies", "applies somewhat", or "does not apply". It is detailed enough to provide raw scores and can also be completed by respondents relatively quickly.

The Rutter Measure (1970) was felt to be useful in this study for three reasons: -

i) The scales offered a valid and reliable measure of behaviour as rated by teachers, thereby affording a potential for measuring pervasive behaviour and any relationship to vulnerability to abduction;

ii) Given that parents had to complete two questionnaires which were felt to be of more value in this study, as well as attend two briefing evenings, there was, a time/quality trade-off in not asking parents to complete the parental version of Rutter (1970). Furthermore, as parents could only compare their child against himself/herself the value and validity of the parental version was questionable;

iii) Lastly, the instrument is culturally sensitive having been developed and used extensively in the United Kingdom.

Two weeks before the onset of the Programme, the questionnaires were completed simultaneously by the Class Teachers on all the children. They provided a behavioural score to allow individual and group comparisons to be made on the knowledge and behavioural measures. These questionnaires were scored by the writer.

**Cognitive Style Test**

As explained in part two of the Literature Review, Kagan et al (1966) developed an empirical test of prediction that impulsive children will make more errors than reflective children of similar verbal ability on inductive-reasoning problems, for they should be prone to select an answer that was not carefully evaluated. It was felt by the writer that this measure may be of particular value in identifying vulnerable children in the simulation of the stranger abduction.

For practical reasons, a selection of the test batteries developed by Kagan et al (1966) was used but which were sensitive enough to
delineate a measurement on a reflective/impulsive scale and on inductive-reasoning problems. The Matching Familiar Figures Test with written guidelines for the teachers was utilised. It was administered by the Head Teacher in both schools simultaneously (a total of fifty-five children). Each child was asked to select the one stimulus that was identical to the standard. Errors and response times were recorded. An overall qualitative rating was given on one of the following scales:

i) Careful scrutiny and correct.
ii) Careful scrutiny but wrong.
iii) Fast scrutiny and correct.
iv) Fast scrutiny but wrong.
v) Random scrutiny.

The second test was an extrapolation reasoning test which was adopted in part and administered by the Head Teachers in both schools with written guidelines. In this test, the fifty-five children were shown a series of six different stimuli that were linked by a principle. The children were also given a set of alternative stimuli and had to select the one that would continue the series according to the principle illustrated. The children were allowed one minute for each answer. The children were given one point for a correct response and zero for a wrong response. The maximum any child could score was six points.

Despite both the reduction in the test batteries and the modifications made, the tests took between fifteen to twenty minutes to administer to each child, committing Head Teachers to two entire days of testing in each of the schools. These modified tests provided a cognitive measurement on all children to allow group comparisons to be made on the knowledge and behavioural measures. As it was impractical for Head Teachers to apply the full battery of tests, these scales broadly represented the scoring on the Kagan Test (1966). This was felt to be a suitable compromise.

Parental Pre-Questionnaire
This measure was the same for both groups. Questions not specifically related to the study aims were included to provide bridging questions
into some of the more sensitive areas in the questionnaire. The questionnaire included demographic data, a record of parental advice given to each subject about coping with strangers and a list of children's fears. The last two areas were replicated on the questionnaires completed by the children. Parents completed their questionnaire three days before the children completed the knowledge pre-test. The parental questionnaires were delivered by their children in sealed envelopes and returned the following day in sealed envelopes to the school. Although parents were asked not to discuss their questionnaire with their children, it is not known if they did so. Despite being advised that the children's questionnaires were available in the respective schools, no parent requested to see them; thus, parents were unaware of the common questions asked of them and their children.

Twenty-six (93%) of the twenty-eight parents in the experimental group, and twenty-three (85%) of the twenty-seven parents in the control group returned the pre-questionnaires, giving an overall return of forty-nine (89%) questionnaires. Additionally, two parents in the control group returned the questionnaires uncompleted. One of these parents included a covering letter which read: 26

"To Sue Hamilton

I am returning your questionnaire un answered, as I am appalled by the questions on it. reading between the lines it is not about strangers as first lead to believe, but very probing home life questions as to child abuse and socio-cultural environment. Yes I was in favour of protecting my child from strangers, but I very much take offence at being asked if my child is frightened of taking a bath or going to bed in their own home. I can assure you that none of my children suffer from any of the things listed in your questionnaire, and I very much object to being asked this. Furthermore had I known the questions my child would be asked at school I never would have allowed her to take part, this is a total outrage asking a ten year old child to name the parts of the body, there is a time and a place for everything, when shes older."

The specific issues mentioned by this parent were not those raised by any of the parents in the pilot school; also, previous research in the States using the same checklist of children's fears and anxieties did not record any parental objection. The writer would acknowledge that

26 This letter is recorded in the form received by the writer.
cultural differences may have been a contributory factor here. In respect of the use of the body chart, the writer had used the same measurement in a previous study (Hamilton 1989) without any parental objection. Despite these reservations, this parent did not withdraw her child from the study.

Pre- and Post-Knowledge Tests
The pre-test provided baseline data about the children's awareness, knowledge, opinions and ability to problem-solve in personal safety issues as well as including the common questions previously mentioned under 'Parental Questionnaire'. This thirty-one item measure was developed after piloting and included some items from instruments used by other researchers. The questionnaire (See Appendix 4), 'What I Need To Know About Touching Scale', (WIKATS) which reflected key aims of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No ' Programme was developed by Hazzard et al (1991) after pilot testing of a longer version and included some items from similar scales (Plummer 1984; Wurtele et al 1986).

The multiple choice questions in this study had been mostly adapted from the research instrument used by Hazzard et al (1991) and had a proven reliability. However, on advice from the teachers, which included the application of a set of test principles in Scottish schools, some of the questions were ordered differently and an additional question included. For these same reasons, the children were also instructed not to turn back to any page. These logistic constraints were outwith the writer's control. However, given the adaptations made by the writer, the measure's previous internal consistency co-efficient of 0.75, as assessed by Cronbach's alpha and the two-week test-retest reliability of 0.77 in the Hazzard et al (1991) study, could not be assumed. In hind-sight, therefore, an analysis of pre- and post-test questionnaires would have been most useful to check for validity and reliability.

Most of the items in the test measure in this study can be traced directly to one or more of the Programmes objectives. Items related to the research aims included the following concepts: feelings; fears;
preparation by parents to cope with strangers; characteristics of abusers; who can abuse; definitions of sexual assault; who can be abused; its okay to say "No"; its okay to tell adults about abuse; and the proper names for sexual parts of the body.

Despite the compromises imposed on the writer on the questionnaire, the reader is reminded from the Literature Review that numerous studies have examined knowledge gains in child sexual abuse prevention programmes. As the Knowledge Test was not the major outcome measure in this study, given the practical constraints, a decision had to be made to concentrate on the central areas of the study, the main focus being child abduction and, in particular, the stranger vignettes and the behavioural measure being deployed - the simulation of the stranger abduction.

There also were two problem-solving vignettes, which were in most part of more relevance than the knowledge questions, as the children's responses in this paper and pencil exercise would be compared with their actual behaviour in the simulation of the stranger abduction. The vignettes required the children to problem-solve what a male and female child should do when faced with a potentially dangerous situation of stranger abduction, predict the consequences of abduction and attribute blame for sexual assault. On police advice, the context of the vignettes, however, were different and therefore outcomes were not comparable (specifically a fairground ('Shows') was used as this was the context for an abduction in Lothian which received nationwide publicity). Questions centred on identifying appropriate solutions to problems and recognising the appropriate application of key concepts included in the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme.

Unfortunately, in hindsight, the stranger vignettes did not specify the age of the child. Moreover, taken at face value, it might appear some gender bias may have been present in the solutions for the attribution of fault. However, in a previous study carried out by the writer (Hamilton 1989), these were the only solutions proffered by children (N=184) of a similar age to the same question. Furthermore, some of the questions are leading and may also elicit socially desirable
responses from the children (Potter 1979). The post-test was a parallel form of the pre-test.

The pre-test was administered simultaneously by the Class Teacher in both schools on the Monday before the Programme commenced and the post-test, on the Friday following the completion of the Programme. In the experimental group, one child who was absent on the day the pre-test was administered completed it two days later on his return to school. Another child, who had a dental appointment, completed it on his return to school. In the control group, one child was absent for the pre-test and two children for the post-test. Arrangements were made for these children to complete the questionnaires immediately on their return to school. However, it is recognised that consultation between the children may have taken place through social contacts outwith school. Additionally, pre-test sensitisation could not be controlled for as a knowledge baseline prior to the teaching of the Programme was necessary to compare knowledge gains and performance on the behavioural measure. This said, every child completed a pre- and post-test knowledge questionnaire. Both tests were scored by the writer.

The Programme
The Programme was taught between mid-February and March 1991. During the six weeks of the Programme, the children in the experimental group received a total of fifteen hours of teaching, averaging between two - three hours per week. The key lessons and a small selection of supplementary lessons were taught. (There is around thirty hours of teaching in the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme should a school wish to teach all of the supplementary lessons).

Parental Post Questionnaire
As the parents in the experimental group had seen the Programme, the post-parental questionnaire was designed in two different formats. Common to both questionnaires, were the same questions asked in the pre-questionnaire on children's fears and the parents' views on the school's role in teaching sexual abuse prevention programmes.
Twenty-five (89%) of the twenty-eight parents in the experimental group and twenty (74%) of the twenty-seven parents in the control group returned their post-questionnaires, giving an overall return of forty-five (81%) questionnaires. It is interesting to note the difference in return rates from the two groups. In the writer's opinion, the fact that the parents in the experimental group had seen the Programme in advance helped allay fears and fantasies of what the children would be taught, as well as establishing trust with those in authority. This prior awareness, also helped these parents put the research objectives into context, something the parents in the control group were denied.

Simulation of the Stranger Abduction

Access to Premises
The writer received consent from Lothian Region Education Department for the exclusive use of one of their Centres, and two members of teaching staff and the janitor for this part of the study. The Centre is used by children for Environmental Studies and is situated near to a castle. It consists of three floors with classrooms and laboratories on the first two floors, and a museum and an office on the third. On the second floor there is also a kitchen which can be seen from the office window on the third floor.

The simulation exercise took five days: one day to set up the room and equipment, and the other four days, for video-recording the simulations (an anticipated fourteen children per day). It was decided that the usual activities of the Centre would take place, except that, the children would encounter a 'stranger' whilst carrying on a task on the third floor in the museum.

Built-in Safeguards

The following safeguards were built into the simulation exercise to ensure that no child would be placed 'at risk':-
Meetings, attended by Head Teachers and Class Teachers, were arranged with parents in both schools. They were fully informed of the research objectives, details of the proposed simulation including the built-in safeguards and debriefing meetings.

Written consent was required from all parents for their child to participate in the simulation exercise.

Secure premises: the writer had exclusive use and control of the Education Centre, entry being gained only through an intercom system and the janitor being fully aware of the situation.

All staff involved were qualified teachers or social workers.

The 'strangers' were a trained teacher and social worker with wide experience of working with children.

The Class Teacher received children after the simulation to assess any immediate adverse effects.

The children and parents were fully debriefed as soon as was practical after the exercise.

A second written consent was obtained from the parents of the children involved in the simulation exercise. This consent was obtained following the debriefing meetings when parents had the opportunity to view the audio-visual recording of their children.

Arrangements were made for the children to remain with the same Class Teachers for the following year primarily to monitor any long-term adverse effects of the simulation. This continuity also ensured that ample opportunity was available to provide a booster session of personal safety and individual work with any child who failed the simulation or who showed any signs of desensitisation to approaches by strangers.

Two weeks after the simulation exercise, the children were interviewed to ascertain their views and to elicit whether there was any evidence of desensitisation to approaches by strangers.

One year after the simulation exercise, the views of the parents were sought to assess any long-term effects of their child's involvement in the simulation exercise.

One year later, the views of all the teachers involved in the simulation exercise were also sought on long-term effects of the children's involvement in the simulation exercise.
Characteristics of Suspects

Studies of the characteristics of child molesters revealed that only 10% - 17% of child molesters use physical force to abduct their victims (Groth 1980; Law 1979). The majority attempt to develop an association with the child or entice the child away from safety (Berliner & Conte 1990; Budin & Johnson 1989; Conte et al 1989). Additionally, molesters are overwhelmingly male (Finkelor 1986). Taking this into account, and following consultation with Lothian and Borders Police, the suspects used for the simulation exercise were selected to resemble the typical molester in the area - white, male, aged between twenty-five and forty and conservative in appearance. Again, on police advice, suspects used one or two lures commonly used by molesters:

(a) a simple request for the child to go with the molester, and
(b) a request to leave with an incentive.

Suspects used the following scripts to present the lures:

(a) Simple lure (Lure 1):

"Hello there, I’m a bit lost. Could you give me a hand with this stuff to my car on the Castle Esplanade?"

(b) Incentive lure (Lure 2):

"Hello there, I’m a bit lost. Could you give me a hand with this stuff to my car on the Castle Esplanade and I’ll give you a couple of quid?"

Table 4:3 overleaf shows the design illustration of the distribution of the variation of the lures used by the stranger in the experimental and control groups. The inconsistency of distribution is accounted for in that, on the second day, the simulation exercise had to be stopped for the control group. This is further explained later in this Chapter. It is, however, acknowledged that, these events, which were outwith the control of the writer, present distributions which will have a bearing on, and drive, later data. This issue will be returned to in the presentation of the data analyses and in addressing the implications for the interpretation of the results.
Table 4:3

Lure by Group
(N = 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Lure 1</th>
<th>Lure 2</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min Cells with E.F. E.F.<5
0.00299 1 0.9563 E.F. E.F.<5
0.19145 1 0.6617 5.571 4 of 4 (B.Y.C.)

Method - Stranger Abduction Simulation

The previously described built-in safeguards were considered a prerequisite for this part of this study. It was decided to conduct the simulation exercise immediately after the Easter holidays when it was felt that the children in the experimental group would be more likely to be off their guard as the teaching of the Programme had been completed prior to this holiday break. Consequently, on the Tuesday the school commenced, half of the control group, (an anticipated fourteen children) were to come to the Centre. However, on arrival at the Centre, an immediate problem was encountered in that the Head Teacher who had been involved in all of the briefings, was ill. The Assistant Head Teacher had been sent in her place. She had to be fully briefed. Additionally, only eleven of the children were present, three being absent from school due to illness. Of the eleven, one child had recently joined the class after the commencement of the study. Consequently, only ten children were available to take part in the simulation exercise.

The children were split at random into two mixed groups of six and five children. The group of five children went with two members of the Centre staff on a field trip. This took all morning. It was planned
that the activities of the two groups would be reversed at lunchtime without either group coming into contact. The six remaining children started the morning in a classroom/laboratory on the second floor (cut off from the main stairwell by two separating doors).

Initially, they were supervised by the school auxiliary and their Class Teacher. The Class Teacher then left this room and 'took up position' in a laboratory on the ground floor to receive each child following the simulation exercise. This arrangement was made to ensure that if any child was distressed then she would be the best person to pick this up. Each child was then taken individually by the Assistant Head Teacher to the museum on the top floor, where they were set a task. They were then left to draw a plan from a three dimensional model of a city.

The Assistant Head Teacher gave an excuse for leaving the room, explaining to the child that she would be in the office next door (some thirty feet away from where the child was working). She left the room, leaving the door fully opened so that the office door could be seen. She telephoned the 'stranger' who was situated in the kitchen below to alert him to proceed with the exercise. (Waving a handkerchief from the office window which could be seen from the kitchen window was used as a back up when the telephones were engaged).

Two male confederates played the part of the 'stranger'. One was a qualified teacher, the other, a qualified social worker. Both had considerable experience in working with children and perpetrators. They were between thirty and thirty-five years old. One was Scottish with a distinct, educated Edinburgh accent (Stranger 1). The other came from Newcastle and had a distinct 'Geordie' accent (Stranger 2). The potential confounding effects of different accents is examined in the data analyses.

Table 4:4 overleaf shows the distribution of the variation of the two strangers between the experimental and control groups.
Table 4:4

Stranger by Group
(N = 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strg 1</th>
<th>Strg 2</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min Cells with
2.51581 1 0.1127 E.F. E.F.<5 (B.Y.C.)
3.87692 1 0.0489 5.571 2 of 4

For the same reasons described at Table 4:3 it is again acknowledged that these distributions will have a bearing on, and drive, later data. This issue will be returned to in the presentation of the analyses and the implications for the interpretation of the results.

On the signal from the Assistant Head Teacher, the 'stranger', dressed as a delivery man laden with parcels and bags, ascended the stairs and entered the room where the child was working. He remained within two feet of the door entrance, leaving a distance of some eighteen feet between himself and the child, and offered one of the two lures described earlier. The 'stranger' had been advised to use only the words in the lure and not to use any follow-up questions. The children's responses were video recorded 'blind' by the writer and a helper behind the notice boards; concealed microphones recorded their verbal responses. The helper controlled the camera; the writer assessed each child's reactions by watching a television monitor and listening to their responses using a head-set.

If any child left the room with the 'stranger', then the latter had an instruction to cough to alert the Assistant Head Teacher. She would
then intervene and tell the 'stranger' in the presence of the child that the janitor was available to lend assistance. To make sure there was no contact with peers who had still to go through the exercise, each child was then take via the stairwell to play computer games in the laboratory on the ground floor. They were received by their Class Teacher as previously detailed. This procedure was repeated for each child.

The returning group, who had been on the field trip during the morning were given a room for lunch on a separate floor and did not make contact with any of the children who had already taken part in the exercise. The morning group were then taken on the same field trip during the afternoon. The procedure, previously outlined, was repeated in the afternoon for each child in the returning group. Ten simulations in total were video-recorded. Due to problems in arranging future transport, the three children who were absent had to be excluded from the exercise. The 'stranger' on this day was the teacher.

The following day, the remaining fourteen children in the control class were asked to report to school half an hour early to try and avoid any contact with their classmates. It was not possible to say whether the children had met socially outside school hours, although this question was subsequently raised with the children at interview. The Head Teacher (who had by this time returned from sick leave) had made the decision that to ensure consistency, the Assistant Head Teacher should remain involved in the exercise. The same procedure was followed on the second day except that the 'stranger' was played by the social worker.

However, during the third simulation, a female child read the encounter as an actual abduction and started to yell for help. Moreover, following this simulation, the confederate playing the part of the 'stranger' was upset at the response he had provoked in this child. The exercise was suspended and a full discussion took place between all professional staff on site. The Assistant Head Teacher contacted the Head Teacher by telephone and the incident was fully
discussed. It was the view of all school staff that the exercise should continue and the child concerned be stringently observed. Despite this, the writer decided that the child's best interests were paramount over the needs of the study. Given there was a distinct risk of other children making reference to the encounter with the 'stranger' which could precipitate further distress in this particular child, a decision was taken by the writer to overrule the school staff and stop the exercise.

The child was stringently monitored by her Class Teacher for the remainder of the day and activities continued for all the children as originally planned. Thus, only thirteen of the anticipated twenty-seven simulations were completed with the control group. These events explain the skewed distributions in Tables 4:3 and 4:4. Meanwhile, the parents of the child were contacted by the Head Teacher and advised of the situation. On her return to the school, the child was taken home by the Assistant Head Teacher and Class Teacher where she and her parents were fully debriefed and the child praised for her response. The child's mother confirmed that her child had responded exactly in the way she had advised her to in such a situation i.e. to yell as loud as she could. The parents were advised to monitor their child and to report any adverse effects to the Head Teacher. Both the child and the parents were requested not to inform the other children or parents at this stage as a debriefing meeting had been organised at the beginning of the following week. It is of particular note that no adverse effects were reported on this child either by parents or school staff in the fifteen months following the simulation exercise.

On the third day of the exercise, on tutorial advice, the staff of the experimental school viewed the video-recording of this child in order to take an informed decision as to whether they should continue in the study. A decision was made to proceed and contingency plans were made in case a similar situation should arise. It was agreed to immediately debrief any child who exhibited any level of distress to the simulation and notify their parents. These discussions and subsequent decisions took considerable time - a full morning was lost. To compensate for the lost time and because the premises had to be vacated early Friday afternoon, it was agreed that every other child in
the experimental group would take part in the simulation that day and on the Friday. Additionally, all the children in this group needed to return to their school for debriefing before the weekend.

The procedure used for the control group was repeated for the experimental group. The only difference was that it was the Head Teacher, as opposed to the Assistant Head Teacher, who set the task for the children. The 'stranger' again alternated on both days. Thus, over the two days, only fifteen of the anticipated twenty-eight simulations in the experimental group were video-recorded, giving a total of twenty-eight simulations from the two groups.

Debriefing
All school staff who were involved in the exercise and the writer attended the debriefing sessions. A decision had been taken initially by teaching staff not to tell any of the children that they had been video-recorded, as it was felt that this would be extremely difficult and embarrassing for the children who 'failed' the simulation. However, the parents of these children felt that if the situation was handled sensitively, their children could use this as a positive learning experience. Furthermore, they felt the simulation exercise had a positive role to play in reinforcing the Programme.

Consequently, the children and the parents in the control group were debriefed in two stages:-

i) The parents of these children were debriefed at an evening meeting on the Tuesday following the exercise. They were given an opportunity to see the audio-visual recording of their child and to raise any issues. The parents were also asked to sign a second consent form to allow the rating for their child to be reported in this study. All parents consented.

ii) The control group were debriefed on the Wednesday following the simulation exercise. The children were advised by the writer that their parents had consented to their taking part in the exercise. Both 'strangers' made an audio-visual recording for the children (dressed as the 'strangers') and explained what had happened and reinforced the message of keeping safe.
The children in the control group were due to start the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme the following week. As a result of their heightened awareness of abduction due to taking part in the exercise, they were alerted to the importance of the Programme.

The parents and the children in the experimental school were debriefed in three stages:-

i) The children in the exercise on the Friday morning were debriefed over lunch after the last simulation; They also met the 'strangers';

ii) The children in the exercise on the Thursday were debriefed after they returned to school on Friday afternoon. They also saw the audio-visual recording made by the 'strangers';

iii) The parents of these children were debriefed at an evening meeting the following Monday and given an opportunity to see the audio-visual recording of their child and to raise any issues. They were asked to sign a second consent form. All parents agreed to this.

The children in the experimental group were advised to continue to use the skills learned in 'The Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme. The writer also stressed to both groups that their parents had agreed to their involvement in this exercise and that they would not give their consent to their children being involved in a similar exercise. Consequently, should they encounter such a situation in the future, it would be for real and they should use their personal safety skills.

**Interview Schedule**

Two weeks after the simulation exercise all the children, except a child in the control school who was sick, who took part in the simulation were interviewed in their respective schools. This involved fifteen children in the experimental school and twelve in the control school. A semi-structured interview schedule was used to elicit :-

i) The children's views and feelings on being involved in the simulation exercise.

ii) The names of people within and outwith the children's families that they trusted and their reasons for this.
iii) Their children's perceptions of a stranger.
iv) The children's views of the Programme.
v) Any child involved in the second days of filming, was asked specifically whether anyone had told them about meeting a 'stranger' on the visit to the Centre.

Parental Questionnaire (Children in Simulation Exercise)
One year after the simulation exercise, a second questionnaire was issued to the twenty-eight parents of those children who were involved in the simulation. It was distributed by the schools in sealed envelopes and given to the children to take home to their parents. An envelope was enclosed and the parents were asked to return the questionnaires to the writer via the school.

There were four questions asked of respondents. The primary objective was to assess whether, with the passage of time, there was any evidence of adverse effects and/or desensitisation to approaches by strangers as a result of their child's involvement in this study. Twenty-seven (97%) of the twenty-eight parents returned their questionnaires (the remaining parents were not contactable as they had moved out of the area). Therefore, there was a 100% return of this questionnaire reflecting, in the writer's opinion, a clear concern for their children's safety. This questionnaire was analysed by the writer.

It is acknowledged that as well as leading questions, social desirable responses has probably influenced parental responses and results (Furnham 1986; Peters & Fox 1993).

Teacher Questionnaire (Simulation Exercise)
This questionnaire was a parallel form of that given to the parents and was administered at the same time. It elicited the views of the teachers specifically, whether there was any evidence of adverse effects and/or desensitisation to strangers through the children's involvement in the simulation exercise. It is recognised that as well as leading questions, socially desirable responses may well have also influenced parental responses and subsequent results (Crino 1985).
Structured Report Form
This form recorded factual details of the circumstances of any child in the experimental or control group using Programme strategies in real life situations. This information included the name and age of the child; the date of the incident; the name of the referrer; the circumstances surrounding the use of the Programme strategies; whether the matter had been referred to the Authorities, and the eventual outcome. For the children in the experimental group, this monitoring continued for fifteen months, starting in March 1990 following the teaching of the Programme and, similarly, for the children in the control group at the end of June 1990.

Ethical Considerations

Any research in child sexual abuse is by its very nature fraught with problems. Consideration of related effects must be weighed up (e.g. a child disclosing abuse). In the writer's opinion, unconditional confidentiality cannot be guaranteed to subjects, particularly when they are minors. The protection of subjects' social, psychological and emotional well-being, as well as their inherent dignity, are essential to good research. This level of protection has particular and added significance when the subject matter is as sensitive and contentious as in this study. Consequently, written informed consent was requested from parents both before and after the simulation exercise was completed. A positive permission form was used to ensure parents judged participation appropriate for their child and to obtain consent for the results to be reported in this study.

Extreme care was taken in the creation of the abduction simulation to protect the emotional well-being of the subjects and to ensure that the simulations were perceived as being well within the norms of everyday occurrences. In designing the simulations, the educational building was selected because it was a protected and controlled environment. All personnel who took part in the testing and staging of the simulations were trained in child development. The statements used in the simulation were deemed to be plausible and non-threatening and, as previously described, extensive safeguards were
also in place

Each child was carefully monitored after the simulation by their Class Teacher to ensure ample opportunity was given to express any fear or anxiety, as well as providing an opportunity to report the encounter. Additionally, in order to ascertain whether there were any adverse effects from the simulation exercise, specific arrangements were made to allow the children to remain with the same Class Teacher the following year. Moreover, one year after the simulation exercise, the views of the parents, teachers were sought on this matter.

These built-in safeguards were considered a prerequisite by the writer in order to ensure that no child was placed at risk and that any adverse effects were minimised. Such were the ethical considerations in this study, that when the child who interpreted the simulation as an actual abduction became upset, the child’s welfare became paramount to the study itself, and against the advice of school staff, the exercise was stopped by the writer.

It should be noted that even the cautious use of a stranger abduction simulation method raises important questions. Researchers need to give very careful thought to their research design, their questionnaires and interviews, as such research may cause inadvertent distress or damage to children. However, given the parents' and participants' positive views of such procedures reported later in this study, there may well be a case for utilising this technique, provided the researcher is sensitive to those problems which may occur, and that tremendous care and safeguards are built into the research design. Moreover, the writer would acknowledge that socially desirable responses from the parents, teachers (Crino 1985; Furnham 1986; Peters & Fox 1993) and the children (Potter 1979) probably influenced these specific responses.

The findings in this study, as narrated in Chapters Six and Seven, shed further light on the validity of the simulation method as a research method and the necessary safeguards when using such a technique.
Validity and Reliability

The following controls were incorporated into this study to ensure validity and reliability:

i) The ability ratings of the children were held constant in that subjects selected fell within a set ability range and were therefore broadly matched.

ii) Where practically possible, all instruments were administered simultaneously in both schools.

iii) A standardised sexual abuse prevention Programme was utilised.

iv) Both Class Teachers had similar skills and length of experience (acknowledged in recent promotion to senior teachers).

v) The control group provided a way to measure the effect of the presentation on the experimental group.

vi) Classroom schedules were not interrupted as the Programme was already part of the curriculum in the experimental school.

vii) A standardised method was utilised with both groups to collect the data.

Data Analyses

Two forms of data collection were used to determine the impact of the sexual abuse prevention Programme, namely:

i) Quantitative data, and,

ii) Qualitative data.

i) Quantitative Data

Descriptive statistics were computed using the SPSS X procedure to organise, summarise and describe the sample group in terms of frequency distributions of the selected variables; group classification; demography; age; gender; ability rating; behaviour rating; cognitive style rating; pre- and post-test scores on the knowledge measure and responses to the stranger vignettes.

A variety of inferential statistics were used to further analyse the data. In order to compute any difference in mean knowledge
gains by the two groups, a paired \( t \) test (Siegel & Castellan 1988) was calculated. Further \( t \) tests were computed using ability, cognitive style and behaviour ratings to check for any differences between the knowledge scores of the groups. The 0.05 level of significance was used in this study.

For the analyses of the stranger vignettes, the original variables were collapsed to form dichotomous variables. Given the sample size, the McNemar test was considered the most appropriate. This was computed to determine whether there was any differences between the group's ability to predict sexual assault as a likely consequence of stranger abduction and to attribute blame appropriately for sexual assault. In order to test for significance, the Binominal two-tailed test was also computed.

The audio-visual recordings of the simulation were rated 'blind' by three teachers, two females and one male. They were asked to look at the recordings and to make a judgement as to whether or not the child was at risk of abduction. In order to maximise the utility of the research design, the writer tried to establish by this method the beginnings of a body of normative data as to the factors placing children at risk of abduction. The teachers were therefore also asked to record the factors influencing their decision. This proved to be highly problematic not least because the area of risk to child abduction/child sexual abuse is a relatively new field in Britain and the raters brought their own subjectivity and overt prejudices to the marking process. Inter-rater scores were not, therefore, used as independent measures. Consequently, the writer, took a decision to compromise the research design by including her own analysis of the simulation exercise as it was impractical to recruit another group of inter-raters (the reasons for this are detailed in the next chapter).

To allow comparisons to be made with the most reliable studies (Fryer et al 1987a & b) which used the simulation technique in the analysis by the writer, a straight pass/fail was awarded. Any child who agreed to accompany the 'stranger' or went with him was
failed. A pass was given to any child who refused the 'stranger's' request to accompany him. The Contingency Coefficient was used to give a measure of reliability to compare the scores of all of the raters. These ratings were further analysed using the Chi Square. The Fisher Exact Probability test was also computed as it is:

"is an extremely and useful technique for analysing discrete data (either nominal or ordinal) when the two independent samples are small to initially test for any differences between groups" (Siegel & Castellan 1988 p.103).

Cross-tabulations on the behavioural responses to the simulation were computed using ability, behavioural, cognitive style and inductive reasoning scores for children who had passed or failed the exercise in both the experimental and control groups. This exercise was then repeated for individual children who had passed or failed the simulation, irrespective of grouping, in an attempt to identify any vulnerability factors likely to affect susceptibility to abduction. A further analysis was computed using the paired $t$ test and the Chi Square test in an effort to identify whether there were any differences between the individuals who had passed or failed the simulation. This flexible approach to these data was adopted in the knowledge that sample bias was already present. This bias was attributable to the experience of some members of the control group being victims of sexual assault and to the unforeseen reduction in the sample size of the children involved in the simulation.

b) Qualitative Data

For the qualitative data, the children were interviewed in their own school in a room specially prepared for this. (full details are given in Chapter Seven). The interviews were primarily diagnostic. Some of the difficulties in interviewing were:-

- The special features of talking at a child's level as opposed to that of an adult.
- The sensitivity of the area being discussed.
- In the control group, some children were known to be victims of sexual assault.
The children were put at ease through small talk with a view to building up a rapport. They were advised of the purpose of the interview and were reminded that their parent(s) had agreed to their taking part in the study. They were informed that they were under no obligation to answer any of the questions. They were asked if they had any objections to handwritten notes being taken whilst they were talking. A conscious decision was taken by the writer not to tape the interviews as it was felt that the children would find a tape intrusive and perhaps not be so open. Additionally, under the same conditions in a previous study (Hamilton 1989), children had used such interviews to disclose abuse. Given the legal complications which may have ensued (e.g. tape ownership) and other considerations, hand-written notes were taken. No child objected to this.

Cannel & Kahn (1968) point out that even more than with adults, the facilitation of trust enhances children's motivation to participate and maximises validity in interviews. As the writer had met all of the children at their respective debriefing sessions, this helped give the interviews a context as well as facilitating trust. For the writer, there was an extra dimension regarding the use of interviews in that too much probing might have raised issues which possibly could have touched emotional areas in the children. Thus, the approach taken was to use a semi-structured questionnaire to obtain the children's views on their participation in the stranger abduction. The data from these interviews, where appropriate, was coded into specific themes in response to the questions asked. This type of coding was important to enable an examination of all of the interviews in a horizontal cross-sectional way. This approach enabled common themes and concepts to be analysed in an attempt to understand the children's experience of the stranger abduction simulation.

The parents completed a post-questionnaire on their views of the simulation exercise and personal safety programmes. The teaching staff completed the same questionnaire as the parents, but were given the opportunity to meet with the writer face-to-
face. This opportunity was only used for clarification of some of the questions. Thus, the views of the children, their parents and their teachers were sought on the simulation exercise in an attempt to triangulate the data.

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

The assumptions and limitations of the study were as follows:-

- For practical and ethical reasons, Lothian Region Education Department would not agree to randomise subjects' placement in either treatment or control group. Although intact groups do restrict the generalisability of results, the use of such groups according to Borg and Gall (1979), are permissible.

- For practical reasons, the study was restricted to two schools, thus limiting the sample size.

- In order to meet the restrictions imposed on this study, schools were matched as far as was practically possible, taking into account the ability of the children, the background of the school, and the socio-economic backgrounds of the parents.

- Given the demography of the area where the research took place, the study was conducted with white subjects, primarily of Scottish origin, and mostly from christian backgrounds.

- As the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme was not being taught to children below the age of eight in Lothian Region schools, the study was limited to fifty-five children aged eight to nine. This specific age was chosen by Lothian Region to dovetail the Programme objectives with the developmental needs of the subjects and because this age is a high risk age for the onset of sexual abuse (Baker & Duncan 1985; Finkelhor 1986).

- It was assumed from statistics in Britain regarding rates of sexual abuse that the same figure would apply in this study and therefore that one in every ten children in the classroom could be a victim of child sexual assault (Baker & Duncan 1985). In this study, there was no way to control for this phenomenon.
• It was assumed that pupils participating in the study might also be exposed to situations and to unknown extraneous material regarding sexual abuse throughout the period of the study. Nevertheless, it was established that none of the subjects, in either the treatment or control group, had been exposed to a prior formal prevention programme.

• As parents were aware of the nature of the study and had access to the measurements deployed, there was a distinct risk of 'contamination of the subjects.' Given that parental consent was necessary for this study to proceed and ethically that parents had to be aware of the nature of the research, there was no way to control for this effect.

• It was assumed that as the Programme was standardised and the Class Teachers were of the same status (promoted staff with approximately the same years of experience in the job), any differences in teacher/pupil relationship were controlled for as far as was practically possible.

• Written parental consent was considered a prerequisite for prospective subjects. Therefore, only those children whose parents had given consent participated in the study. The letter seeking consent specifically made reference to the purpose of the study. A meeting with parents made this explicit. It is recognised that the sample may be slightly biased in that one parent would not consent to her child being involved in the simulation exercise.

• The assumptions and limitations of the statistical analyses have already been described. Despite these, and other limitations, given the evolutionary state of research in the area of child sexual abuse prevention, it is the writer's contention that this study has an important contribution to make to the field.

• The writer would acknowledge that both leading questions and socially desirable of responses from parents, teachers (Crino 1985; Peters & Fox 1993) and the children (Potter 1979) have in some measure influenced the results.

The next chapter addresses the data analyses.
CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS OF THE PARENTAL PRE-QUESTIONNAIRES AND KNOWLEDGE TESTS

"Group level outcome evaluations assess the effect of a programme's overall performance. These studies involve (1) collecting the data on the same question(s) from different individuals, (2) aggregating the data, and (3) assessing the aggregated data to determine how the group, as a whole, responded" (Pietrzak et al 1990 p.144).

Introduction

According to the above researchers, group level outcome evaluations in educational child abuse prevention programmes have as their main goals:

- Involvement of parents in school-based prevention programmes.
- Increasing a group's knowledge about child abuse.
- Improving a child's awareness that an abusive incident is not his/her fault.
- Improving a child's ability to say "No" in a potentially abusive situation, i.e. a behavioural change.
- Facilitating a child's ability to report abuse.

These main goals were incorporated into the research design of this study and were reflected in the hypotheses and questions which form the research aims.

This chapter, the first of four, presents the data analyses. It covers the following topics:

- Overview of the study.
- Demographic data.
- Results of the standardised tests.
Overview of the Study

The goal of this study was to evaluate the impact of a child abduction and sexual abuse prevention programme called 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' on a variety of different measures between children in an experimental and a control group.

A sample of fifty-six children was selected at primary six level from two primary schools in Lothian Region; however, due to sample attrition, there were fifty-five children at the outset of the fieldwork. A school already teaching the Programme had a class which formed the experimental group. These children were matched with a class in a control school. Both schools and classes were nominated by the Education Department. For ethical and practical reasons, therefore, random assignment was not possible.

At the time of nomination, the control school had no direct knowledge or experience of any child having been sexually abused. Subsequent events changed this, when, shortly after the schools had been matched and the standardised tests administered, a male member of staff was convicted of sexually assaulting several children. Moreover, it is unknown how many children in total were involved as disclosures have continued throughout the period of this study from children in the control group and pupils at secondary school, as well as from children one year younger than the children in this study. What is not in doubt, however, is that these events have confounded the results of this study.

The majority of the parents completed a pre-questionnaire which included family background characteristics and the advice given to their children on stranger abduction.
Several standardised tests to give an ability rating, behavioural profile and cognitive style were completed by the Class Teachers and Head Teachers to provide a rating for each child. The children completed pre- and post-knowledge tests, including two vignettes on stranger abduction.

Family background characteristics, the results of the standardised tests, the data relating to parental advice on stranger abduction and the knowledge tests are reported in Chapter Five.

The findings of the stranger vignettes are presented in Chapter Six. A sub-set of twenty-eight children from both groups took part in a 'blind' simulation of stranger abduction to give a behavioural measure. Considerable care was taken to ensure that safeguards were in place to ensure no child was placed at risk.

This behavioural measure was rated 'blind' by three raters and the writer (The reasons for this 'breach' of the research design have been explained in the previous chapter and are further addressed in the following chapter). This subset of children were also interviewed regarding their views and feelings of the simulation exercise. All of these findings are reported in Chapter Six.

One year after the simulation, parents and teachers completed a questionnaire which included, their views of the simulation exercise. In particular, the area of desensitisation to approaches by strangers through the usage of the simulation method was examined. The analyses of these data are also reported in Chapter Six. The wider views of the children are reported in Chapter Seven.

The parents were also asked in the post-questionnaire their views on personal safety programmes. The children were then followed up for fifteen months after the Programme was taught to ascertain whether they had cause to use any of the Programme strategies in real life situations. These findings are reported in Chapter Eight. Thus, both children and parents were given their own voice in this study.
Four meetings were set up with parents, one in each school before and after the simulation exercise. In addition, the writer made six extra visits to the schools to meet with parents and ensure they saw the audio-visual recording of their child. These meetings took place with both the Head and Class Teacher in attendance.

Written informed consent was obtained from all parents both before, and after, completion of the standardised tests and the administration of all the research instruments. Parents were also offered access to the results of the standardised tests. Although no parent took advantage of looking at the research instruments, all parents viewed the audio-visual recording of their child in the abduction simulation. They also completed a further consent for the simulation results to be reported in this study.

The demographic data is presented first. The results of the standardised tests are then reported. This is followed by the results of the testing of the research hypotheses. In order to provide greater insight and understanding of the findings, where appropriate, the quantitative data is supported by qualitative data.

**Demographic Data**

In the experimental group, twenty-six (92.9%) of the twenty-eight parents returned the pre-questionnaires in comparison with twenty-three (85.2%) of the twenty-seven parents in the control group, giving a return rate of forty-nine (89.1%) questionnaires. In forty-three (87.8%) questionnaires, the child's mother was the respondent, the other six (12.2%), were fathers.

Table 5:1 overleaf presents the demographic data from the pre-parental questionnaires.
Table 5:1
Demographic Data
(N=49)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Responses</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>N=26</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>N=23</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(65.4)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(69.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 - 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(26.9)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(17.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(88.5)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(82.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Constellation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Parent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(92.3)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(69.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(26.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother's Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(26.9)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(47.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Worker</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(46.2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(26.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Manual Worker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(19.2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother's Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Income</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(23.1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(30.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Benefits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under £70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(34.6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£70 - £99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(26.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100 - £249</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father's Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Worker</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(61.5)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(30.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Manual Worker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(30.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(23.1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(39.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father's Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Benefits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under £70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£70 - £99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100 - £249</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(42.3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£250 - £500+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(17.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(30.8)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(43.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(77.0)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(56.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 5:1 shows that most parents were between thirty and thirty nine years of age, seventeen (65.4%) in the experimental group and sixteen (69.6%) in the control group. Most were married, twenty three (88.5%) in the experimental group and nineteen (82.7%) in the control group. The religious affiliation of the families was overwhelmingly Christian, twenty two (79%) in the experimental group and fifteen (65.2%) in the control group. Eight (14.5%) parents said they had no religious affiliation - three (11.5%) in the experimental group and five (21.7%) in the control group.

Most children lived in two-parent families, twenty four (92.3%) in the experimental group compared with sixteen (69.6%) in the control group. However, there was a disproportionate amount of children from single parents families in the control group - six (26.1%) compared with two (7.7%) in the experimental group. This factor would appear to be accidental as there were no other indicator of sample bias which could account for this difference. Despite efforts to match the groups, such a phenomenon highlights one of the problems of working with small samples. As a result, due to a combination of this bias in the control group and non-responses in the categories of 'parental work status' and 'income', further refinement analysis on this variable was not considered meaningful by the writer.

This lack of data had other implications for the testing of a related part of the second hypothesis. Unfortunately, on the first variable it was planned to use for the analysis on family background - that of 'parental income' - a total of eighteen parents (32.7%) did not to give this information. When this figure was combined with the six non-returned questionnaires, the data was not available for twenty-three (41.8%) of the children. Given the resultant small size, this part of the analyses had to be abandoned. The writer also looked at using 'family constellation' for this analysis. Unfortunately, as the numbers of children from single-parent families in the sample were small, this made significant comparisons meaningless. Consequently, this analyses was abandoned and is not presented for any of the relevant hypotheses.
Table 5.2 illustrates specific demographic information on the children at the time of the administration of the pre-parental questionnaire.

Table 5:2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>% (50)</td>
<td>N=27</td>
<td>% (51.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at June 1990</td>
<td>Over Ten Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(21.4)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under Ten Years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(78.6)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 5:2 reveals that both groups were fairly even in gender mix with the control group, due to sample attrition, having one female less. At the outset of the study, in June 1990, just over one fifth (21.4%) of the experimental group and over one quarter (29.6%) of the control group were aged ten years, the oldest child being ten and a half. The remainder of the children were under ten years, with the youngest child being nine years and five months, thus creating a maximum age gap of some thirteen months between the oldest and youngest child in the sample.

The results of the standardised tests follow beginning with ability ratings of the children.

Results of the Standardised Tests

The distribution of the raw scores for each child in the sample on the Edinburgh Reading Test (The Godfrey Thomson Unit 1981) is presented in Table 5:3. This Test, which has a proven reliability, provided a measurement of reading ability and comprehension skills.
Table 5:3

**Edinburgh Reading Test - Raw Ability Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>N=27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>3 (10.7)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3 (10.7)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>5 (18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>9 (16.3%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>34 (61.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>12 (21.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5:4 below shows the aggregated ability scores for both groups.

Table 5:4

**Aggregated Ability Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>N=27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>4 (14.3)</td>
<td>5 (18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>19 (67.9)</td>
<td>16 (59.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>5 (17.9)</td>
<td>6 (22.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Tables 5:3 and 5:4 demonstrate that both groups were very similar in reading ability and comprehension skills.
Table 5:5 shows the distribution of the behavioural scores on the Rutter Measure.

**Table 5:5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Problems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dispersion of scores in Table 5:5 shows that only two (7.1%) children in the experimental group compared with ten (37%) in the control group scored nine or over on the Rutter Measure. In the experimental group, one was male and the other female compared with eight males and two females in the control group. These scores illustrate that the control group contained disproportionately more disturbed children. Furthermore, these children were identified as having demonstrably higher behavioural disturbance scores than those in the experimental group. Additionally, in the children identified as having no significant behavioural problems, the scores between the two groups are discrepant with eighteen (59.2%) children in the experimental group falling between having no problems and a score of two, compared with only four (14.8%) in the control group.

Clearly, the control group presents a skewed distribution on this
measure and were a significantly more disturbed group of children, particularly the boys.

Table 5:6 illustrates the behaviour scores within the specific categories on the Rutter Measure.

Table 5:6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Significant Problems</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(92.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive/Anti Social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurotic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 5:6 confirm the skewed distribution of the behavioural scores within the specific categories. However, it is acknowledged that although the Rutter Measure is a tried and tested instrument, as a criterion measure, it constantly presents researchers with problems in data analyses. By its design, the instrument in describing ordered categorical variables, always produces a skewed distribution as it is biased towards negative behaviours. This is further compounded in this study by the disproportionate number of boys identified as having behavioural problems in the control group.

Retrospectively, it is the view of staff in the control school that the reason for these behavioural difficulties was as a direct consequence of possible sexual abuse of several male members of the group. It is worth noting that one year later, two more boys in the control group disclosed that they also had been sexually assaulted by the same member of staff. It has been speculated by school staff that at least five of the boys in this sample may have been affected by this experience.

Given the research findings previously described in the Literature
Review (Budin & Johnston 1989; Conte et al 1989; Gilgun & Connor 1989) on what perpetrators tell us about the characteristics (loner, attention-seeking) they look for in children they select to molest, a further analysis was carried out by the writer on the Rutter Measure to ascertain if any of the children had 'relationship problems' as the same characteristics identified in the above research findings feature in this sub-score on the Rutter Measure. This was felt to be appropriate as it may shed light on vulnerability characteristics, which in turn, may have implications for group performance in the simulation of the stranger abduction.

Table 5:7 shows the distribution these scores on the Rutter Measure.

**Table 5:7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Score</td>
<td>22 (78.6)</td>
<td>11 (40.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (10.7)</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>7 (25.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 5:7 confirm that over half (59.2%) of the children in the control group were assessed as having problems in this area of their social functioning in comparison with only six (21.4%) in the experimental group. These data will be further examined and compared with the individual performance, irrespective of grouping, of the children in the simulation exercise in an attempt assess if there is any relationship with vulnerability to abduction.

The distribution scores collated from the Kagan Cognitive Style Test (Amended), details of which have already been explained in Part Two of the Literature Review and in the Methods Chapter, are presented in Table 5:8.
Table 5:8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Measure</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful Scrutiny and Correct</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(21.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful Scrutiny but Wrong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Scrutiny and Correct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Scrutiny but Wrong</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(32.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Scrutiny</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of 'Random Scrutiny', the data in Table 5:8 show that there is not a large difference in the cognitive style scores between the two groups. However, the category 'Random Scrutiny' suggests that five (18.5%) more children in the control group may be more susceptible to risk-taking than in the experimental group. This cognitive style of decision-making may, therefore, have implications for group performance in the simulation of the stranger abduction.

Table 5:9 illustrates the distribution scores for inductive reasoning on the Kagan Measure (Amended).

Table 5:9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Correct</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(32.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Correct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Correct</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(32.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Correct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Correct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Correct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 5:9 confirm that no child scored six. Moreover, only three (10.7%) children in the experimental group scored five. In contrast, no child in the control group scored more than four. Twenty-two children from each group scored three or below, with more of the
experimental group scoring only one. These scores would appear to have implications for the capacity of the sample to problem-solve appropriately in the simulation of the stranger abduction.

Knowledge Test Results

Figures 5:1, 5:2, 5:3 and 5:4 present the pre- and post-test knowledge distribution scores for the experimental and control groups.

Figure 5:1

Knowledge Distribution Scores
Pre-Test - Experimental
(N = 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | Min. | Max. |
-----|--------|-----------|------|------|
6.429 | 6.000  | 2.441     | 2.000| 11.000|

Figure 5:2

Knowledge Distribution Scores
Post-Test - Experimental
(N = 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | Min. | Max. |
-----|--------|-----------|------|------|
8.893 | 9.000  | 1.912     | 4.000| 11.000|

Figure 5:3

Knowledge Distribution Scores
Pre-Test - Control
(N = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | Min. | Max. |
-----|--------|-----------|------|------|
6.593 | 7.000  | 2.099     | 1.000| 10.000|

Figure 5:4

Knowledge Distribution Scores
Post-Test - Control
(N = 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean | Median | Std. Dev. | Min. | Max. |
-----|--------|-----------|------|------|
8.222 | 9.000  | 1.867     | 3.000| 11.000|
As can be seen from the knowledge questionnaire in Appendix 4, some of the questions did not necessarily elicit a right or wrong answer, they also sought opinions or attitudes. Specifically, these questions were designed to reflect Programme objectives and, as explained in the Methods Chapter, they had been replicated, with some adjustments, from a previous study. For the answers, the writer ascribed a value of correct or incorrect bearing in mind the Programme objectives and the dynamics of sexual abuse, e.g. for 'Do You Think Children Should Always Obey Grown-Ups?' a negative reply would be the correct answer.

Figures 5:1 and 5:3 illustrate that prior to the teaching of the Programme, both groups had similar pre-test scores with the experimental group having a mean of 6.429 which was slightly lower than the control group with a mean of 6.593.

As shown in Figures 5:2 and 5:4, in the post-test, the experimental group had a mean of 8.893 and the control group 8.222. However, further examination of these data illustrates that more children in the experimental group scored at the higher end of the ratings in comparison with the control group.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that both groups had approximately the same pre- and post-test knowledge scores, allowing meaningful comparisons to be drawn from their responses to the simulation of the stranger abduction.

Selective Pre-Test Results

A selection of descriptive statistics from the knowledge pre-test are presented because they give an insight into socialisation processes. Figures 5:5, 5:6, 5:7, and 5:8 demonstrate these data. A comparison of the findings of these same questions is then presented to give further insights into the post-test results. (Refer to Appendix 6 for the comparative findings for the other questions).
The data in Figure 5:5 shows that in the pre-test, twenty-three (56.3%) children thought you should always obey grown-ups and two (3.7%) did not know, giving a total of three fifths of the sample being unable to give the expected answer. This is an interesting result as it appears in the writer's experience to reflect child-rearing philosophy in Scotland - the prevailing conventional wisdom being that children 'should be seen and not heard'. This perspective is further highlighted in the writer's experience of training teachers, who readily admit that they do not take to/do not like children who are assertive or who question them. Yet, as the Literature Review revealed, children who
are non-assertive may be more vulnerable to sexual assault. This is further addressed in Chapter Nine.

From the data in Figure 5:6, it is worth noting that, if the twenty-two (40%) children in the sample who replied in the affirmative are combined with those who did not know whether or not they should keep a secret if asked to do so by an adult, then more than half (52.7%) of the children lacked discriminatory skills in this area. Whilst this specific question is open to interpretation, the writer's classroom experience confirms that, even primary seven (aged eleven) children have difficulty in differentiating what constitutes 'good' and 'bad' secrets and when they should, and should not, be kept.

When these results are looked at in conjunction with the findings in Figure 5:5, what emerges is that over half of the children in the sample were of the opinion that they should always obey and keep a secret if asked by an adult to do so. Clearly, it is of concern that such socialisation messages to children in a Scottish culture may create an adult-child dynamic, ripe for exploitation by those intent on sexually abusing children. The general societal message to children that they should always obey and not discriminate when asked to keep a secret by an adult must therefore be challenged. This debate is continued in Chapter Nine.

From the findings in Figure 5:7, it is worth noting that in the pre-test, thirty-three (60%) children in the sample either answered wrongly or did not know whether boys were ever sexually assaulted. This figure is surprisingly high given the publicity surrounding sexual abuse in Scotland in the past few years as well as the experience of male sexual abuse by a staff member in the control school. It is the writer's opinion, that socialisation messages may have contributed to this finding. The implications are further addressed in Tables 5:12(a) and 5:12(b) which present the pre- and post-test responses for this question.

With regard to the definition of an exposer, the data in Figure 5:8, shows that if the 'No' and 'Don't Know' categories are combined then more than two thirds (67.3%) of the children answered wrongly. This
lack of awareness is borne out in the writer's experience, when staff in a school teaching the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, discovered that although five children in two classes had been exposed to by the same man in a nearby public swimming pool, no child had told anyone about these incidents. This had been accepted by the children as normal behaviour!

Selective Pre- and Post-Test Results

Tables 5:10(a) and 5:10(b) present the comparative analysis of the pre- and post-test data for the same question at Figure 5:5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5:10(a)</th>
<th>Table 5:10(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do You Think Children Should Always Obey Grown-Ups?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Do You Think Children Should Always Obey Grown-Ups?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17 (60.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 (35.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15 (53.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>4 (14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 5:10(a) shows that in the pre-test seventeen (60.6%) children in the experimental group and fourteen (51.9%) in the control group thought children should always obey grown-ups. In the post-test, the information in Table 5:10(b) shows a shift in both groups with five (17.9%) children in the experimental group and seven (25.0%) in the control group changing to the 'no' response. This result would indicate that in the experimental group, either pre-test sensitisation or the Programme, had had a positive impact on their awareness of the appropriateness of such behaviour. Some other influence was also present in the control group - pre-test sensitisation, the experience of sexual abuse on site or parental advice following this incident.

The data presented in Tables 5:11(a) and 5:11(b) relates to adults and secrets.
In the post-test, the data in Table 5:11(b) reveals that the experimental group show an increase of only four (14.3%) appropriate responses. In contrast, the control group show a considerable shift in the responses with an additional ten (37.0%) children answering appropriately. It is the writer's belief, that the extraneous events, whereby a member of staff was charged with sexual assault on several children, may have encouraged parents to take some action on the issue of secrecy. Pre-test sensitisation, however cannot be ruled out. The implications of these findings are addressed in Chapter Nine.

Tables 5:12(a) and 5:12(b) illustrate the pre- and post-test responses of the children’s awareness of whether boys were ever sexually assaulted.

In the pre-test, only seven (25%) children in the experimental group
compared with fifteen (55.5%) in the control group knew that boys could be sexually assaulted. Thus, it would appear that prior to the Programme, the children in the control group had greater knowledge in this area as a direct result of the experience in the school. However, in the post-test, a considerable shift in awareness was in evidence in the experimental group with an additional sixteen (57.1%) children answering appropriately. This, in the writer's opinion indicates Programme effectiveness. Although there was also an increase in the control group of five (18.5%) children answering correctly, this may well have been influenced by events which were high profile in the school or pre-test sensitisation.

Tables 5:13(a) and 5:13(b) illustrate the children's pre- and post-opinions of whether an exposer shows his private parts to others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5:13(a)</th>
<th>Does An Exposer Show His Private Parts To Others?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the pre-test, a total of thirty seven (67.3%) children did not know the definition of an exposer. However, in the post-test, fourteen (50.0%) children in the experimental group and eleven (40.7%) in the control group answered appropriately. This would suggest that in the experimental group some level of Programme effectiveness, although given the findings for the control group, pre-test sensitisation cannot be ruled out. Moreover, in the control group, it is speculated that the extraneous circumstances, previously referred to, may well have also

---

27 Additionally, in the month prior to the pre-test being administered, allegations of satanic abuse in Orkney (Clyde 1992) resulted in high media coverage which continued throughout the period of the fieldwork. However, both groups were subjected to this influence in greater or lesser quantities.
influenced these results.

Results of the Hypotheses Testing

This section is presented in two parts:-

a) Pre- and post-test analysis of Hypothesis One.
b) Pre- and post-test analysis of Hypothesis Two.

a) The first hypothesis (H₀₁) postulated that:
'There will be no difference in the gain in mean knowledge scores between the experimental and control group.'

The t tests are presented in Tables 5:14(a) and 5:14(b).

Table 5:14(a) t test Knowledge Scores - Experimental Group (N=28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>6.4286</td>
<td>2.441</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>-2.4643</td>
<td>2.589</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>-5.04</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>8.8929</td>
<td>1.912</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>-5.04</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>-3.97</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5:14(b) t test Knowledge Scores - Control Group (N=27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>6.5926</td>
<td>2.099</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>-1.6296</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>-3.97</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>8.2222</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>-3.97</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>-3.97</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Tables 5:14(a) and 5:14(b) confirm that both the experimental and control groups made gains in knowledge of 2.5 and 1.6 respectively. The gain by the experimental group was 0.9 higher than that for the control group. Whilst this suggests that the gain by the experimental group was more than that of the control group in order to establish whether this difference was
due to chance, the standard error of the differences in gains between the groups was computed. The formula assumes that the four means (6.4, 8.9, 6.6, 8.2) come from independent samples (the assumptions and limitations of the statistics have been explained in the previous chapter):

Square root of \[ SE(1)^2 + SE(2)^2 + SE(3)^2 + SE(4)^2 \]
which is:
Square root of \[ 0.21 + 0.13 + 0.16 + 0.13 \]
which equals 0.79

Hence the actual difference 0.9 is slightly more than the standard error (0.79). However, the \( t \) value is not statistically significant. Therefore, the findings would suggest that the knowledge gains for both groups were broadly the same. Hypothesis One is therefore retained.

This finding, of both groups having made significant knowledge gains, differs from most previous studies evaluating child sexual abuse prevention programmes which had a control group (see the Literature Review). The only evaluation of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme which had a control group found the treatment group to have made significant knowledge gains (Hazzard et al 1991). In contrast, this evaluation has produced the same result as the only other Scottish study carried out in Glasgow by Mayes et al (1991) albeit, these researchers were evaluating a different programme called 'Kidscape' (Elliot 1986). They attributed their findings to pre-test sensitisation and the fact the control schools were already predisposed to personal safety training.

b) Hypothesis Two \((H_{02})\) postulated that:
'There will be no difference in the gain in mean knowledge scores between the experimental and control group between children of different :-
i) ability ratings;  
ii) behavioural scores;  
iii) cognitive styles.

These cross-tabulations were computed using the same standard error formula described in Hypothesis One. To avoid cluttering the text, all of the Tables relating to the testing of the second hypothesis are in Appendix 5.

### Ability Ratings

Tables A5:1(a), A5:1(aa), A5:1(b), A5:1(bb), A5:1(c) and A5:1(cc) detail the *t* tests on knowledge scores by ability level. Tables A5:1(a) and A5:1(aa) illustrate the scores for children who were judged to have below-average ability. They show both the experimental and control groups made knowledge gains of 1.5 and 1.2 respectively. Whilst this suggests that the experimental group did gain more than the control group, in order to establish whether this difference was due to chance, the standard error of the difference in gains (0.3) between the groups was computed. This difference is less than its standard error of the difference in gains (2.18). Moreover, the *t* value is not statistically significant. There is, therefore, no evidence that the children in the experimental group judged to have below-average ability gained more knowledge than their peers in the control group. Moreover, the number of children involved was relatively small, four in the experimental and five in the control group making meaningful comparisons difficult.

Tables A5:1(b) and A5:1(bb) show the scores for children who were judged to have average ability. These data show that both the experimental and control groups made knowledge gains of 2.6 and 2.1 respectively. Whilst this suggests that the experimental group did gain more than the control group in order to establish whether this difference was due to chance, the standard error of the difference in gains (0.5) between the groups was computed. This actual difference is less than its standard error of the difference in gains (1.05). Moreover, the *t* value is
not statistically significant. There is, therefore, no evidence that the children in the experimental group judged to have average ability gained more knowledge than their peers in the control group.

Tables A5:1(c) and A5:1(cc) show the scores for children who were judged to have above-average ability. Both the experimental and control groups made knowledge gains of 2.8 and 0.9 respectively. Whilst this again suggests that the experimental group did gain more than the control group in order to establish whether this difference was due to, chance the standard error of the difference (1.9) in gains between the groups was computed. This difference is more than twice its standard error of the difference in gains (1.28). There is, therefore, some support in the data that the children in the experimental group judged to have above average ability gained more knowledge than the control group. Caution is urged in this finding as there were only five children in this category in the experimental group and six in the control.

The data presented in Tables A5:1(a), A5:1(aa), A5:1(b), A5:1(bb), A5:1(c) and A5:1(cc) show that both children in the experimental and control groups increased their knowledge scores. Thus, the gain scores for the experimental group in comparison to the control group, were 0.03 for children below-average ability, 0.05 for children of average ability, and 1.9 for children above-average ability. These results would suggest some level of Programme impact with children above average ability. In the control group, in the absence of Programme intervention, in the writer's opinion, the reasons for the knowledge gains, are pre-test sensitisation or on site experience of sexual abuse or as a result of this, information and advice from parents, or any of combination of these factors. With the exception of those children assessed as having above average ability, the first part of Hypothesis Two is retained.
ii) **Behavioural Ratings**

Tables A5:2(a), A5:2(aa), A5:2(b) and A5:2(bb) detail the $t$ tests on knowledge scores by behavioural style on the Rutter Measure. Tables A5:2(a) and A5:2(aa) show the knowledge scores for children who were judged to have no behavioural problems. Both the experimental and control groups made knowledge gains of 2.4 and 2.2 respectively. Whilst this suggests that children in the experimental group with no behavioural problems did gain slightly more than the control group, in order to establish whether this difference was due to chance, the standard error of the difference in gains (0.2) between the groups was computed. The difference is less than the standard error of the difference in gains (0.96), and the $t$ value is not statistically significant. The data, therefore, does not support that children in the experimental group judged to have no behavioural problems gained more knowledge than their peers in the control group.

Tables A5:2(b) and A5:2(bb) illustrate the scores for children who were judged to have behavioural problems on the Rutter Measure. Both the experimental and control groups made knowledge gains of 3.0 and 1.9 respectively. Whilst this suggests that the experimental group did gain more than the control group, in order to establish whether this difference was due to chance, the standard error of the difference in gains (1.1) between the groups was computed. This difference is slightly less than the standard error of the difference in gains (1.3) and the $t$ value is not statistically significant. There is, therefore, no finding to support that the children in the experimental group judged to have behavioural problems gained more knowledge than their peers in the control group.

However caution is urged in these finding as there were only two children in this category in the experimental group compared with ten in the control group. Therefore, no inference can be drawn as to whether children with, or without, behavioural problems were more likely to have a higher
knowledge measure. The second part of Hypothesis Two is also retained.

iii) Cognitive Style
Two aspects of cognitive style are examined:

a) cognitive style; and,

b) inductive reasoning

a) Cognitive Style

The first part of the analysis examines the effects of differing cognitive styles on knowledge attainment. Tables A5:3(a), A5:3(aa), A5:3(b) and A5:3(bb) illustrate the data. Tables A5:3(a) and A5:3(aa) show the knowledge scores for children assessed as having a reflective style of decision-making on the amended Kagan Measure used in this study. Both the experimental and control groups made knowledge gains of 2.9 and 1.6 respectively. Whilst this suggests that children in the experimental group assessed as having a reflective style of decision making did gain more than the control group, in order to establish whether this difference was due to chance, the standard error of the difference in gains (1.4) between the groups was computed. This difference is the same as the standard error of the difference in gains (1.4). and the $t$ value is not statistically significant. The data, therefore, does not support that children in the experimental group assessed as having a reflective style of decision-making gained more knowledge than their peers in the control group.

Tables A5:3(b) and A5:3(bb) show the knowledge scores for children assessed as having an impulsive style of decision-making. They show that both the experimental and control groups made knowledge gains of 1.5 and 1.7 respectively. The standard error of the difference (-0.2) in gains between the groups was computed. The difference less than its standard error of the difference in gains (0.6) and the $t$ value is not statistically significant. The data, therefore, does not support that children in the experimental group assessed as having a impulsive style
of decision-making gained more knowledge than their peers in the control group.

In common with the ability and behavioural analyses, these findings show that cognitive style was not a determinant factor in children's post-test knowledge scores. The difference in knowledge gains did not depend on cognitive style.

b) Inductive Reasoning

This part of the analyses examines the second part of the cognitive style test - that of inductive reasoning - before making a decision on whether to reject or accept the third part of Hypothesis Two.

Tables A5:4(a), A5:4(aa), A5:4(b) and A5:4(bb) present the $t$ tests on the children's score of inductive reasoning by knowledge scores. Tables A5:4(a) and A5:4(aa) illustrate the knowledge scores for children assessed as having high inductive reasoning. Both the experimental and control groups made knowledge gains of 2.7 and 1.6 respectively. Whilst this suggests that children in the experimental group assessed as having high inductive reasoning did gain more than the control group, in order to establish whether this difference was due to chance, the standard error of the difference (0.9) in gains between the groups was computed. This difference is the same as its standard error of the difference in gains (0.9). Moreover, the $t$ value is not statistically significant.

Tables A5:4(b) and A5:4(bb) show the knowledge scores for children assessed as having low inductive reasoning. They show that both the experimental and control groups made knowledge gains of 2.4 and 1.6 respectively. Whilst this suggests that children in the experimental group assessed as having low inductive reasoning did gain more than the control group, in order to establish whether this difference was due to chance, the standard error of the difference in gains (0.8) between the groups
was computed. This difference is slightly less than its standard error of the difference in gains (0.91). However, the t value is not statistically significant. The difference in knowledge gains between the experimental and control groups did not depend on whether children were impulsive or reflective decision makers.

These findings confirm that inductive reasoning per se was not a determinant factor in the knowledge scores of the children. Therefore, with the exception of the findings in respect of the high ability children in the experimental group, the second null Hypothesis in its entirety is retained.

**Summary of Findings**

The following hypotheses :-

- **H₀₁** 'There will be no difference in the gain in mean knowledge scores between the experimental and the control group'.
- **H₀₂** 'There will be no difference in the gain in mean knowledge scores between the experimental and control group between children of different :-
  1. ability ratings;
  2. behavioural scores;
  3. cognitive styles.'

have been tested. With the exception of the high ability group, no differences were established in the gain in the mean knowledge scores between the experimental and the control group. Both Null Hypotheses have therefore been retained. However, it could be argued that given the findings in the high ability group that these are the children who gained most from this Programmes. There is also support for this in other studies (e.g. Fryer et al 1987a & b). This calls into question the efficacy of child sexual abuse prevention programmes for some of the most vulnerable children. This is further discussed in Chapter Nine.

What is evident is that due to extraneous events the findings in this study have undoubtedly been confounded. This said, in the
experimental group, the descriptive statistics presented in this chapter would suggest that there was some evidence of Programme impact in some of the post-test results. However, pre-test sensitisation cannot be ruled out. In contrast, in the control group, the experience of sexual abuse itself, pre-test sensitisation or additional information from sources such as parents, or any combination of these factors, would appear to have influenced increased knowledge scores. The confounding variables in the study make it impossible to extrapolate which of these factors, if any, were of greater influence in the post-test results. This is further addressed in Chapter Nine.

Despite these findings, it is clear from the development of the study that the knowledge test provided a base-line for the stranger abduction. The reader is reminded, before the results of the stranger abduction are reported that, irrespective of Programme intervention, both groups had approximately the same pre- and post-test knowledge scores. Furthermore, the spread of ability ratings was more or less the same between the two groups. Two key differences, nevertheless, emerge between the experimental and control groups.

Firstly, only two (7.2%) children in the experimental group were identified as having significant behavioural problems in comparison with ten (37%) children in the control group on the Rutter Measure. Moreover, on the raw score for relationship problems on this same Measure, six (21.4%) children in the experimental group were identified as having problems in comparison with sixteen (59.2%) in the control group. Thus, in terms of behavioural characteristics, the control group were identified as a much more disturbed and possibly more vulnerable group of children to abduction, particularly when these factors are considered alongside the research findings on offenders and the characteristics they look for in children (Budin & Johnson 1989; Conte et al 1989). Therefore, the behavioural profile of the control group may well have implications for group performance in the simulation of the stranger abduction. Secondly, on the Kagan Cognitive Style Test, in the category, 'Random Scrutiny', eight (28.6%) children in the experimental group were assessed as having this style of decision-making compared with thirteen (48.1%) children in the
control group. Therefore, this cognitive style of decision-making may also have implications for group performance in the simulation of the stranger abduction.

Having highlighted the similarities and the differences between the control and experimental group which may have a bearing in the behavioural measure being utilized in this study, the next chapter examines the data relating to the stranger vignettes and the simulation of the stranger abduction.
CHAPTER SIX

RESULTS OF PARENTAL ADVICE ON STRANGER ABDUCTION, THE VIGNETTES AND SIMULATION EXERCISE

"This (sexual abuse) is clearly not a field of endeavor for the faint-hearted. It is also not a field for those who need to understand a phenomenon fully before dealing with it or who require specific directions that they can use to deal with any type of situation. It is, however, a field where much needs to be learned and done. Those who are willing to forge ahead despite the roadblocks to success will find their contributions useful and helpful to many" (Haugaard & Repucci 1988 p. 376).

Introduction

The above quotation illustrates some of the conflicts faced by researchers in the child sexual abuse field. Although some problems were experienced during the setting up of the study, it is the writer's opinion that the field-work, the methods used and the areas investigated make a positive contribution to the field of child abduction and sexual abuse prevention.

Most of the data analysed in this chapter is detailed in tabular form accompanied by descriptive narrative. Where possible, each table has been labelled with the actual question asked of the respondents in the respective research instruments. Where this has not been possible, an explanation is given. Throughout the chapter, direct quotes from the children, parents and teachers are included to give greater insight and understanding of the findings.

This chapter covers the following topics :-

▲ The research hypotheses and research questions.
▲ Parental advice on stranger abduction.
▲ Parental advice - Qualitative data.
▲ Parental advice on the consequences of stranger abduction.
The children's responses to the consequences of stranger abduction.
The children's understanding of sexual assault.
Summary of the children's understanding of sexual assault.
Predicted behavioural responses of children in the vignettes.
Consequences of stranger abduction.
Attribution of fault for sexual assault.
The analyses of the stranger abduction simulation.
The results of the stranger abduction simulation.
The children's perception of their responses in the simulation exercise.
The results of the research questions.
Summary of findings on vulnerability to abduction.
The issue of desensitisation.
The children's views of the simulation exercise.
The parents' views of the simulation exercise.
The teachers' views of the simulation exercise.
Summary of the key findings.

The Research Hypotheses and Research Questions

The following hypotheses were tested :-

H03 'There will be no difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to predict sexual assault as a likely consequence of stranger abduction.'

H04 'There will be no difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to attribute fault appropriately for sexual assault.'

H05 'There will be no difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group.'

H06 'There will be no difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group between children of different :-
i) ability ratings;
ii) behavioural scores;
iii) cognitive styles.'

The following research questions were examined:

1. What characteristics make children vulnerable to abduction?
2. Does the simulation method desensitise children to approaches by strangers?

Parental Advice on Stranger Abduction

The analyses begins with a comparison of the data from the pre-questionnaire28 responses by parents on whether the subject of strangers had been discussed with their children and the corresponding question from the pre-test for the children. This information is presented to give further insight, other than the knowledge test, of the children's knowledge with regard to stranger abduction. The data in Tables 6:1(a) and 6:1(b) illustrate the responses from both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6:1(a)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have You Spoken To Your Child About Strangers?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parental Pre-Questionnaire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6:1(b)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has Your Mum or Dad Ever Spoken To You About Strangers?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pre-Test</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Experimental</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 6:1(a) demonstrate that, with one exception in the control group, every parent had discussed the subject of strangers with their child. In contrast, the responses in Table 6:1(b) illustrates that every child said their parents had spoken to them about strangers.

28 The analyses excludes the six parents who failed to return their questionnaires, two in the experimental group and four in the control group.
Tables 6:2(a) and 6:2(b) show the frequency with which parents spoke to their children about strangers in the month prior to the commencement of the study.

Table 6:2(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 26</td>
<td>N = 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4 (15.4%)</td>
<td>3 (13.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Times</td>
<td>12 (46.1%)</td>
<td>9 (39.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 Times</td>
<td>4 (15.4%)</td>
<td>6 (26.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>4 (15.4%)</td>
<td>5 (21.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2 (7.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6:2(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>8 (28.6%)</td>
<td>11 (40.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Times</td>
<td>7 (25.0%)</td>
<td>11 (40.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 Times</td>
<td>9 (32.1%)</td>
<td>4 (14.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>4 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the data in Tables 6:2(a) and 6:2(b) shows, even if allowances are made for the non-returned parental questionnaires, some discrepancies between the responses of parents and children. In the experimental group, four (15.4%) parents said they had not spoken to their child in the last month about strangers, whilst twice as many children said this was so. In the control group, three (13%) parents said they had not spoken to their child in the last month about strangers, in comparison with eleven (40.7%) children. In the experimental group, in the category - 'Two Times', twelve (46.1%) parents said they had discussed the matter with their children with comparison to only seven (25%) children. In the next category - '3-5 Times' - more than twice as many children, nine (32.1%), gave this as a response in comparison with only four (15.4%) of their parents. Category four - '6+ Times' - is the only variable where both parents and children are in accord in the experimental group.

In the control group in categories two, three, and four, if allowances are made for the four non-returned questionnaires, it is difficult to evaluate whether the perceived differences in responses between the
parents and the children in either group actually exist. This said, in the month prior to the study commencing, if the responses of the parents are correct, slightly more parents in the control group had spoken to their children more often about strangers than parents in the experimental group. However, if the children’s responses are correct, then the opposite is the case. Furthermore, the data from the knowledge pre-test would appear to suggest that, in light of the incident in the control school, these parents had probably spoken more often to their children about the dangers of sexual assault as their children had a slightly higher knowledge pre-test score. Given the area under inquiry and the sensitivity of the subject matter, socially desirable responses have also probably influenced these findings (Furnham 1986; Fox & Peters 1993).

Parental Advice on the Consequences of Stranger Abduction

Tables 6:3(a) and 6:3(b) present the data on whether parents had told their children about the consequences of stranger abduction.

Table 6:3(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 26</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24 (92.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 (7.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6:3(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27 (96.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most parents, twenty four (92.3%) in the experimental and twenty two (95.7%) in the control group, said they had told their children of the consequences of stranger abduction. Two (7.7%) parents in the experimental group said they had not told their children about this. In contrast, the data in Table 6:3(b) show that twenty-seven (96.4%) of the children in the experimental and twenty-five (92.6%) in the control group said their parents had told them about the consequences of stranger abduction. The discrepancy is probably accounted for in the...
non-returned parental questionnaires.

Figures 6:1 and 6:2 show the parental responses to the question: 'What did you tell your child would happen if they went with a stranger?' Figures 6:3 and 6:4 show the children's responses to the question: What do you think would happen if you went with a stranger? Specifically, sexual assault as a consequence of stranger abduction is reported.29

29 This is a key objective of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme.
Prior to the Programme being taught, only seven (14.2%) parents and six (10.9%) children responded that sexual assault was a distinct consequence of stranger abduction. In the experimental group, the data in Figures 6:1 and 6:3 illustrate that only five (19.2%) of the parents and four (14.3%) of the children mentioned this. This small discrepancy between the groups could again be accounted for by the missing parental questionnaires. In the control group, the data in Figures 6:2 and 6:4 demonstrate that only two parents (8.7%) and two (7.4%) children responded that the consequences of stranger abduction might result in sexual assault. Clearly, these findings highlight that parents in both groups found difficulty talking about this issue with their children.

These findings are in direct contrast to some of the latest findings in the American studies, particularly those conducted after the high media profile following the McMartin case. Gilbert & Berrick (1989) and Nibert et al (1986) found that the media was felt to be a major influence on the ability of parents to talk to their preschool children about sexual assault. Despite the fact this study was conducted after the Cleveland Inquiry, during the Orkney Inquiry (with daily media coverage), and, in a control group where some children had been sexually abused by a staff member, it would appear that these events did not make it any easier for the majority of parents to discuss sexual assault as a likely consequence of stranger abduction with their prepubescent children. Moreover, the results are comparable with the study by Hazzard et al (1991) whose sample of children were very similar in age and exposed to the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme and where the American researchers found that parents were the main providers of this type of information. It may be that cultural factors, e.g. Calvinistic attitudes account for this difference or indeed it is more difficult to talk to older children and it may be more embarrassing as they may ask more searching questions.

As demonstrated in the Literature Review (Crewdson 1988), children are more likely to be abused by someone known to them. It is, therefore, reasonable to project from these findings that parents will have even greater difficulties discussing the possibility of abuse by
someone their child knows and trusts or intra-familial abuse. This has been borne out in the writer’s experience at the previewing of the ‘Feeling Yes, Feeling No’ Programme by approximately twenty thousand parents in primary schools in Lothian Region. Frequently, parents have reported their great difficulty in finding the language to discuss sexual assault with their children. They have also stated how relieved they are that the school is taking a lead role in this area.

In Appendix 7, the data in Tables A7:1(a) and A7:1(b) show that the most frequent responses by parents with regard to the consequences of stranger abduction were that the most likely outcome for a child would be: murder and/or physically assaulted; and/or might not see their family again. These constitute the key themes from the analysis of the parental pre-questionnaires. It can, therefore, be concluded, that parents have less difficulty in talking to their child with regard to these outcomes, than that of sexual assault. It may well be that these were the messages that parents themselves were given as children and therefore have a greater degree of familiarity with these outcomes than those associated with sexual assault. The findings would suggest that parents may well need training in this area. The role of parents in child sexual abuse prevention programmes has already been discussed in the Literature Review and the implications of these findings are further addressed in the Chapter Nine

Parental Advice - Qualitative Data

In Appendix 7, in Table A7:1(a), the following selection of quotes from parents support the three key themes of murder and/or physical assault, and/or may not see their family again. They also provide a rare opportunity on parental advice to children in this sensitive area:

"I told Darren if he went away with any strangers he might be killed and he would never see us again. I have tried to explain all the things a stranger might say to entice children away" (E group).

"That they could be very badly hurt or killed if any stranger asked them to go with them or tried to take them away, they were to run as fast as they could or shout and scream as loud as they could and if anyone did ask or try to take them or say rude words to them to
tell me or their dad or teacher straight away” (C group).

"The stranger might hurt him he might not see me again” (C group).

A further analysis of the qualitative data relating to these themes reveals that seven parents (14.2%) in the total sample (four in the experimental group and three in the control group) included in their responses partial information which could be interpreted as highly euphemistic. The following are three examples:

"That they would take them away and may do bad things to her and she may never see her family again” (C group).

"We said it could be very dangerous to go with a strange man or woman. That they would do things to him that he does not like. We said it could even lead to death” (C group).

"I have said to James that going with a stranger may mean I don’t know where he is and that this stranger could do something James doesn’t like or could be painful” (E group).

The following is a cross-section of the responses from parents who mentioned sexual assault or rape as a consequence of abduction:

"That strangers may be harmless, but that some adults, male and female, do want to harm kids, by physical, sexual or emotional violence and they should not go into houses or vehicles with people they don’t know, or accept sweets/money etc (I usually only mention this when subject is in the news)” (C group).

"The stranger would harm her physically or sexually assault her not to allow her to come home to us at worst may kill her. Gave examples of other young victims. Explained in a way that she would understand warned her not to trust strangers, no matter how kind they may appear” (E group).

"That they would take them away and interfere with them and if any stranger spoke to them, she was to tell us” (C group).

"When a man rapes you he puts his private part into her private part and touches her with his hands. She may also be killed. Donna asked what RAPE meant so I told her and women may also touch her where they shouldn’t” (E group).
The last two quotes illustrate the use of words such as 'interfear' (interfere) and 'rape'. In the writer's social work and limited teaching experience, such words may not be readily understood by children of primary age. Additionally, the quote using the word 'interfear' is euphemistic. It assumes that a child of ten understands the meaning of this word in a sexual context - an assumption which, in the writer's experience, may well be unfounded. The word 'rape' is a word often frequently used by children of this age but not readily understood. Consequently, these parents and those who use euphemistic language may be lulled into a false sense of security of thinking they have prepared their children for encounters with a stranger, when in fact, the messages have not been understood by them. This is examined in the next section.

The Children's Responses to the Consequences of Stranger Abduction

In common with parental responses in Appendix 7, the data in Tables A7:1(a) and A7:1(b) also demonstrate that the most frequent responses by the children regarding the consequences of stranger abduction were murder and/or physical assault, and/or may not see their family again. The following is a cross-section of the responses in the pre-test from these three categories:

"You might get kilt or get poisoned" (Male E group).

"I think they would kill you and keep you forever" (Male C group).

"He could have a gun and shoot you or he could take you to a strange place and dump you there you would be alone in the dark to find your way home" (Female E group).

"I think you would be stragled and he would give you poisen sweets and thretim your mum" (Male C group).

"You might get killed or they might through you in the river and burry you" (Female E group).
"I think they would contaked my mum told them they would kill me unless my mum gave them money" (Male C group).

"I think I could have got kidnapped or killed if they looked a bit evil or not. I would likely try to run away" (Male E group).

"I would be kidnapped and starved and then locked in a garage with a running car" (Male C group).

"The stranger would burn me with fag ashes" (Male C group).

"Get sigret biens marks get tid up get irion burns and rop marks” (Female C group).

The following five responses were given by children who either answered that they would be raped or sexually assaulted:

"I might get killed or get raped" (Female E group).

"If I went with a stranger I think I might get raped or killed or stabed and never see my mum or dad again“ (Female C group).

"We can get rapt” (Male E group).

"I think I might be yoused as a hosteg or I might get killed or raped” (Female C group).

"He might hit me or kill me or he could sexually abuse me” (Male E group).

A selection of interesting responses from the seven (12.7%) children whose responses are recorded under 'Other' in Table A7:1(b) follows:

"I would get into very deep trouble” (Male C group).

"Anything” (Female E group).

"I would get hidden and get put on TV to see if eneybody had seen me” (Male C group).

Somewhat worrying were the following responses:

"I think that he would frighting you a bit and about a month let me go” (Male E group), and,

"I think him or her would treat me ok” (Male E group).
Figures 6:5, 6:6, 6:7, and 6:8 present the pre- and post-test responses to one of the key Programme strategies - that sexual assault is a likely consequence of stranger abduction. The children were asked: "What do you think would happen if you went with a stranger?"

In the experimental group, in the pre-test, only four (14.3%) children
defined the consequences of abduction involving possible sexual assault (three used the word 'rape'). In the post-test, there was a significant shift with twenty seven (96.4%) of the twenty eight children in the experimental group mentioning this in their responses. This, on the writer's opinion, would suggest Programme impact. Twenty six (92.8%) of the children used the phrase "sexually assaulted" in their responses. A male child who is recorded as a child with learning difficulties wrote:

"I would get ses as sey a fuck."

The writer has interpreted this as sexual assault. The child, a female, who did not mention sexual assault in the post-test wrote:

"They might try to kill you or take you far away."

In contrast, in the pre-test, in the control group, two children (7.4%) mentioned sexual assault (rape) as a possible consequence of abduction. Of the nine (33%) who gave this response in the post-test, five (18.5%) also used the word 'rape'. Possible explanations of this shift may well lie not only in pre-test sensitisation but also in the invasive factor of the on-site problems at the school.

These findings suggest Programme effectiveness resulted in a considerable change in knowledge in the post-test responses of the experimental group enabling them to predict sexual assault as a likely consequence of stranger abduction. This will be further examined and tested in the stranger vignettes. It also is worth noting that many of the dramatic and graphic details of what strangers might do, so aptly demonstrated in the quotes in the pre-test by the experimental group, were totally absent in the post-test. The following examples illustrate this:

"You would get sexualey assaulted or murderd" (Male).

"The stranger would hurt you or murder you or sexual assault you" (Female).

"You might get sexially assalted" (Male).
Conversely, still in evidence from the control group in the post-test, were many dramatic and graphic details of what strangers would do to them:

"I would be tied to a chair and hit with leather gloves" (Male).

"I think I would get burned with fag ashes and being forced to do dirty things" (Male).

and, somewhat worrying:

"I would let him take me and I would lead him to the police" (Male).

and:

"May mum and dad would go to the poles stashen" (Male).

The following examples are from the children in the control group who mentioned either rape or sexual assault in the post-test:

"I think they would get hurt or raped" (Male).

"If I go with a stranger I think they would kill you or rape you and you will never see my mum dad or little sister again" (Female).

"I think they would sexually assalt me or bater me" (Female).

"I think they would touch my private parts" (Female).

The Children's Understanding of Sexual Assault

Tables 6:4(a) and 6:4(b) show the children's responses in the pre- and post-test in the completion of the following sentence: "I think sexual assault is ............. "

The responses from both groups were coded into the categories in the following tables, thus ensuring that any aspect of sexual assault mentioned by a child was taken into account. Some degree of licence has been taken by the writer both in the interpretation of the language and colloquialisms in deciding an appropriate category for responses.
Table 6.4(a)

Definition of Sexual Assault
Pre-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Experimental N=28</th>
<th>Control N=27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Y.B.W.P*</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>19 (67.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Y.P.B.P*</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>19 (67.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S.E.P.B.P*</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>20 (71.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>21 (75.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. Int.*</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>20 (71.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>21 (75.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undress You</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>19 (67.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy. Ass.*</td>
<td>3 (10.7)</td>
<td>18 (64.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12 (42.9)</td>
<td>9 (32.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T.Y.B.W.P = Touch Your Body Without Permission
* T.Y.P.B.P = Touch Your Private/Body Parts
* T.S.E.P.B.P = Touch Someone Else's Private/Body Parts
* Sex. Int. = Sexual Intercourse
* Phy. Ass. = Physical Assault
N/R = No Response

Table 6.4(b)

Definition of Sexual Assault
Post-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Experimental N=28</th>
<th>Control N=27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Y.B.W.P*</td>
<td>17 (60.7)</td>
<td>11 (39.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Y.P.B.P*</td>
<td>21 (75.0)</td>
<td>7 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S.E.P.B.P*</td>
<td>15 (53.6)</td>
<td>13 (46.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>28 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. Int.*</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>28 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>10 (36.7)</td>
<td>18 (64.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undress You</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>28 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy. Ass.*</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>28 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>28 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T.Y.B.W.P = Touch Your Body Without Permission
* T.Y.P.B.P = Touch Your Private/Body Parts
* T.S.E.P.B.P = Touch Someone Else's Private/Body Parts
* Sex. Int. = Sexual Intercourse
* Phy. Ass. = Physical Assault
N/R = No Response

It is worth noting that in the pre-test in Table 6.4(a) a total of seventeen (31%) children, seven children (25%) in the experimental group and ten (37%) in the control group, were unable to proffer any definition whatsoever of sexual assault. In order to provide additional insight
into the children's responses, the following are some examples in the pre-test of each of the categories detailed in Table 6.4(a):

i) **Touch your Body Without Permission**
Only four children mentioned this in the pre-test, two (7.1%) in the experimental and two (7.4%) in the control group:

"When somebody touches you when you don't want them and if you don't let them they will hurt you more" (Female E group).

"I think its when you get taken and get touchet alought when you don't went it done" (Female C group).

ii) **Touch You Private/Body Parts**
Only three children mentioned this two (7.1%) in the experimental and one (3.7%) in the control group:

"Someone touching your private parts" (Female E group).

"When someone fell's you" (Male C group).

iii) **Touch Someone Else's Body Parts**
No child mentioned this clearly seeing themselves as being the passive person in any sexual abuse.

iv) **Rape**
It is interesting to note that no child in the experimental group mentioned 'rape' in the pre-test, although it was the most common response in the control group - mentioned by one third (32.3%) of the children:

"When somoen has rape and is not soposto" (Male).

"When people rape you and try and have sex" (Male).

v) **Sexual Intercourse**
Four children mentioned this in their responses, one (3.6%) in the experimental group and three (11.1%) in the control:
"When someone assaults you and tries to force you to have sex" (Male E group).

"It is when a man takes you away and tries to have sex with you" (Female C group).

vi) **Exposure**

Only one (3.7%) child in the control group gave this response:

"Being raped being seen some ones privet parts" (Female).

vii) **Undress You**

Four children, two in the experimental group (7.1%) and two (7.4%) in the control group included this perspective of sexual assault in their responses:

"When a man or a lady ondersses you and does rude things I can not mention" (Male E group).

"I think sexual assault is people take your clothes off and do things to you" (Male C group).

viii) **Physical Assault**

Five children gave this response, three (10.7%) in the experimental group and two (7.4%) in the control group:

"Getting freatened by someone. It is like if someone is kicking they would say 'If you tell on me I will kick you again'" (Male E group).

"I think it is an adult hitting other people's children" (Male C group).

ix) **Other**

In contrast with the control group, where one third of the children answered that sexual assault meant rape, the most common response by the experimental group was in the 'Other' category. In the experimental group, twelve (42.9%) children gave a variety of responses which the writer categorised as 'Other'. The following examples provide further insight into the children's thinking in this sensitive area:
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"Very bad and horrible" (Male).

"A very scary fing to do to some wone" (Male).

"Terdiy" 30 (Male - child with learning difficulties).

"It is a very very very bad thing to do" (Male).

"Very dangerous and you might get hurt" (Female).

"When someone takes you away and kisses you and thing" (Female).

"When a man takes you away and takes you into bed" (Female).

and, somewhat worrying :

"Not very bad" (Male).

Finally, two very individual definitions:

"If someone takes your son it is sexual assault because that is stealing" (Female).

"When someone talks about all the things that change to you when you are growing up to be a nice senceble woman" (Female).

In comparing the data in Tables 6:4(a) and 6:4(b), several differences emerge between the two groups. In the experimental group in category one - 'Touch Your Body Parts Without Permission' - the post-test responses showed an increase of fifteen (53.6%). In contrast, the pre- and post-test findings for the control group remained the same, thus appearing to confirm Programme impact particularly on the message of body ownership. In category two - 'Touch Your Private/Body Parts' - a considerable shift of nineteen (67.9%) responses was recorded in the post-test results in the experimental group, Programme impact being the most likely explanation. However, an increase is also noted in the control group in the post-test, showing an overall increase of eleven (40.8%) responses. Both the heightened awareness through the events

30 Following consultation with an advisor in children with learning difficulties, the writer has interpreted this to mean 'dirty'.
previously referred to in the control school, and/or information from parents, and/or pre-test sensitisation may well account for this change.

In the experimental group, in category three - 'Made To Touch Someone Else's Private/Body Parts' - no child mentioned this in the pre-test. In the post-test, however, over half (53.6%) of the children saw this as being sufficiently important to warrant inclusion in their definition of sexual assault. Thus, there was a noticeable shift in knowledge from these children in the realisation that they may not necessarily be the passive person in sexual assault. No child in the control group mentioned this aspect of sexual assault in the post-test. Programme impact would again appear to account for these findings.

In category four - 'Rape' - whilst no child in the experimental group used this terminology in either the pre- or post-test, approximately one third (33.4%) of the children in the control group mentioned this in the pre-test and over half (55.6%) in the post-test. Regarding the experimental group, it is the 'Touch Concept' which underpins the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme and therefore rape may not have carried the same weight for them. The only other explanation the writer can suggest for this difference between the groups is the particular events in the control school, and/or information from parents, and/or that some of these children may also have been subjected to other influences in greater quantities where this terminology is used, e.g. television, certain newspapers, magazines or possibly pornography.

In category five, 'Sexual Intercourse', while no child in the experimental group mentioned this in the post-test, four (14.8%) children in the control group did so. In the last category - 'Exposure', only one child in the control group mentioned this in the pre-test. In the experimental group in the post-test, an additional ten children (35.7%) in mentioned this in their definition of sexual assault. Yet again, Programme impact would appear to have influenced these findings.

In the remaining two categories - 'Physical Assault' and 'Other' - there
is a distinct shift in the experimental group in that no child's response fell into either of these two categories in comparison with the pre-test which recorded three (10.7%) responses in the 'Physical Assault' category and twelve (42.9%) in the 'Other' category. This would again appear to suggest Programme influence.

The following selection of post-test responses detailed in Table 6.4(b) give further insight into the children's thinking as to what constitutes sexual assault:

i) **Touch your Body Parts Without Permission**

"Touching somebody's body parts that the person doesn't want to be touched or someone asking somebody to touch their body parts or exposing these to someone else or telling someone to explore theirs. This is sexual assault" (Male E group).

"When a man try to have sex with you and you do'nt want to and touches your private parts" (Female C group).

ii) **Touch Your Private or Body Parts**

"When someone touches your parts of the body like the penis or the vagina" (Male E group).

"I think it is when someone toches your privet parts" (Male C group).

iii) **Touch Someone Else's Body Parts**

These responses relate to the experimental group:

"When someone touches your private parts or makes you touch theirs" (Male).

"When a man or a woman trys to touch your private parts where you do not want them to or if they make you touch there private parts" (Male).

"When you are tuched or are made to tuch or made to look at a boy's peanis or bum or a girls vigina breasts or bum" (Female).
iv) Rape
These responses relate to the control group:

"Rapping some-one" (Female).

"When people take you away and rape you" (Female).

v) Sexual Intercourse
These responses relate to the control group:

"Taking of all my cloths and touches your fanny and other places then shagging you when you don't want" (Female).

"When a man trys to have sex with you and you do not want to and touches your private parts" (Female).

vi) Exposure
These responses relate to the experimental group:

"When someone shows there vagina or penice or bum or breast at you" (Male).

"Where someone (man or woman) shows you a part of the body or touches you in a way you do not like" (Female).

Summary of the Children's Understanding of Sexual Assault

In contrast to the pre-test, where seven (25%) children in the experimental group and ten (37%) in the control were unable to give a definition of sexual assault, every child in the experimental group was able to offer a definition of sexual assault compatible with Programme objectives. Programme impact would appear to be the most likely explanation particularly, as there was no change in the control group's responses. Moreover, if the first six categories in Table 6:4(b) are accepted within the definition of sexual assault, then significantly more responses from the experimental group - sixty-four against twenty-eight were given in the post-test responses.

These findings would appear to support effective Programme intervention in that children in the experimental group were able to
give a much wider definition of sexual assault than the children in the control group. It is also evident from these data that following the teaching of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, that these children had a much broader, more exact, and relevant use of language in their definition of sexual assault. These results were achieved despite the fact that some children in the control school had actually been sexually assaulted on site by a member of staff. Moreover, these data show that most parents were unable to explain to their children that the consequences of stranger abduction may result in sexual assault. For those parents who did so, they had difficulty also explaining the meaning of sexual assault in terms that their children could understand. Where parents failed in this task, the Class Teacher of the experimental group achieved an impressive result.

Having examined the parental advice on stranger abduction and the children's understanding of this, the children's responses in the paper and pencil exercise in this study - the stranger vignettes - are now considered.

**Predicted Behavioural Responses of Children in Vignettes**

The reader is reminded that the idiom and set of the vignettes involving a male and female child (see Appendix 4) was familiar to the children through other aspects of school work. Each vignette was set in a different context and therefore outcomes were not comparable.

**The Vignette - Stephen:**

'It was a Friday night and Stephen's mum had let him go to the shows (fairground). A man that Stephen did not know came up to him. This man said that he would give Stephen £20.00 to spend if he went with him to the local amusement arcade to play the machines.'

Tables 6:5(a) and 6:5(b) present the pre- and post-test responses to the first question asked in the vignettes: Should Stephen go with the man?
In the experimental group, in the pre-test, two children, including the child with learning difficulties, said Stephen should go with the stranger. One child did not respond as he had turned two pages of the questionnaire. In contrast, every child in the control group identified the appropriate behaviour by Stephen. In the post-test, again with the exception of the child with learning difficulties, every child in the sample identified the appropriate behaviour by Stephen when approached by the stranger. These findings will be compared with the children’s responses in the simulation of the stranger abduction. 31

The Vignette Jane:

'It was pouring rain and Jane was walking home from school. A man Jane had not seen before stopped his car and said Jane’s mother had sent him to give her a lift. He asked her to get in the car.'

Tables 6:6(a) and 6:6(b) present the pre- and post-test responses in respect of Jane for the same question at 6:5(a) and 6:5(b) for Stephen.

---

31 The reader is alerted that the child with learning difficulties took part in the simulation.
In the experimental group in the pre-test, of the three children who said Jane should go with the stranger, with the exception of the child with learning difficulties, appropriate responses were given by the other children in the post-test. Yet again, in the control group, no child in either the pre- or post-test, thought Jane should go with the stranger.

These findings would tend to support the view that at the time of the post-test every child, except the child with learning difficulties, was able to identify the appropriate behaviour of the children in the vignettes at a cognitive/hypothetical level when approached by a stranger. Additionally, irrespective of the gender of the child and the different contextual frameworks in the vignettes, their responses were consistent - neither child should go with the stranger. The central point of interest here, is to what extent will this be borne out in the simulation exercise? Does knowledge and awareness, so manifestly demonstrated by the children's responses in the paper and pencil exercise in this study translate into appropriate behaviour under controlled conditions when a stranger abduction simulation is set up? Given the evidence so far, if knowledge is a predictor of appropriate behaviour, it would be reasonable to predict in the stranger abduction simulation that every child in the subset, except the child with learning difficulties, would respond appropriately.

Consequences of Stranger Abduction

The third Hypothesis (H03) postulated that:
'There will be no difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to predict sexual assault as a likely consequence of stranger abduction.'

The hypothesis related to questions 25 and 30 in the questionnaire:
If the man sexually assaulted Stephen, (or Jane for Q 30) whose fault would it be?

Tables 6:7(a) and 6:7(b) present the McNemar analysis for Stephen.
These data demonstrate that the intervention did have a significant impact on the experimental group's ability to predict that sexual assault was a likely outcome of abduction for Stephen - $p \leq 0.05$ with a finding of 0.0063. However, the result for the control group is not significant, the extraneous events on site and subsequent action by parents being the most likely explanation. These findings also relate to one of the key Programme strategies - that a stranger who abducts you is likely to sexually assault you. Thus, it can be concluded, where parents were unable to tackle the consequences of stranger abduction including possible sexual assault with their children, this Programme objective was achieved by the Class Teacher of the experimental group.

Tables 6:8(a) and 6:8(b) present the McNemar analysis for Jane.

In contrast with the male vignette, the findings for the female vignette were not significant, $p > 0.05$ with a finding of 0.0768 for the experimental group and 0.6875 for the control group. The descriptive statistics in Appendix 6 show that, prior to teaching the Programme,
most children knew that the female child in the vignettes was more likely to be sexually assaulted than the male child. However, the writer would acknowledge that the context of this vignette probably had a bearing on this result. In particular, from experience, parents are not only more likely to warn girls about the dangers of strangers and the context is also more likely to involve a car than the 'Shows' (fairground).

These findings indicate that, in the post-test, the experimental group, unlike the control group, were significantly more able to predict sexual assault as a likely outcome of stranger abduction in respect of the male child presented in the vignettes. Despite both vignettes having a different context, it would appear that the Programme effectiveness is the most likely explanation of this finding. There was no significant change recorded for Jane by either group. The pre-test base-line showed a much higher awareness that the female child in the context of an abduction involving a car was likely to be sexually assaulted. The implications of these findings is discussed further in Chapter Nine.

Thus, Hypothesis Three is rejected in respect of Stephen with regard to the consequence of stranger abduction resulting in sexual assault, but retained in respect of Jane. Whilst acknowledging the different contextual frameworks of the vignettes, these findings raise questions about child rearing practices and gender issues in male socialisation process in terms of vulnerability to abduction.

Attribution of Fault for Sexual Assault

The fourth Hypothesis (H04) postulated that:

'There will be no difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to attribute fault appropriately for sexual assault.'

This Hypothesis relates to the questions 27 and 33 in the questionnaire: If the man sexually assaulted Stephen, (or Jane for Q 33) whose fault would it be?
Tables 6:9(a), 6:9(b), 6:10(a), and 6:10(b) present the McNemar analysis.

### Table 6:9(a)

**Attribution of Fault - Stephen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 28

(Binomial) 0.0002

2-tailed P

### Table 6:9(b)

**Attribution of Fault - Stephen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 27

(Binomial) 1.0000

2-tailed P

### Table 6:10(a)

**Attribution of Fault - Jane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 28

(Binomial) 0.0002

2-tailed P

### Table 6:10(b)

**Attribution of Fault - Jane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 27

(Binomial) 0.7266

2-tailed P

These data show that the intervention did have a significant impact on the experimental group's ability to predict within two different contextual vignettes that sexual assault was a likely outcome of abduction for Stephen - p ≤ 0.05 with a finding of 0.0002 and, for Jane, p ≤ 0.05 of 0.0020. The result for the control group was not significant.

These findings again relate to one of the key Programme strategies, that is, 'it is not a child's fault if he/she is sexually abused' (see Chapter Three). This, in the writer's opinion, is an important result as research findings, e.g. Finkelhor (1986), confirmed in the writer's experience, show that children tend to self-recriminate when they have been sexually abused. This is also the case, for example, in divorce (Mitchell 1984; Wallerstein & Kelly 1980).

The implications of both the child feeling guilty and that he/she is to blame for the sexual assault mean that many of the professional services are unable to make progress with victims until these issues are
dealt with. While the findings in this study relate to stranger abuse, (the writer acknowledges the greater complexities involved in the attribution of fault in intra-familial abuse) nevertheless, they make a contribution to the literature in demonstrating that within the described contexts, children can attribute appropriate blame in a paper and pencil exercise for sexual assault. The implication of these findings is further discussed in Chapter Nine.

The Analyses of the Stranger Abduction Simulation

Chapter Four gave a detailed description of how the simulation exercise was set-up and the considerable care taken to ensure that no child was placed at risk. As previously explained, there was an opportunity to look at the possibility of contributing to the research literature by trying to establish, through the use of independent raters and the criteria used for scoring the simulations, the beginnings of a body of normative data as to what constitutes at risk factors to abduction. This section deals with the problems encountered in this endeavour.

Three raters, all experienced teachers, were asked to rate 'blind' the audio-visual recordings of the subset of children involved in the simulation. They were asked whether, in their opinion, any child was at risk of abduction and to give reasons for their decision. The audio-visual recordings were technologically limited in that, for example, frame by frame analysis was not available to the raters. (The writer would acknowledge that this is an essential analytical tool in this type of research and it may have resolved the identified problems).

Despite their common training and considerable professional experience, there were very discrepant interpretations of the children's vulnerability to abduction which ultimately had been influenced by a range of subjective judgements, e.g an article of the child's clothing (trainers) being the sole benchmark as to whether the child was, or was not, at risk of abduction. Furthermore, the writer could not accept, despite their verbal intentions to tell their teacher, that three children were given pass scores in the simulation by two raters when the
children had the 'stranger's' baggage in their hand and had to be intercepted by a member of staff before they left the building with him (this is further addressed later in this chapter).

Due to time constraints and practical problems (the reader is reminded that the writer's first request to an educational farm was refused; furthermore, access to the Education Centre took some further nine months to negotiate) it was not possible to consider other raters and a compromise had therefore to be sought. A decision was therefore made by the writer to abandon the original intention to try and establish a body of normative data of at risk factors to abduction and to simply accept the raters' scores on whether the child had passed (was not at risk of abduction) or failed (was at at risk of abduction) the simulation.

A comparison was then made with the scores of the writer based on a straight forward pass/fail as to the child's agreement or non-agreement to accompany the 'stranger' as this had been the criteria used in other comparable studies. Albeit that the writer's objectivity had been compromised and this approach could be viewed as a 'breach' of the research design and/or unsound methodology, this strategy allowed the results of this study to be compared with the studies by Fryer et al (1987a &b). This said, the reader is reminded from the Literature review that in the three studies which have involved the simulation of a stranger abduction only one study (Peterson 1984) did not involve the researcher(s) in the scoring of the simulation exercise.

The data in table 6:11. shows a comparison of the raters' scores with those of the writer.
Table 6:11

Simulation Scores
Raters and Writer
(N = 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No</th>
<th>Rater One</th>
<th>Rater Two</th>
<th>Rater Three</th>
<th>Writer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Pass
0 = Fail

The data in Table 6:11 illustrate that in twenty-three cases (82%), there was agreement in the scores between the raters and in twenty-one (75%) between the raters and the writer. Of note, in the experimental group, there was disagreement in only one case. It may be that this group's behavioural responses were easier to delineate because the behaviour of those who refused to go with the 'stranger' was so explicit. Tables 6:12(a), 6:12(a), 6:12(a) and 6:12(a) illustrate the Chi-square analyses of the individual raters and the writer.
Table 6:12 (a) shows the scores of the first rater. It is worth noting that she is a Senior Teacher, who has more knowledge than most teachers about sexual abuse, having completed a dissertation on the training needs of teachers in child sexual abuse prevention. No significant differences were found between her ratings for the two groups. Although this rater and the writer arrived at the same conclusion of the total number of children who had passed or failed the simulation, the data in Table 6:11 show that there was disagreement in four cases. This aside, inter-rater reliability was fairly high, as is seen later in the
contingency coefficient analysis.

An important difference in the marking of the writer and rater one, compared with rater two and three, was that the latter raters passed three children in the control group, who not only 'left' with the 'stranger' but also helped him with his baggage, saying they were "going to tell their teacher". These children were failed by the writer and the first rater. Both raters two and three, who passed these children, took their stated verbal intentions in good faith and assumed they were therefore not placing themselves at risk of abduction. The writer and the first rater did not take the children's verbal intentions as an absolute indicator of their predicted behaviour. This was further confirmed by the intervening teacher: in all three instances the teacher had to intervene as the 'stranger' had coughed to alert her that the children were leaving the building with him.

Table 6:12(b) presents the data of the only male rater. No significant differences were found between his scores of the two groups. Interestingly, he passed the highest number of children, including the three children who were making their way out of the third floor of the building with the 'stranger', but had said they were going to tell their teacher. Even if these three children are included, there is still a difference of two children in the overall pass rate. It may be that in the same way, gender influenced these findings.

Table 6:12(c) illustrates the scores of rater three. No significant differences were found between her scores of the two groups. It is, however, worth noting in Table 6:11 that had rater three, who is a highly respected adviser in special education, failed the three children who went with the 'stranger' but said they would tell their teacher, both she and the writer would have achieved complete agreement between the children who had passed or failed the simulation. There, therefore, would also have been significant finding in her ratings.

Table 6:12(d) shows the writer's ratings. The analysis shows a significant (0.02) finding. The data demonstrate, that seventeen
children (66.7%) passed the simulation and eleven (39.3%) failed. In common with the only comparable study (Fryer et al 1987a & b), and in contrast to any of the other raters, the yard stick used by the writer was that if the child agreed, or made any attempt to leave with the 'stranger', he/she was failed.

Table 6:13 shows the overall comparison of the contingency coefficient analysis of the writer and raters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Rater One</th>
<th>Rater Two</th>
<th>Rater Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rater One</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater Two</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater Three</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the writer is aware of the convention that a reliability coefficient of 0.85 or greater is regarded as robust, the simulation in this study was rated on the individual behaviour of the children on a subjective measure by the raters as to what factors, in their opinion, constituted 'at risk' to abduction. Using the same criteria for scoring as Fryer et al (1987a & b), the writer used awarded a straight forward pass/fail rating based on the child's performance during the simulation. It connoted simply whether or not the child agreed to the stranger's request. In the studies by Fryer et al (1987a & b), inter-rater reliability was 1.0 (total reliability) among the research team members.

The analysis of the raters' scores show that, unlike the scores by the writer, there was no significant finding between the experimental and control group's performance in the behavioural measure used in this study. However, had rater three, failed the three children who went
with the 'stranger' but said they would tell their teacher, both she and the writer would have achieved complete agreement between the children who had passed or failed the simulation. There, therefore would have been another significant finding.

In a further exploration of the data relating to the scores of the stranger abduction, the writer removed all cases where there was disagreement between the writer and the raters and then where there was agreement between the raters only. Tables 6:14 and 6:15 illustrate these data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min Cells with 0.26250 1 0.6084 E.F. E.F.<5 1.05000 1 0.3055 2.000 (B.Y.C.) 3 of 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min Cells with 0.02192 1 0.8822 E.F. E.F.<5 0.40266 1 0.5257 2.348 (B.Y.C.) 2 of 4

Tables 6:14(a) and 6:14(b) show a non significant finding in respect of these comparisons between the control and the experimental group’s performance in the simulation of the stranger abduction.

A further analysis was conducted to examine whether the variation of the stranger had any bearing in group performance. The writer again removed all cases where there was disagreement between the writer and the raters and then where there was any disagreement between the raters.

Tables 6:15(a), 6:15(b), 6:15(c), and 6:15(d) present these data.
Table 6:15 (a)

Rater Agreement
Pass Scores by Stranger
(N = 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strg 1</th>
<th>Strg 2</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min Cells with
1.81108 1 0.1783 E.F. E.F.<5
3.43792 1 0.0637 2.824 2 of 4
(B.Y.C.)

Table 6:15 (b)

Rater Agreement
Fail Scores by Stranger
(N = 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strg 1</th>
<th>Strg 2</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min Cells with
0.00000 1 1.0000 E.F. E.F.<5
0.00000 1 1.0000 1.000 4 of 4
(B.Y.C.)

Table 6:15 (c)

Writer
Pass Scores by Stranger
(N = 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strg 1</th>
<th>Strg 2</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min Cells with
0.22768 1 0.6332 E.F. E.F.<5
1.03519 1 0.3087 2.059 3 of 4
(B.Y.C.)

Table 6:15 (d)

Writer
Fail Scores by Stranger
(N = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Strg 1</th>
<th>Strg 2</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square D.F. Significance Min Cells with
0.00000 1 1.0000 E.F. E.F.<5
0.63567 1 0.4249 0.545 3 of 4
(B.Y.C.)

These data show that there was no significant finding in any of the analyses of the variation of the 'stranger'. However, the data in Tables 6:15(a) and 6:15(b) illustrate that there were fewer passes with the experimental group with four out of six children rejecting stranger one (Scottish educated accent) compared with seven out of eight children with stranger two (distinct 'Geordie' accent). It may be that the 'foreign' accent made the children more wary. The same cannot be said for the control group and the small numbers make comparisons difficult. Overall, there is weak evidence to suggest that the variation of the 'stranger' may have affected group performance. This very weak
evidence would warrant further research. In order to consider other possible confounding variables in the stranger abduction simulation, an analysis was conducted to examine whether the variation of the lure had any bearing on group performance. The writer removed all cases where there was disagreement between the writer and the raters and those where there was disagreement between the raters. Tables 6:16(a), 6:16(b), 6:16(c), and 6:16(d) illustrate these data.

These results are not significant. However in Tables 6:16(c) and 6:16(d), in the control group, four (50%) children rejected the first lure, (no money incentive) in comparison to one (25%) out of five children...
(with money incentive). Given the small numbers involved and events in the control group the reasons for this would be highly speculative. However, in keeping with the findings that children would appear to know that girls are more likely to be sexually assaulted by strangers without the input of a formal personal safety programme, it may be that parents have also told their children "not to take money from strangers" since these are likely to be the messages they themselves received as children.

The Results of the Stranger Abduction Simulation

Hypothesis five (H05) postulated that:
'There will be no difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group.'

In the endeavour to contribute to the beginnings of a knowledge of a body of normative data as to what factors constitute at risk to abduction, the analyses of the simulation of a stranger abduction proved to be highly problematic. For practical reasons and faced with an intractable problem, in order to maximise the data available to the writer, there was a recognition that the classical research paradigm had to be compromised. The reasons for this have been detailed earlier in this chapter. Further analyses showed that on agreed inter-rater scores of all children, no significant differences were found between the groups. The same can be said from the analysis of agreed inter-rater scores and those of the writer. However, there was a significant finding in the analysis on the writer's score of a straightforward pass/fail criteria. Moreover, as illustrated in Table 6:11 had rater three failed the three children who attempted to leave with the 'stranger' but said they would tell their teacher, both she and the writer would have achieved complete agreement between the children who have passed or failed the simulation. There, therefore would have been a significant finding in her scores.

Thus, on the criteria applied by the writer, and within the reservations previously expressed with regard to the compromisation of the
research design and the reliability and validity of the scoring, of the twenty-eight children who took part in the simulation, in the experimental group, twelve (80%) children (including the child with learning difficulties) passed compared with five (38.5%) in the control group. This finding demonstrates that children in the experimental group were twice as likely to pass the simulation in comparison with children in the control group.

This result was achieved despite the fact that both the experimental and control groups were of a similar ability and had broadly similar pre and post-test knowledge scores. However, the control group were identified as a much more disturbed group of children whose behavioural characteristics may have made them more vulnerable to abduction. Weighed against this, however, the control group had probably more parental input on the subject of stranger abduction and on-site experience of sexual assault. Moreover, as demonstrated in the qualitative data on the definition of sexual assault, the control group were more likely to define sexual assault as either sexual intercourse or rape than assault based on the 'Touch Concept'. However, in the stranger vignettes, they were unlikely to be able to predict that sexual assault was a likely consequence of stranger abduction. It could therefore be projected and supported in the Literature on Social Learning Theory (Bandura 1977) that had they understood the consequences of stranger abduction to include sexual assault they may have acted differently in the simulation exercise.

However, five key differences are worth noting between the two groups which would appear to lend further support for a differential performance by the experimental group in the simulation exercise. Firstly, as the data in Figures 6:7 and 6:8 (Post-test Results - Consequences of Stranger Abduction) confirm, the experimental group were three times more likely to understand that the consequences of stranger abduction might result in sexual assault. Therefore, in terms of social learning theory, this knowledge (supported in the qualitative data) appears to have influenced their behaviour in the simulation exercise. Secondly, in contrast with the pre-test, where seven (25%)

The reader is reminded that the vast majority of parents had not told their children that sexual assault was a likely outcome of stranger abduction.
children in the experimental group and ten (37%) children in the control group were unable/could not complete the definition of sexual assault, Programme impact was in evidence in the experimental group in the post-test, in that every child was able to offer a definition of sexual assault compatible with Programme objectives. This would appear to support effective Programme intervention in that children in the experimental group were also able to give a much wider definition of sexual assault than the children in the control group. It is also evident from the data that following the teaching of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, these children had a much broader, more exact, and relevant use of language in their definition of sexual assault.

Thirdly, they had had the opportunity, through the behaviourally-based learning in the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme, to practise their personal safety skills. Fourthly, in the vignettes, they were significantly more able to predict sexual assault as a consequence of stranger abduction in the male vignette. Lastly, the qualitative data that follows shows, their responses were influenced by the fact they recognised the 'delivery man' as a 'stranger', and/or knew the outcome of going would possibly result in sexual assault.

These data also confirm that the experimental group had a much better perception of the risk involved, they read the situation better and had a much clearer recognition of the 'stranger', than did the control group. Furthermore, in interviews, their definition of 'a stranger' was far more precise, broader and more realistic than that of the control group. While the evidence is not conclusive, all of these factors point to some level of Programme impact. Clearly, knowledge levels of personal safety were not the only factors at work in the simulation. This is further supported later in this chapter in the data which examines whether the simulation method desensitises children to approaches by strangers.

It is also most interesting to note that, with the exception of the child with learning difficulties, all of children, irrespective of rater, who failed the simulation said in both the pre- and post-test vignettes that the child should not go with the stranger. Thus, these children were
not able to transfer the knowledge so manifestly demonstrated in the paper and pencil exercise in this study to the behavioural measure. It is also very important to record that the child with learning difficulties who responded in both vignettes that the child should go with the stranger did not go with the 'stranger' in the simulation exercise! As Table 6:11 shows (Case 13) all raters and the writer passed this child in the simulation exercise. It may be that the paper and pencil exercise was indicative of the child's limited literacy skills but he clearly showed the appropriate behaviour in the simulation exercise. Although this is very limited data, there may be implications here for the development of prevention curricula in the special schools sector. Clearly, more research is warranted in this area.

These results would appear to confirm that a knowledge measure on its own as an outcome measure of the effectiveness of a child sexual assault prevention programme, is not a reliable predictor of a child's actual behaviour in a potentially dangerous situation. It may also be that children's verbal responses may underestimate their behavioural responses, as Miltenberger et al (1988) recently found when they compared children's verbal and role-play responses to abduction scenarios. Furthermore, the analyses of the variations of both the different 'stranger' and lures used in the simulation exercise did not appear to influence in any significant way the children's behaviour in the simulation exercise. This said, there was weak evidence that the variation in accent may have impacted on the findings. Future studies may wish to take this on board. Moreover, it would appear that children at this stage in their development already are aware that girls are likely to be the victims of sexual within the context of stranger abduction involving a car. There were also some suggestion that children were more likely to refuse a lure which involved a money incentive. Future programme designers of child abduction and sexual abuse prevention curricula may wish to take this into account.

The data from the personal interviews with the children which have a direct bearing on their responses in the simulation exercise are now presented. (The other data from the interviews with the children are reported in Chapter Seven).
The Children's Perceptions of their Responses in the Simulation Exercise

This section is based on the children's perception of their behaviour in the simulation exercise on whether they felt they had made any attempt to go with the 'stranger'. As the audio-visual recordings had not been rated at this stage, the children's responses were not in any way influenced by this and the marking by the writer had not even been a consideration at this point.

This section is presented in two parts:

a) The children's reasons for going with the 'stranger'.
b) The children's reasons for not going with the 'stranger'.

a) The children's reasons for going with the 'stranger'.

The Experimental Group

Of the three children who said they went with the 'stranger', two said their main reason for acquiescing with the 'stranger's' request was that they were trying to be helpful:

"I thought I was safe because the Head Teacher would see me. I was trying to be helpful" (Male).

"Because I was trying to be kind and helpful" (Female).

The second reason given by the third child was that he had assumed the 'stranger' worked there:

"At first I thought he was lost when he went down the stairs I went for the Head Teacher. I thought he worked there and was not a stranger but I know now and would use my personal safety" (Male).

There was complete agreement between all raters and the writer on the scores of these children. All three had the 'stranger's' baggage and were preparing to leave the building with him. A key difference here in raters scores with other children
who left with the 'stranger' is that this group of children did not state their intention to tell anybody and they were therefore failed by everyone.

The Control Group
Again, the most common reason to emerge from the control group as to the primary reason for acquiescing with the 'stranger's' request, was a need to be helpful. Of the seven children who perceived themselves as having failed the simulation, four gave this as the reason for their actions:

“I was scared. The man could hardly walk and he needed a hand. I was being helpful. I went to the office and told the Assistant Head Teacher but couldn’t find her” (Male).

“I thought what am I gonna do. Say no or yell on the Assistant Head Teacher. He had loads of boxes and I felt he needed help and he could not grab me with all the boxes. I wouldn’t take his baggage the next time” (Female).

“Well he was quite laden and had dropped a box and he needed a hand. I told the Assistant Head Teacher. I had a strange feeling that he might be a stranger. I wouldn’t go next time” (Male).

“To help him down the stairs with the bags, he had thousands of bags. I would say no the next time” (Male).

Again, the next most common reason given by the control group for acquiescing with the 'stranger's' request was the assumption that the 'stranger' worked in the building:

“I thought he was a worker in the building” (Female).

“Thought he was a janitor or something - I told my Assistant Head Teacher” (Female).

The next reason given was that of being frightened:

“I was frightened I was not sure what to do so I called the Assistant Head Teacher” (Female).
There was only complete agreement by the raters and the writer in the scores of three of these children. Three more were failed by the writer and at least one rater. One was failed by the writer only. The remaining child, also failed only by the writer, did not see herself as having made any attempt to leave with the 'stranger'. Her only comment was that she did not think she would have left the building with the 'stranger'.

Thus the data from these children confirmed that seven of the eight children failed by the writer agreed with this assessment. It is now proposed to look at the data from the children who did not go with the 'stranger'.

b) The children's reasons for not going with the 'stranger'.

The Experimental Group
In the experimental group, eleven (73%) of the twelve children who passed the simulation based on the writer's scores, compared with only two (17%) of the children in the control group, said they did not go with the man because they recognised him as a stranger.

There was complete agreement in the scores in eleven of these twelve children between the raters and the writer and agreement by two of the raters and the writer in respect of the other child. As already referred to, it would appear that there was a far greater degree of consistency in the overall scores of the experimental group because there response were so precise.

The following is a selection of quotes which illustrate the children's reasons for their responses:

"Because he would sexually assault you. Thought he was strange looking. I knew he was a stranger. I knew an adult had not introduced me to him so I knew he must be a stranger" (Female).
“Cause he might have sexually assaulted me cause he was a stranger cause I had never seen him before” (Male).

“I was thinking that he might take me away and kill me. Cause my mum and dad have told me never to go with someone I don’t know. I knew he was a stranger” (Female).

and, from the child with learning difficulties:

“Cause he might have sexually assaulted me cause he was a stranger. I said no and told the Head Teacher” (Male).

Moreover, six (40%) of the experimental group also said they thought of the three stranger questions from the Programme:

“Because I could have got taken away and hurt. He was a stranger. I remembered my three stranger questions quickly and I went and got the Head Teacher” (Male).

“Because he would have taken me away. Thought on my personal safety. I knew he was a stranger because he had not been introduced to me by an adult I trust” (Female).

“Cause he could have pulled you into his car and took you away. I thought he was a stranger and thought on my three stranger questions” (Male).

The other child in the experimental group could not give any reason for his refusal to go with the 'stranger'.

The Control Group
Of the remaining three children in this group who refused to go with the 'stranger', in comparison with the experimental group, they did not recognise the man as a stranger. The reason given by two of these children for not going with the 'stranger' was that of external authority, i.e. the teacher's instruction:

"Cause the Assistant Head Teacher told me to stay here" (Male).

"I thought he was going to kidnap me. Cause the Teacher said I was to stay in the office. I was scared” (Male).
The other child's reason for not going was heeding parental advice:

"My mum told me not to go with people I didn't know. I knew I was not going to go" (Female).

To summarise, these data would appear to support that in the experimental group, with the exception of one child, there was agreement between all of the raters, the writer and the children themselves as to their behavioural response in the simulation exercise. In contrast, in the control group, there were considerable differences in the perceptions and scores of all of those involved. This said, in only one case did the child disagree with the rating awarded by the writer. The data would also suggest that there was a much greater awareness in the experimental group, both in the recognition of the 'stranger' and of the inherent dangers of stranger abduction i.e. sexual assault, in comparison with the control group. The factors which appeared to induce the children, irrespective of grouping, to acquiesce with the request of the 'stranger' were those of trying to be kind and helpful as well as sympathy for his plight. Another factor was that the 'stranger' was an employee in the building and, therefore, the child did not consider himself/herself at risk.

These findings have clear implications on how we train children to discriminate safe and unsafe situations and for the design of child sexual assault prevention curricula. Moreover, people acting in loco parentis need to be far more vigilant about how they introduce unknown adults in settings where children are being cared for or educated. Schools are particularly vulnerable to numerous adults and visiting staff being around. This is further elaborated on in the Chapter Nine.

The next section examines whether the children had contact with each other in between the simulation exercise. The question asked:

Q Did anyone in your class tell you about their school trip?
None of the three children in the control group who were involved in the second day of video-recording said they had been in contact with anyone in their class who had been involved in
the simulation on the first day. From the six children in the experimental group, however, one boy said:

"My pal told me the night before that he thought something happened to do with personal safety but he didnae tell me what."

This child passed the simulation.

The other five children said they did not have contact with any of their class mates who had been on the trip on the first day. Thus, there was one child in the experimental group who may have been alerted that 'something' might happen.

Hypothesis six (H_{06}) postulated that:

'There will be no difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group between children of different:

i) ability ratings;

ii) behavioural scores;

iii) cognitive styles.'

The reader is reminded that the original objective of this study was to include every child, where parental consent had been given, in the simulation exercise. As described earlier, for ethical reasons, this objective had to be abandoned. Consequently, this part of the data analyses contained a reduced sample, with only three children in the experimental group who, on everyone's marking, had failed the simulation and a spread of variables in most instances which contained less than five in each cell. Therefore, in those categories, where it was possible, further clustering into dichotomous variables did not resolve the problem of having enough data for this comparative analysis. Additionally, because of the low numbers, the Fisher Exact test was run to test for significant interactions but this proved to be unproductive. Quite simply, the data was not available to test Hypothesis six. This analysis was therefore abandoned and Hypothesis six deemed unworkable.
A more flexible approach to the data was adopted by the writer to try and minimise this unanticipated development and maximise the available data. The writer decided that it was more appropriate to conduct an in-depth analysis of children, irrespective of grouping, who had passed or failed the simulation, with a view to trying to identify vulnerability factors to abduction. It was felt such an analysis might assist future research projects.

The Results of the Research Questions

The research questions were:
1. What characteristics make children vulnerable to abduction?
2. Does the simulation method desensitise children to approaches by strangers?

Given the very small numbers involved in this part of the analyses and the spread of variables, the writer would urge great caution in the findings. A series of cross-tabulations was carried out which looked at the children who passed or failed, irrespective of original grouping.

The writer's scores of the simulation were cross-tabulated with:
- a) Rutter (Relationship) scores by gender;
- b) Knowledge scores;
- c) Attribution of fault form sexual assault in the stranger vignettes;
- d) Gender;
- e) Ability rating;
- f) Cognitive style.

to check for any significant interactions. The only findings reported, therefore, are those of significance or which offer pointers for future research. These were based on the writer's scores in the simulation exercise.

The following results are reported for the cross-tabulations on:
- a) Rutter (Relationship) scores by gender;
- b) Knowledge scores;
- c) Attribution of fault responses in the stranger vignettes.
a) Rutter (Relationship) scores by gender

Tables 6:17(a) and 6:17(b) provide the descriptive statistics of the breakdown by gender on the raw score of those children who took part in the simulation.

The reader is reminded that the data in Table 5:7 show a highly skewed distribution for the control group. Consequently, given more children in the control group failed the simulation, this inevitably affects the validity of any findings.

Despite these limitations, it is worth noting that in Tables 6:17(a) and 6:17(b) that eight (72.7%) of the eleven children who failed the simulation had been identified on this part of the Rutter Measure as having relationship problems in comparison with four who passed. Additionally, every female child, irrespective of grouping, who failed the simulation had been identified on the relationship score on the Rutter Measure as being:

- a loner or is isolated,
• does not relate to their peer group,
• is irritable, quick to 'fly off the handle.'

The reader is also reminded that research which examined how perpetrators' groom their victims (Budin & Johnston 1989; Conte et al 1989), identified children who were loners or isolates and who tend not to mix well with their peers as being at risk of sexual abuse. Further studies may wish to make more imaginative use of this part of the Rutter Measure as it may offer some value as a predictor of childhood vulnerability to abduction in general, and sexual assault in particular. This area is further addressed in Chapter Nine.

b) Knowledge Scores

Tables 6:18(a) and 6:18(b) show the $t$ tests for children who passed or failed the simulation exercise.

Table 6:18(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.5882</td>
<td>2.203</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>2.2353</td>
<td>2.513</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>-3.67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.8235</td>
<td>1.976</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>2.2353</td>
<td>2.513</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>-3.67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6:18(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4545</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>3.1818</td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>-3.65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.6364</td>
<td>2.693</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>3.1818</td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>-3.65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data show that the children who failed the simulation scored less on the knowledge pre-test with a mean of 5.4545 in comparison to 6.5882 for the group who passed. However, the difference in the gain scores is 2.2 for the group who passed the simulation in comparison with 3.2 for the group who failed. In common with similar calculations in the previous chapter which examined knowledge scores, this analysis was calculated in the same manner. Thus, the difference of the gains
(1.00) is less than the standard error of the difference (1.8). Furthermore, the $t$ value is not significant.

The findings confirm that both groups made gains in knowledge. Although the children who failed the simulation did less well in the pre-test, had a higher gains score in the post-test than children who passed the simulation, this was not of relevance to their performance in the simulation exercise. This further confirmed that knowledge as assessed by the questionnaire used in this study was not the only influence in the responses of the children in the simulation exercise.

c) Attribution of Fault

Tables 6:19(a), 6:19(b), 6:20(a) and 6:20(b) illustrate the data for the attribution of fault for sexual assault in the vignettes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6:19(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution of Fault</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Stephen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children who Passed the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6:19(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution of Fault</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Stephen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children who Failed the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6:20(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution of Fault</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Jane</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children who Passed the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6:20(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution of Fault</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Jane</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children who Failed the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the analysis to locate any differences between the children who passed or failed the simulation, the only significant finding was in the attribution for fault in sexual assault in both vignettes. For the children who passed, (albeit there was more of the experimental group in this subset who, with the exception of the child with
special needs, had been able to assign appropriate blame in the post-test vignettes) there was a significant finding $p \leq 0.05$ of 0.0078 of the appropriate attribution of fault for both Stephen and Jane. For the children who failed, albeit that there was proportionately more of the control group, (who by and large had been unable to assign appropriate blame in the vignettes) there was a finding of 0.6250 for Stephen and 0.5000 for Jane. Although this analysis was limited in that the subset was small, and already biased, nevertheless, the findings may offer some pointers for future research.

### Summary of Findings on Vulnerability to Abduction

The first research question posed:

1. What characteristics make children vulnerable to abduction?

The findings show that on the writer's scores, eight (72.7%) of the children who were identified as having relationship score on the Rutter Measure failed the simulation in comparison with four (36.3%) who passed. This finding may in some way point to risk of abduction. Further studies may wish to make more imaginative use of this part of the Rutter Measure as it may offer some value as a predictor of childhood vulnerability to abduction in general, and sexual assault in particular. This area is further addressed in Chapter Nine. As referred to earlier, this is particularly relevant in light of the recent research findings on how perpetrators 'groom' their victims.

In the knowledge test, knowledge levels were not a predictor of children's vulnerability to abduction. In the vignettes, the attribution of fault for sexual assault showed a significant finding of differences between the group who passed and the group failed the simulation. However, the small numbers and the bias within the groups make it impossible to draw any firm conclusions. Future research endeavours may wish to study these specific aspects of possible vulnerability to abduction. The next section examines the second research question.
Desentisation

The second research question posed:

2 Does the simulation method desensitise children to approaches by strangers?

Two weeks after the simulation exercise took place, the views of the children were sought. The views of the parents and teachers were evaluated one year later. Given the contention surrounding the simulation method, particularly, whether it desensitises children to approaches by strangers, it was felt important to triangulate the views of all concerned.

The Children's Views on the Simulation Exercise

The first question in the interview schedule was:

i) What did you feel about being involved in the simulation exercise?

The most prominent theme to emerge was that it had been, for most children, a positive experience. Twenty five (93%) of the twenty seven children used the word 'good' in varying degrees and included all fifteen children in the experimental group. The following quotes give a flavour of their initial feelings:

"At first I was a wee bit scared and then I told my Head Teacher. The exercise was fine because I knew where my Head Teacher was, and therefore was not in danger. I learned you should always say "No" (Female, E group).

"I felt frightened. Its a good thing because it shows you what it would be like if someone really came up to you and you would know better what to do. (Female, C group).

The remaining two children, both boys in the control group, expressed different concerns that such exercises may be "bad" (desensitise) for children although one of the boys also used the word 'good' in his response giving a total of twenty six (96%) children viewing the exercise in a positive way. The first boy
raised desensitisation in relation to other children:

"I didn’t know what to do when the 'stranger' came in. Its bad cause it might make some children feel the next time its an experiment. Its good cause its telling you all about safety. It was good at teaching you."

The other boy, who failed the simulation, said it had been a negative experience and gave indications that, at that time, he may well have desensitised to approaches by strangers:

"I felt strange. Got a wee fright when he came in. I think that it is a bad idea and the next time it would be an exercise too."

This view is particularly worrying, as at the debriefing session, great pains were taken to tell the children that their parents had agreed to them taking part in the simulation exercise and that they would not consent to their child being involved in such an exercise again. Furthermore, the writer and teaching staff made it explicit to the children that should they encounter a similar situation, they should treat the situation as real, react as taught, and apply their personal safety skills. As one of the in-built safeguards of the research design, this information was immediately passed to the Class Teacher so that work could be done with him on personal safety to try and remedy this or minimise damage limitation.33

The second theme to emerge was that the exercise was a good teaching method. This was echoed by twenty one (78%) of the children, eleven in the experimental group and ten in the control group. As well as seeing it as a 'good' way to learn, three children specifically gave comparisons with other ways of learning as highlighted in the following quotes:

"I was a wee bit scared when the 'stranger' came in. It's a good thing so they don't go with strangers. It's better than telling cause they've had the experience" (Male C group).

"When the 'stranger' came in, I felt a bit worried. I think it is

---

33 As well as the child remaining with the same class teacher for the following year, this was a built-in safeguard of the research design.
a good thing because it would help them know if they actually knew what to do” (Female E group).

“I was a bit worried when the man came. It was a good thing cause then I would know what to do in a real situation. Its better than telling you what to do” (Male C group).

"A wee bit worried when the 'stranger' came in. Happy about the exercise. Its a good idea so you know what to say to strangers. Its better than your mum telling you not to go” (Female C group).

"I was a bit scared. The exercise is a good thing because if it happens again I’ll know what to do” (Male E group).

"I didn’t feel there was anything wrong. I felt a bit scared when the 'stranger' came in. I think its a good idea because when the man came you know he would not take you away because it was an experiment but the next time he would. I've learned that” (Male C group).

"First, I was a wee bit scared because I didn’t know it was a set-up. It was a good test in case you forgot your personal safety” (Male E group).

The implications of these findings and considered later.

Another theme to emerge when the 'stranger' entered the room was that the children felt anxious. Sixteen (59%) of the twenty seven children described their initial feelings of varying degrees of anxiety. They were split evenly between the experimental and control groups. However, as demonstrated in the quotes which follow, only one child described herself as being shocked :

"I was shocked when the 'stranger' came in. It was a good thing - it just shows you that it really could happen. I think it was quite good for children to learn like this not to go with strangers" (Female E group).

"It was O.K. but it was a bit scary in the beginning. It was quite good to know you had been tested” (Female E group).

Seven (26%) of the children described feeling 'O.K.' One child described himself as not being frightened at all:
"I wondered 'Who's he?' If it's a wee one it's (the exercise) bad cause they might be frightened. I'm not frightened" (E group).

The remaining three children did not give a feeling word in their answers to the question.

Thus, for every child, with one exception, the experience of being involved in the simulation exercise had been 'good' and for the majority, a positive learning experience. The writer would acknowledge that socially desirable responses also influenced the children's responses (Potter 1979). There were indications that for those children who had responded appropriately in the simulation exercise, that their self-efficacy skills had been strengthened. It had also heightened their awareness to approaches by strangers. Nevertheless, it is most worrying that for one child in the control group, his involvement may have initially led to desensitisation. As this information was passed immediately to the Class Teacher prior to the teaching of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, remedial work was undertaken to reduce damage limitation. Additionally, the Class Teacher also continued with this child for the following year. This arrangement was one of the built-in safe-guards and it is suggested by the writer that in any future similar research this would be an essential prerequisite.

The Parents' Views on the Simulation Exercise

One year after the simulation, the views of the parents were sought in order to compare their views with those of their children and to assess whether there was any evidence over a longer period of desensitisation to stranger abduction. Twenty-seven (one parent had moved away from the area) of the original twenty-eight parents children involved in the simulation were contacted by letter. They were asked to complete a very short questionnaire (see Appendix 4) regarding their views of the exercise and whether there had been any effects on their child. Every parent returned a completed questionnaire. This is the
only part of this study where a full return of parental questionnaires was achieved. It is the writer's opinion that this reflects parental concerns about children's safety and a serious view of this research project. Moreover, the parents understood that they had an important contribution to make, particularly in relation to the use of the simulation method.

Five questions were asked of the parents. In hindsight, the writer would acknowledge that some of these questions are leading and biased towards seeking socially desirable responses (Furnham 1986; Peters & Fox 1993). Each section is prefaced by the question asked of parents.

The first question asked:

i) Do you think it was helpful for your child to be involved in the simulation exercise?
In common with the children, every parent, except one, viewed their child's involvement in the simulation as helpful. Twenty six (96%) of the twenty seven parents said this, including the mother of the child who showed signs of being desensitised. The other parent, in the experimental group, said she thought it had not been helpful for her son to be involved in the simulation:

"He never thought much of the exercise as he doesn't like to speak about it or doesn't want to speak about it."

It is worth noting that this child failed the simulation. However, in direct contradiction to his mother, the boy said:

"I felt a bit scared. It a good thing 'cause if it happens again, I'll know what to do."

ii) Please explain the reason for the box you have ticked?
Twenty-five (92.6%) of the parents (including the one parent who said that she did not think it was helpful for her child to be involved in the simulation) chose to expand on their answers. From the remaining twenty-four parents, the following themes emerged as key reasons why they thought the exercise had been helpful. Twelve (48%) of the twenty-five parents said that the
The exercise had heightened their child's awareness of stranger abduction. The following quotes are a cross-section of responses from the parents:

"Because it made him aware how easy it is for something to happen when not accompanied by an adult" (E group).

"To see the importance of not going with strangers" (C group).

and,

"I think it brought home to our child that it could actually happen to her. Her reaction and response greatly encouraged us - she is such a trusting, eager to please child" (E group).

The second theme to emerge was the helpfulness of the simulation in teaching children how easy it was for a stranger to abduct them. Eight (29.6%) parents mentioned this in their replies as the following quotes demonstrate:

"Yes I think it was helpful as it shows how easy it is for a stranger to lure a child away" (E group).

"I think it was helpful as it showed her that strangers can approach anytime and anywhere" (C group).

"This was very important both that my son knew not to go with a stranger no matter what the circumstances, also that it shows how easy it was for a stranger to entice someone into going with them" (E group).

The third theme was that the simulation exercise allowed an opportunity for the use of personal safety skills. Three (11%) parents in the experimental group mentioned this:

"Reactions to stranger showed what he would do if approached in the street" (E group).

"Her personal safety was exercised" (E group).

"The simulation helped her act out the correct response to an approach by a stranger" (E group).

Individual comments:
"I think it is important that a child is taught like this to stay away from strangers" (C group).

"I think it was a good idea as there are far too many children going away. I think you have also done a good job" (C group).

iii) Do you think the exercise had positive effects on your child?
Twenty five (92.5%) parents said they thought the exercise had had positive effects on their child, in comparison with two (7.5%) parents who replied in the negative, albeit with qualification. The overwhelming theme to emerge from the first group of parents was that the children's awareness had been heightened. Seventeen (68%) parents mentioned this in their responses. The following is a cross-section of replies:

"He is more aware of people lingering about in cars or people standing watching when he is out playing" (E group).

"If anyone approached my child, I am sure she would know how to cope with the situation. Thanks to the programme" (C group).

"Yes as now my Andrew will think twice about going with someone he does not know" (E group).

"I think it was good for children to go through this exercise, it might make their awareness to the situation more responsible" (C group).

"It has made Donna stop and think about what she is doing and with whom she speaks to, it has certainly made her aware of what could happen" (E group).

From the other eight (24.5%) parents, the following are a selection of individual comments made:

"My son now knows he can say and mean NO to adults if he feels he wants to" (E group).

"I think all children should have this exercise done on them, and maybe, their would be a lot of children saved." (C group)
"Because she now phones me from friends houses to ask if she can go down the street" (E group).

From the two parents who answered negatively, one thought it had been helpful for her son to be involved in the simulation but did not think it had had a positive effect on him:

"He already knew not to talk to strangers. If anyone approaches him outside he always comes home and tells us" (E group).

The other parent, in direct contradiction to her son, thought it was neither helpful nor positive for him to have been involved:

"He knows not to go with strangers outside, but as this was a school trip he maybe felt safer with the Headmistress next door" (E group).

iv) Do you think the exercise had any negative effects on children?

Twenty five (92.5%) parents replied that they did not think the simulation exercise had had negative effects on their children - some again included an expansion in their replied:

"It was all handled very carefully and well planned. I would like to see my other two children receive the same programme" (C group).

"I believe she realised these situations could affect her" (E group).

"I think all children should be taught not to talk or go near strangers" (C group).

Two parents replied saying that it might/did have negative effects. The first parent raised a very important point:

"I was thinking it might make him think it was too easy, in a real situation he would be persuaded more" (E group).

The parent who thought it was neither helpful nor positive, and whose son failed the simulation stated:
"I think it only frightened him and confused him as he thought the man in the video needed help with his bags as he is very helpful anyway" (E group).

The reader is reminded that the view of this parent does not accord with her child, the latter having seen his involvement in the simulation exercise as a positive learning experience.

The last question asked the parents:

v) Is there anything else you would like to say about the children's involvement in this exercise?

Fifteen (55.5%) parents chose to give additional comments on the simulation exercise, nine (60%) in the experimental group and six (50%) in the control group. One of the themes to emerge was that parents in the experimental group had seen their children demonstrate their personal safety skills:

"My husband and I were very proud the way our son portrayed himself on the video and that he was not afraid to say no."

"My son felt happy within himself that he was able to say 'No' because he had learned alot about personal safety and he exercised this by saying no in the exercise."

"It has shown Alex to say no to anyone he is not sure of or does not trust."

"On her way home from school that day, she told us what had happened and we were pleased about the action she had taken."

From a parent, also in the experimental group, who initially doubted the value of the simulation exercise:

"Initially, I was uncertain about the exercise - having seen the video I am thankful to all concerned in this project - I'm not sure what my child's reaction would have been without the series of videos, class instruction, etc. I hope other children will benefit from the personal safety programme as our child most certainly did."
The second theme to emerge from both groups of parents was that the exercise raised the children's awareness and some children enjoyed it:

"It made him see how easy it is for a stranger to approach you. He also remembers the event quite clearly" (E group).

"I think it is a very good exercise. It has taught Donna to be very careful. She is always telling her little sister about speaking to strangers and going off without telling anyone" (E group).

"My child found it very interesting and enjoyable. She also learned a lot form it" (C group).

"I think myself that the outing that day has taught the children a lot. It certainly helped my daughter to understand" (C group).

"I feel she has a more mature attitude and I would cope better if anything happened" (C group).

From another parent, in the control group, with initial reservations about the simulation exercise:

"At first I was not happy about this exercise, but on considering it for Paula, I have no doubts" (C group).

Clearly these two response highlight the problem of social desirable responses, when parents who had reservations about the study, did not feel confident enough to express them.

Two individual comments:

"I think it was a good exercise for children of this age to go through. I hope you will continue to go on with the programme" (C group).

This last comment reinforced parental messages on personal safety:
"It is very worthwhile as it confirms what parents are always telling their children" (E group).

In summary, all the parents, except one, were of the opinion that the simulation exercise had been a positive experience for their children. For the parent who felt it had not been a positive experience for her child, in direct contrast, there was evidence from the child that it had been a positive learning experience for him.

Only in one case, regrettably, was there evidence, that a child may well have been initially desensitised as a result of his experience in the simulation exercise. However, one year later, this was not in evidence in the responses from his parents or Class Teacher. The built-in safeguards would appear to have minimised this. This regrettable situation has to be weighed up against the other twenty six children, where the data from parents matched that of the children - that the experience of the simulation had heightened their awareness and strengthened their personal safety knowledge and skills.

The Teachers' Views on the Simulation Exercise

The same questions asked of the parents were asked of the four teachers (two in each school). Again social desirability of responses will probably have influenced the findings (Crino 1985; Peters & Fox 1993).

i) **Do you think it was helpful for children to be involved in the simulation exercise?**

In common with the overwhelming majority of the parents and children, teaching staff were of the opinion that the children's involvement in the simulation exercise had been helpful to them. Every response has been recorded from the teaching staff as follows:

"I think that it made discussion of possible abduction more meaningful. I know that they spent time discussing it amongst themselves. The few who had 'gone' with the stranger seemed known to the others although this was not
discussed in class situation (in the abstract but not naming names)” (Class Teacher E School).

“Even though over a number of years pupils have taken part in the programme, it has been difficult to assess how they would react in a potentially dangerous situation. The controlled exercise at was the closest the pupils could ever come to this. It was gratifying to see pupils use the strategies of the programme and have the courage to say ‘no’ to an adult” (Head Teacher E School).

“Obviously very helpful for the researchers, educationalists and other professionals involved. The children themselves are very aware that they played a very important and valuable role in the exercise. I would say a definite yes feeling” (Class Teacher C School).

“A contribution to protecting others in the future and an experience which, I hope, will heighten their awareness of potentially dangerous situations” (Head Teacher C School).

ii) Do you think the exercise had positive effects on the children?
Again, the overall opinion of teaching staff was in accord with the children and parents, in that, the simulation exercise had proved to be a positive experience for the children. The following quotes reinforce this:

“I think it heightened the awareness of most of them. Although one child played truant recently for a whole day it was only by chance that we knew she should have been at school - she had been absent and it would have been assumed that she was still ill. Her mother would have assumed that she was at school. She could have been abducted between 8.30 am and 3.30 pm and no-one would have known. She was with an older girl. The other children brought up the subject of personal safety in relation to what happened. Jane admitted she had not thought of any dangers” (Class Teacher E School).

“Those who had not gone with the ‘stranger’ had the confidence to say ‘no’ and were pleased with themselves. Those who went with the ‘stranger’ were reminded of the potential danger and of their stranger questions. All had the importance of the programme reinforced by the exercise” (Head Teacher E School).
"The exercise most emphatically demonstrated to the children concerned how easily a possible abduction could take place. Many have perhaps lost their 'innocence' to the dangers around them" (Class Teacher C School).

"A contribution to protecting others in the future and an experience which, I hope, will heighten their awareness of potentially dangerous situations" (Head Teacher C School).

iii) Do you think the exercise had negative effects on children?

As the following comments demonstrate, with some reservations by the Class Teacher in the control school, the teaching staff generally felt that the children's involvement in the simulation had not negatively affected them:

"I think it made them understand how easily you might be lured into danger. They did not seem to be unduly upset or afraid by it" (Class Teacher E School).

"Some children were upset immediately after the encounter with the 'stranger', because they were able to correctly 'read the situation'. After realising how they had done in using the programme and knowing they had been able to say 'no' even though it was difficult, we were all able to celebrate their success. The children discussed the fact that the scenario was a 'set-up', but realised if they were in a similar situation, it would be for real" (Head Teacher E School).

"I am not really fully convinced that the most vulnerable children are now more aware. I feel that in a real situation, they might still perhaps react in a similar manner. I feel the exercise strengthened the strong, positive children but has helped to a lesser extent the more vulnerable. I am not sure if this is a negative comment on the exercise or of the "'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' programme itself" (Class Teacher C School).

"No" (Head Teacher C School).

This view about some of the "most vulnerable" children being still at risk was also mentioned by the Class Teacher in the experimental group. It is an issue already raised in the section which examined vulnerability to abduction and is discussed further in Chapter Nine.
iv) Any Further Comments you would like to make about the exercise?

Two of the teachers involved made further comments. From the Head Teacher of the experimental group:

"At different times, I have been asked about the successes within the programme. This is difficult to assess, because young people using the programme don't put themselves at risk, therefore we don't know about the successes. The exception to this was the incident experienced by the child who was abducted locally" (This incident is reported in Chapter Eight).

I have supported the programme since I first saw the presentation and the video, 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No'. After the experience of the simulation exercise, I know it does work. The use of the video evidence will be invaluable at the parents' meetings and in the training of professionals. I am very proud that my primary school had a part in this piece for research which should have great implications in Scotland, and indeed, internationally" (Head Teacher E School).

From the Class Teacher in the control school:

"The whole scenario - the research questionnaires, cumulating in the simulation exercise and the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' programme - has been extremely worthwhile and beneficial to the children and to me, both as a teacher and a mother. The rapport and relationship we had in class certainly deepened. The children learned to listen to each other much more carefully and developed a more caring and trusting relationship.

I would like to add that I feel the children I work with who participated in the exercise, would have benefited this year from seeing themselves on video. Throughout this session in P7, we have made constant reference to 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' programme in many different situations and circumstances: the programme is so extensive and cross-curricular. The children, seeing themselves perhaps one year later, would be able to assess and evaluate their reactions and I feel would be extremely receptive to positive and even negative feedback. It would be an excellent opportunity to stress all the personal safety skills they now had acquired."
Perhaps in any future research of this kind, this would be something to consider. I realise it is a very delicate subject but if the teacher(s) and children are chosen very carefully and sensitively, it could work with wonderful reinforcing benefits!"

In conclusion, the data from the children, parents and teachers would appear to support that, with one exception, the children's involvement in the simulation was a positive experience which also enhanced their personal safety skills. As acknowledged in Chapter Four under Assumptions and Limitations of the study, the writer is also aware that the responses of all of these groups have been influenced by some level of socially desirable responses.

It is deeply regrettable that, despite the built-in safeguards in the research design, two weeks after the simulation exercise when the writer interviewed the children, there was evidence that one child had probably been desensitised to approaches by strangers through his involvement in this study. However, this was not in evidence one year later: neither the child's parent or Class Teacher noted this as a concern. Some reservations were expressed by the two Class Teachers that the most vulnerable children did not gain as much benefit from the Programme or the simulation exercise, as did their peers.

Overall, the data would support the contention that the simulation method, far from desensitising children to approaches to strangers, for the vast majority of them, it actually strengthened their personal safety skills and there were indicators that their self-efficacy skills had similarly been increased. Furthermore, these data would appear to support the use of the simulation method not only as a valid research tool but as a positive teaching method in training children to avoid abduction.
Summary of Findings

The following hypotheses:

\( H_0^3 \) 'There will be no difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to predict sexual assault as a likely consequence of stranger abduction.'

\( H_0^4 \) 'There will be no difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to attribute fault appropriately for sexual assault.'

\( H_0^5 \) 'There will be no difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group.'

\( H_0^6 \) 'There will be no difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group between children of different:

i) ability ratings;
ii) behavioural scores;
iii) cognitive styles.'

were tested.

Hypothesis three was rejected in respect of the male child, Stephen, in the vignettes but retained in respect of the female child, Jane. The children clearly had the knowledge, prior to the Programme being taught, that a female child was more at risk of sexual assault than a male child. However, the different context of the vignettes may have acted as a confounding variable. This said, the Programme appears to have been instrumental in raising the knowledge and awareness of the children in the experimental group, that irrespective of the gender of the victims, sexual assault is a likely outcome in the abduction of male children.

Hypothesis four was not retained as there was a significant change in the appropriate attribution of fault for sexual assault in both vignettes in the experimental group.
Hypothesis five was retained in that no significant difference was found on the raters scores between the two groups on the behavioural measure deployed in this study. On the writer's scores, however, the experimental group were twice as likely to pass the simulation exercise than the control group and a significant finding was achieved. This result was achieved despite the fact the control group had received slightly more parental advice on stranger abduction, a slightly higher pre-test knowledge score, on-site experience of sexual assault, and approximately the same post-test score as the experimental group. However, the control group were identified as a much more disturbed group of children with behavioural characteristics which may have made them more vulnerable to abduction. While the evidence is not conclusive, the data point in the direction of some level of Programme impact. Clearly, knowledge levels of personal safety were not the only factors at work in the simulation exercise. The writer would conclude that the differential factors in these findings were that the experimental group had:

i) the knowledge that sexual assault was a likely outcome in stranger abduction, and,

ii) the behaviourally-based learning in the role-play in the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme.

Moreover, this is supported in the qualitative data. These data show that the experimental group had a much better perception of the consequences involved, they read the situation better, had a much clearer recognition of the 'stranger', than did the control group.

Hypothesis six was abandoned as it was deemed unworkable.

The following research questions were examined:

1. What characteristics make children vulnerable to abduction?
2. Does the simulation method desensitise children to approaches by strangers?

The findings showed that the Rutter Measure may in some way point to potential vulnerability to abduction. As referred to earlier, this is particularly relevant in light of the recent research findings on how
particularly relevant in light of the recent research findings on how perpetrators 'groom' their victims. The knowledge test, was not a reliable predictor of children at risk of abduction. In the vignettes, the appropriate attribution of fault for sexual assault showed a significant finding between the groups who passed or failed the simulation. However, the small numbers and the bias within the groups made it impossible to draw any firm conclusions. Future research endeavours may wish to study further these specific aspects of possible vulnerability to abduction.

In relation to the second research question regarding the possibility of the simulation method desensitising children to approaches by strangers, the data in this study show that for the overwhelming majority of children the simulation method had been a positive learning experience and had actually bolstered their personal safety. There was some evidence to suggest that, for those children who had been successful in the simulation exercise, their self-efficacy skills may have also been strengthened. The implications of these findings are addressed in Chapter Nine.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE CHILDREN'S PERCEPTIONS OF A STRANGER AND VIEWS OF THE 'FEELING YES, FEELING NO' PROGRAMME

"Grown-ups love figures. When you tell them that you have made a new friend, they never ask you any questions about essential matters. They never say to you "What does his voice sound like?", "What games does he love best?", "Does he collect butterflies?" Instead, they demand: "How old is he?", "How many brothers has he?", How much does he weigh?", "How much money does his father make?" Only from these figures do they think they have learned anything about him" (De Saint Exupery 1945 p.15).

Introduction

This quotation from the famous children's book, 'The Little Prince', captures one of the main ideas of phenomenological thinking: that the search for an understanding of phenomena rather than solely numerical explanations and statistical analyses can also yield valuable information. The phenomena in this study was the children's experiences of the simulation of the stranger abduction. Given the newness of the child sexual abuse prevention field, the sensitive nature of enquiry in this study, the ethical considerations, as well as the use of the simulation method with the attendant possibility of desensitising the children to approaches by strangers, it is the writer's opinion that the children's views were of utmost importance. Although the interviews with the children were primarily diagnostic, the underpinning philosophy of the phenomenological approach made it possible to explore the children's experiences.

This chapter presents the analysis of the interviews with the children who participated in the stranger abduction exercise and the unsolicited views of the experimental group on the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme. The reader is reminded that coding has been done on specific themes and various concepts in response to the questions put to the children. Where possible, direct quotes from the children have
been used to support the interpretation of the analysis. By adopting this strategy, it was hoped to gain further insight into the prevention of child sexual abuse and abduction within the specific context of the simulation experience.

This chapter deals with the following topics:-
▲ Interview set-up.
▲ Interview schedule.
▲ The research questions.
▲ The children's perceptions of a stranger.
▲ The children's views of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme.
▲ Summary of findings.

**Interview Set-Up**

Twenty-seven of the twenty-eight children (fifteen in the experimental group and twelve in the control group) who took part in the simulation of the stranger abduction were interviewed in their own school in a room prepared for the purpose. This subset consisted of twelve boys and fifteen girls, seven boys and eight girls from the experimental group and seven girls and five boys from the control group. The female child from the control group who had experienced upset during the simulation exercise, was absent because of bronchitis. She was not expected back at school for two weeks.

The children were interviewed in school in the Assistant Head Teacher's room. The physical surroundings were informal with comfortable chairs, coffee table, plants and pictures. Efforts were made to remove any items that added formality. e.g. class registers, jotters and soft drinks were provided for the children.

The children had already met the writer at the debriefing meetings. Each child was brought to the room from their classroom by their respective Head Teacher and Assistant Head Teacher who had been present during the simulation exercise. After the interview, the children returned to a separate classroom for refreshments. The
children who had been interviewed were also kept separate at morning break from the rest of their class. Each interview lasted approximately twenty minutes.

The children were put at ease through small talk and advised of the purpose of the interview. They were reminded that their parent(s) had agreed to their taking part in the study and were also advised that they were under no obligation to answer any of the questions. They were informed that providing they had no objections, handwritten notes would be taken whilst they were talking. A conscious decision was taken not to tape the interviews. It was felt by the writer that the children would find a tape recorder intrusive and perhaps not be so open. Additionally, under the same conditions in a previous study undertaken by the writer (Hamilton 1989) children had used such interviews to disclose abuse. Given the legal complications which may have ensued e.g. ownership of the tapes and the other considerations outlined, handwritten notes were taken.

**Interview Schedule**

The reader is reminded that the responses to the following questions from the interview schedule:

What did you feel about being involved in the simulation exercise?:
Why did you go with the man?:
Why did you not go with the man?
What were your views and feelings regarding participation in the stranger abduction?

have been reported in Chapter Six in the section which examined desensitisation issues.

**The Research Questions**

This chapter presents the data for the following research questions:

3. What are the children's perceptions of a stranger? and,
4. What are the children's views of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme?
The Children's Perceptions of a Stranger

i) How would you describe a stranger?
In the experimental group, twelve (80%) of the fifteen children interviewed gave the definition provided in the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme:

"Someone who has not been introduced to you by an adult you know and trust."

The other three children, none of whom had failed the simulation, also mentioned that a stranger could be of either gender:

"A man who asks you to go with him. Could be a lady or somebody you know" (Male).

"He's got a glare in his eyes and he's got a strict face sometimes. You can also have a nice stranger - someone you would want to help. He could be a man or a woman" (Male).

"Somebody you don't know" (Female).

In summary, every child in the experimental group, recognised that a stranger could be of either gender. In marked contrast in the control group where, despite a prompt from the writer (used for any child who specifically described a stranger as only male), only three children (25%) mentioned that a stranger could be of either gender as the following examples demonstrate:

"Somebody you shouldn't go with" (Female).

"A bad person. (Male).

The third child, a female who failed the simulation, gave the best definition of all. She said:

"A person who you've never seen before. Could be dangerous or kind or he could be someone you mum or dad knows but you've never seen before. You would not know
whether to trust him or not."

Three of the control group described a stranger as follows:

"Frightening" (Female).

"Frightening and nasty" (Male).

"He's bad" (Female).

Interestingly, yet worrying, were the descriptions provided by two males and two females in the control group, all of whom failed the simulation:

"He would try and trick you with overalls and carrying a lot of things. He might have a moustache so he would disguise himself and take it off" (Male).

"He would have glasses and a brown moustache, tall looking, chubby cheeks, black hair" (Male).

"Black curly hair, brown eyes. He would be dressed up as somebody. He would probably have a mask on" (Female).

"Someone with black hair, tall. He would have a jacket on" (Female).

These descriptions, with the exception of the glasses, mask and detachable moustache (the moustache was real!) fit one or both of the 'strangers' used in the simulation exercise. These data highlight that, in the absence of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, there is a danger that the simulation exercise provided/reinforced a stereotyped 'stranger' for the children in the control group. Another male child, who also failed the simulation, gave an equally worrying description:

"A stranger would have black or blond hair, or any colour. He would be wearing jeans or track suit bottoms. A stranger is a person who takes you away and threatens to kill you, but they don't."

The last child in the control group, described the stranger as:
"I don’t know him. I’ve never seen him before and I’ve not to go away with him" (Female).

What is clear from these data is that the children's perception of a stranger differed markedly between the experimental and control groups. For most of the experimental group, they were much more aware that a stranger could be of either gender and they did not ascribe specific details of appearance - clear Programme impact was in evidence. In direct contrast, many of the control group saw a stranger as being only male and several children described him as having specific characteristics, the majority of which were in accord with the physical appearance of the 'strangers' used in the simulation. In the absence of the Programme, they based their definition of a stranger on their perceived fantasies or their experience of the simulation with the attendant possibility of desentisation. Thus, the experimental group appeared to have greater awareness and knowledge, a wider definition and a much more realistic concept of a stranger compared to the control group. This contrast in perceptions of strangers between the two groups will be discussed in Chapter Nine.

ii) Name one person in your family that you can trust.

Chart 7:1

There was no difference between the two groups in their nominated trusted person- overwhelmingly, twenty-three (85.2%)
of the twenty-seven children named their mother, three their father, and one child his aunt.

iii) Why do you trust that person?

The most important theme to emerge as an index of trust by the children was a message by an adult to the child that they could bring a problem and that they would either be listened to, understood, believed and given help or any combination of these responses. Fourteen (52%) children saw these as being important markers of trust. These responses provide further insight:

"Because she's (mum) always there to help you tell her something she always there to sort it out. She keeps you safe and gives you a home" (Male C group).

"Because she's (mum) looked after me since I was born. Whenever I have had any problems, she's always helped me." (Female E group).

"He's (dad) sometimes there when you want him. He usually looks after me most of the time because my mum works sometimes" (Male E group).

"Because any time I have a problem I can go to him (dad) cause I trust him. Cause I know he would help me" (Male C group).

"Cause she's my mum. She understands me" (Male E group).

"Cause she's (mum) family. She trusts me. She says if anything ever happens to me I can go and tell her" (Female C group).

"Because she's my mum. She's trustworthy. She gives you good advice" (Male C group).

"Cause she (mum) always tells me I can go to her and tell her things that have happened. She always helps me" (Female C group).

Another theme to emerge was that the children trusted adults who offered safety and protection. Overall, nine (33%) of the children saw this as being important in a trusting relationship. Interestingly, only two children in the experimental group
mentioned this as being an important index of trust compared with seven (58%) children in the control group who gave it a high profile in their answers. It is worth noting, that of these nine children, six had failed the simulation. A selection of these responses follows:

"She's always there. Because if someone tries to get me my mum would always be there" (Female C group).

"Me and my cousin were playing football and this man came over and my Auntie Linda said 'Move, yer no touchin them" (Male C group).

"She's (mum) kind, she's gentle and I know that she wouldn't do anything to harm you. She's always been there when I needed her. She does a lot of things for me and my brothers" (Female C group).

"Cause she (mum) tells me not to speak to strangers. She watches me playing outside in the square" (Female C group).

Additionally, direct comment on possible abductions was mentioned by two males in the control group. The first child had failed the simulation:

"Because he's (dad) got a car and he always listens. He always asks me what he looks like (the man) and I said 'No' when the man in the park asked me to go to the hospital. He was in a car and I got the registration number. My dad keeps looking for this man" (Male C group).

"Cause I got followed once and I told her (mum) and she said 'Right, that's it, yer stayin' in.' She believes me. She gives me money, she buys me clothes. She takes good care of me" (Male C group).

The third theme to emerge, mentioned by four (11%) children as being important for children trusting adults, was confidentiality:

"She's (mum) kind. She cares about you if your hurt. She won't discuss with her friends if you tell her something" (Male E group).
"Because I've told her (mum) things and she's done something about it. If I ask her not to tell anyone she doesn't tell. If it was something serious she would report it to the police cause she cares" (Female C group).

"She (mum) won't tell anyone if you tell her something" (Female E group).

"She (mum) loves me and if you tell her something she won't tell anybody" (Male E group).

These themes - being understood, believed, listened to, protected, receiving help, having a confidence kept - of trusting family members are of considerable interest. As shown in the Literature Review, it is these very areas which are breached by sexual offenders in the 'grooming' process (Budin & Johnson 1989; Conte et al 1989). Moreover, these breaches are usually accompanied by threats which can cause long term psychological and emotional damage in victims (Finkelhor 1986). These findings highlight the complexity facing programme makers of prevention curricula as the identified areas which facilitate trust and security in the parent/child relationship are the same areas which are often breached by those intent on abusing children.

iv) Name one person not in your family that you trust.

Chart 7:2

Named Trusted Person Outwith Family
(N=27)

- 1 (4%)
- 2 (7%)
- 3 (11%)
- 4 (15%)
- 5 (19%)
- 6 (19%)
- 8 (19%)
- 9 (19%)

Pal's Mum
Aunt
Mum's friend
Gran
Best Pal
Teacher
Sister's Friend
No-one
Chart 7:2, shows a range of trusted people named by the children. However, grandparents, best friends and teachers rated most highly (fifteen responses), but equally, as the key people the children would trust outwith their immediate family followed by a friend's mum mentioned by four children.

Six themes for trusting adults emerged for non-family members, five of which were the same as for family members, the exception being that of treats. Again, being able to share a problem with an adult who would listen and keep a confidence, being believed, helped and protected were deemed to be the most important indices of trust for non-family members. Fourteen (52%) children mentioned these as being important and are highlighted in the following examples:

"She's (mum's best friend) helped me and has always been friendly towards me. She helps me choose what I buy. She's my friend's mum and mum's friend and she's been friendly with my mum for years" (Female E group).

"Cause she's (Gran) helpful. She understands me" (Female C group).

"Because if you've got a problem at school you can go and tell her (teacher). Because I know she'd help me" (Male E group).

"Because we visit her (Gran) on Saturdays and Sundays and she's easy to talk to. Because sometimes when we stay with her at the weekend I can just ask her if I need help" (Male E group).

"She's (teacher) been trained to care about children. She said she felt awful about lying through the exercise (the simulation). She would sit down and listen and take you somewhere quiet if something happened at home or something" (Female C group).

In terms of safety and protection being important indices of trust between children and adults outwith the family, six (22%) children, four in the control group and two in the experimental group, mentioned this. Two examples follow:
"Because he (best friend) helps you. He tries to tell you what to do. When we were going to X, he asked whether we should go because there are always fights between X and Y to see who controls the bridge" (Male C group).

"My two big cousins asked me to go out at half past ten and she (mum's friend) said 'Ye might forget when yer talking to your friend and someone might take you away" (Male, C group).

In common with the themes for family members, confidentiality was mentioned by three (11%) of the children:

"She (best friend) doesn't go about telling people things. She's my best friend" (Female E group).

"Cause she (teacher) helps you with a lot of things. She's there for to tell her things. She can keep secrets. If I told her something like if I was scared of my cousin and I told her not to tell, I don't think that she would" (Female C group).

"That he's my best friend and keeps secrets" (Male E group).

Treats was the last theme to emerge as an indicator of trust for people outwith the nuclear family mentioned by two (7%) of the children:

"She (sister's friend) takes me to the Centre" (Female C group).

"Cause when I go into his (male friend of mum) hoose, he gives me stuff to eat and that. He gives me money and I stay with him" (Male C group).

v) Is there anything else you would like to say about being involved in the simulation exercise?
 Twenty-five (93%) of the twenty-seven children gave additional comments about being involved in the simulation exercise. The key theme to emerge was that either the exercise or the Programme itself had been a positive experience. Given the area of inquiry, the use of some leading questions in the post questionnaires and the sensitivity of the subject matter, socially desirable responses have undoubtedly influenced these findings.
(Potter 1979). Thirteen (48%) of the children mentioned the benefits of the Programme or the simulation exercise. Three examples follow:

"I think its really good, its helped a lot of people and children in keeping safe" (Female E group).

"Don't talk to strangers. Don't take their bags. Other children should go through it. Its good cause if ye went ye know that time you were safe but the next time you won't be so you should say no and get the teacher" (Male C group).

"I think it good for children because if an adult comes up to them they'll know what to do. Its very good" (Female, E group).

The next theme to emerge, exclusively confined to the children in the experimental group, was a realistic feeling of confidence combined with a knowledge of safety. Eight (53%) of the children in the experimental group commented on this. Three examples follow:

"That its helped me with other things, both the programme and the exercise. I'm much more secure and would know what to do if a stranger came to me again" (Male).

"I enjoyed 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' and feel more able to cope if I ever met a stranger" (Male).

"Its good. Glad I got it. I know a lot more. Am more able and more confident to handle the situation" (Male).

Another theme to emerge was the need for all children to go through the simulation exercise. Four (31%) of the children from the control group mentioned this. Three examples follow:

"Watch yourself. Other children should get the exercise so that they know what it feels like and they know what to do" (Female).
"It's important for other children to know about personal safety. You should do the exercise on other children so that they always know what to do" (Female).

"I feel the exercise makes you more aware and all children should go through the exercise. The personal safety programme should go to all children in the world" (Female).

Some individual comments:

"They shouldn't go with strangers. I learned to tell somebody" (Female C group).

"The Feeling Yes, Feeling No programme has helped me a lot with personal safety cause if I did not know personal safety I might just have went with the man" (Female E group).

Finally, and somewhat worrying, from a child who failed the simulation:

"I wouldn't tell anyone that I had been involved in this exercise" (Male C group).

(This information was passed to the Class Teacher for action).

The Children's Views on the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme

The following data, unsolicited by the writer, 'appeared' on the back of the questionnaires of the children in the experimental group. The information had apparently been prompted by the Class Teacher who had suggested to the children that they may wish to include any additional comments of their own on the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme. All twenty eight (100%) children gave additional comments none of which were negative. Three themes emerged - the Programme was positive, the children's personal safety knowledge had increased, and children should receive personal safety training at a much younger age.

Firstly, the experience of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme had been a positive one. Twenty (91.4%) children mentioned this as shown in the following examples:
"I think the lessons were good because it could keep a lot of people safe because no one put out Feeling "yes" Feeling "no" a lot of people in Britain would be killed I thin the lessons was very good because it learned me lots of new think about keeping my self safe" (Male).

"I think that this programme is really good and it really taught me more about how to keep myself safe and that if someone did try to take me away I should say no and to tell an adult I trust and it taught me what a stranger is" (Female).

"I think that personal safety is much better for children. Personal safety has made me feel much safer now that I have saw it and it is much better for children. I think it will help children much more to keep safe. If there wasn't personal safety children might not of known what to do if some one sexual assalted some one. And if I get sexual assalted I know what to do and I shall tell an adult and now I know the three stranger questions and the five good responses mean I can use the three stranger questions if I need them I am glad there was a personal safety program" (Female).

Secondly, the children's personal safety knowledge had been increased. This was mentioned by eleven (39.2%) children as highlighted in the following illustrations:

"I think the personal safety program is very good because it teachers children how to be safe. I learned a lot on this programme" (Male).

"I think this exercise was useful and has helped me a lot. I will use the skills at ant time if I need to. I hope my information about what I think has helped you too with your questions. It was a pleasure doing them for you. Personal safety was good and it will also learn to keep children safe at any day or time. When I got the first sheet I didn't have a clue what to do, but now I've had done personal safety I have a good idea about what its like and now I understand how to keep myself safe. Well sue thank-you for your help its very good" (Female).

"I have learned a very lot on feeling "Yes" feeling "No" like if someone does something to you just look them straight in the eye and shout No! and you have too look after your own health and safety" (Female).
Lastly, that younger children should receive a personal safety programme. Five (17.8%) of the children saw this as important. Three illustrations follow:

"I am glad you gave this program to us it has helped a lot and I would no what to do if a stranger came up to me and said something like if he said would you like to come into the car I would ask the three stranger questions first and my spelling might be wrong but I like it and I think it should go down to p.1. I think it was very good i'm glad you make it up" (Male).

"I think that the program should be shown to the fives and fore I have learned a lot about feeling yes and feeling no and if a boy or girl was to be sexual assaulted it would be the grown ups fault" (Female).

"I think that personal safety was a great help. I liked the programme very much. But I think that you should give it to children a bit younger like from P.4. and up. But it is a great help to children. The three stranger questions are good but you should tell children about them in P3-P7. If children now have got a problem then I am sure they will take your advice and go to an adult they trust I THINK IT WAS GOOD" (Female).

The implications of these findings are addressed in Chapter Nine.

Summary of Findings

The data in this chapter confirm that the children in the experimental group had a more realistic view of a stranger. Unlike the control group, they did not have a stereotypical view of either the gender or physical characteristics of a stranger. Moreover, the majority of these children were able to provide the Programme definition of a stranger and see a stranger being of either gender.

The themes - of being understood, believed, protected having a confidence kept by trusted adults - for trusting both family and non-family members are of considerable interest in that, as it is these very areas which are often breached by sexual offenders in the 'grooming' process (e.g. Conte et al 1989). Furthermore, these breaches usually are accompanied by threats which can also cause long term psychological
and emotional damage in victims (Finkelhor 1986). The reasons the children gave for trusting both family members and people outwith their family, highlights the complexity of the task facing programme makers in child sexual abuse prevention programmes.

The data also confirmed that, for the majority of children, the simulation exercise had been a positive experience. The findings show that every child in the experimental group felt positive about, and valued, the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme. They also felt their personal safety knowledge had been enhanced and that younger children should receive the Programme.

Having heard the voices of the children on their perception of strangers and their views on the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme, the next chapter will look at another part of the jigsaw in helping children keep safe - the views of the parents and whether the children were able to generalise any of the strategies learned to the real world.
CHAPTER EIGHT

THE PARENTS' VIEWS AND CHILDREN'S USAGE OF THE 'FEELING YES, FEELING NO' PROGRAMME

"In spite of the possible advantages, relatively few efforts have been made to involve parents (in preventing child sexual abuse). One reason may be that parents have a difficult time talking to their children about sexual topics of all sorts" (Haugaard & Repucci 1988 pp. 317-318).

Introduction

The above quotation highlights the fact that a key group - parents - have seldom figured in the research efforts in the field of child sexual abuse prevention. Although parents' views of the simulation exercise have been reported in Chapter Six, this chapter examines the parental views on child sexual abuse prevention programmes and whether the children could generalise any of the learned knowledge and skills to the real world.

For the first part of the analysis, the data is drawn from the post-parental questionnaires. For the second part of the analyses, the schedule of notification of usage of the programme was used and implemented for both groups in the fifteen-month follow-up. These data have been analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The same approach was adopted for the qualitative analysis as outlined in the last chapter in respect of the children's questionnaires.

The parental post-questionnaires for the control and experimental group were different in content as at the time of the data collection, the parents in the control group had not seen the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme. So, for the purpose of this analysis, their views were sought on the broader issues e.g. should schools teach such programmes? On the other hand, the parents of the experimental group had been involved in previewing the material and monitoring their children throughout the teaching of the Programme. Consequently, they were asked for their views on the 'Feeling Yes,
This chapter addresses the following topics:-

- The research questions.
- The parents' views of child sexual abuse prevention programmes.
- Generalisation of programme strategies.
- Usage of programme strategies in an attempted abduction and rape.
- Discussion of findings.

The Research Questions

The final research questions examined:

5. What are the parents' views of child sexual abuse prevention programmes?

6. Are children able to generalise knowledge and skills from the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme to real life situations?

Twenty-five (89%) of the twenty-eight parents in the experimental group returned their questionnaires compared with twenty (74%) of the twenty-seven parents in the control group. Overall, forty-five (82%) of the fifty-five parents in the study returned completed post-questionnaires.

The Parents' Views on Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Programmes

The Control Group

As previously explained, for this part of the analyses, only two questions in the post-questionnaire appertained to the research question on the parental views of the programme. The first question asked:

(i) Do you think your school should teach sexual abuse prevention programmes?

Eighteen (90%) of the twenty parents who responded agreed that the school should teach sexual abuse prevention programmes. Interestingly, two (10%) parents felt it was not the role of the
school to do so. The next question asked:

(ii) Do you think parents should be partners with the school in keeping children safe?

Parents were unanimous in their response to this question: every parent (100%) said that both home and school should be partners in keeping children safe.

The Experimental Group

Six questions were asked of these parents.

(i) Since being taught the personal safety programme ’Feeling Yes, Feeling No’ has your child asked you any questions about the topic?

Twelve (48%) of the twenty-five parents who returned their post-questionnaires, said that their children had asked about the questions. Seven were the parents of girls, the remainder parents of boys. Varied themes emerged. Three children sought clarification about what they should do in a potentially dangerous situation:

"If asked by a stranger for directions what should she do?"

"My daughter asked if I would ever send someone she didn’t know to pick her up from school."

"She has told me what she would do in a situation and asked me if I thought this was right."

Two parents reported their children needed further clarification on sexual assault as demonstrated in the following examples:

"What does sexual mean - this was explained in full and discussed with the child."

"Asked about toughing (sic) private parts. What to do about it. If anybody done anything like that to him he wanted to know if that was sexual assault."

Another two parents highlighted their children’s needs to seek clarification of specific strategies advocated in the Programme:
"If I knew what the five good responses were."

"What are the responses. What are the three stranger questions?"

Two of the parents stated that their children had asked specifically about strangers:

"What bad things they do."

"Why do bad people want to hurt us?"

The remaining questions were:

"Our body is not dirty is it?"

"Would I believe him"

"Could it happen to me. Other than that we just had a general discussion regarding the video content."

"Did I have a personal safety programme when I was young."

(ii) In your opinion, what effect did the personal safety programme 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' have on your child?

The parents in the experimental group were offered three different categories to rate the Programme's effect on their children:

i) Very good overall effect.

ii) Bad overall effect.

iii) No effect.

All twenty five (100%) parents who returned their post-questionnaires were unanimous that the programme had "a very good overall effect" on their child.

(iii) Please explain your reasons for the box you have ticked.

Twenty four (96%) of the twenty five parents offered additional insight into why they felt the programme had had 'a very good overall effect'. The main theme to emerge, mentioned by

[35] These responses are the same as those used by Hazzard et al (1991).
nineteen (79%) parents in a variety of ways, was the heightened awareness of their children to abduction and sexual assault. The following are some examples:

"He is more aware of what is happening around him when he is outside playing with friends, etc."

"It has made her aware of the kind of society we live in."

"I think it helps the child very much it makes them wary of things which they would not be."

"It helped her realise and understand the very real dangers as well as confirming what she should do."

"I think it is a very good thing for kids to see how easy they can be conned and sometimes it can be by somebody they thought they could trust."

"I think it is good to teach children about safety and life in general and warn them about possible dangers."

"It helped her to realise and understand the very real dangers as well as confirming what she should do. Initially, she was a bit concerned about video No. 2 - okay once reassured."

The second theme was that parents felt their children were more open with them. Three (12%) of the parents mention this as being a contributory factor as evidenced in the following quotes:

"Although my son has not asked questions he has come home and discussed it with me and has been very open about it which I think has been very good."

"She will talk very openly about what she has learned and I think it has given her the confidence to say No."

(iv) Do you think that personal safety programmes like 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' are good for your child?
All twenty five (100%) of parents ticked the 'yes' box, expressing unanimous support for the view that personal safety programmes are beneficial for their children.
(v) Have you any other comments or suggestions to make about the programme?
Nine (36%) parents offered comments and suggestions as follows.
Firstly, that it should be extended in schools:

"Should be part of the education programme in all primary schools."

"I think it should be available to younger children too. Why wait till 10 years? Perhaps the programme could be altered to suit younger children. If I had been asked to give my consent say, 2 years ago, I would have."

"It has made us know how very serious this is and we think it should be extended further in one way or another. Thanks for your concern and excellent work."
Secondly, the programme was highly valued:

"I think the programme was excellent from an adults point of view and it taught children in a very positive way and not too frightening as I had expected! Something for both parents and child to discuss."

"I just think it was a very good idea."

"I think the programme is a very good idea as it teaches children to be more aware of who they are talking to and not just to trust anyone because they are asked to."

"I am very pleased that my child was part of this research programme."

and, finally, two individual, insightful, comments:

"Children are given information where it may not be possible for them to get it anywhere else."

"I think when you tell your own children about these things, they think you are just worried because you are their mum. But when someone else tells them and shows them the video, they tend to take more notice."
(vi) **To the best of your knowledge, has your child used any part of the programme to keep themselves safe?**

At the time of the administration of the post questionnaire, four (16%) parents said that their child had used the programme in the following ways:

"She does not go anywhere alone always in two’s or a number of people."

"She always has someone with her when out at night."

"Thought man at park was watching him and when he left the park to come home man followed for him. He ran home but man went away in other direction."

"A man asked him if he wanted sweets - he used the 3 stranger questions then ran home."

The follow-up data is examined next in an attempt to answer the last research question as to whether any other children (including the two examples above) could generalise knowledge and skills to real life situations.

**Generalisation of Programme Strategies**

As well as the two incidents mentioned in the previous section, by the time the fieldwork was completed in June 1992, the writer had received a further three reports from parents and/or teachers of children in the sample using the programme in potentially dangerous situations.

The first incident occurred in March 1991\(^3\) :

"Heather and a friend were asked by a stranger in a car to come into the car and look at photographs. They said "No" and went to tell Audrey’s mum. They were at a caravan site in Burntisland. Mum went to look but the man and car had gone. She then reported the incident to the site office. They said they would inform the police and other holiday makers."

---

\(^3\) All identifying details have been omitted.
The next incident occurred in May 1991:

"Julie was coming out of the Shopping Centre. A woman whom she did not recognise came up to her and asked her if she wanted a lift home. Julie told me 'I thought of my personal safety right away - I had the no feeling and said "no." She told her mum as soon as she got home.

When we (class teacher and child) discussed it we talked about the fact that it might have been someone who knew her mum and recognised her - she has vivid red hair. Julie was quite insistent that she did not know the woman and her mum did not recognise the description. I reinforced how well she had done to use her personal safety and to tell an adult she trusted right away. The children picked up on the fact that a woman might try to trick you, not just a man."

The final incident was in June 1991:

"Gary was walking home from attending football training. He was by himself and it was raining. A man stopped and offered him a lift. It was a quiet road surrounded by woods. He got the 'no' feeling, shout no and ran away. He told his mum when he got home. He told me a few days later. He said he thought of his personal safety questions at once."

Usage of Programme Strategies in an Attempted Abduction and Rape

In August 1991, a child in a school, half a mile from the experimental school, was attacked on her way to secondary school. She had been taught the Programme some six months previously. In October 1991, the Director of Education received the following letter from the child's father:

Dear Mr Semple

"Personal Safety Programme"

I refer to the above and wish to advise you that I am the father of a 12 year old girl who was recently attacked on her way to school by a 23 year old man who tried to rape her.
My daughter is a beautiful, intelligent innocent child and was doing nothing more than sitting waiting on a path for her two friends to join her before walking to secondary school to commence her second day there.

The pervert who attacked her subjected her to the most horrifying and disgusting ordeal but throughout my daughter resisted and fought with him to such an extent that he did not rape her but instead allowed her to go. Because of my daughter the police were able to arrest the person responsible the next day. It later came to light that he attacked two other twelve year old girls and a woman a few days before and he is presently awaiting trail on all three charges.

The reason I am writing to you is to advise you that my daughter has told me that she knew how to fight off her attacker because of the "Personal Safety Programme" taught to her at primary school.

I am of the opinion that if it had not been for the instruction given to her that the attack on my daughter would have been much more serious. Indeed I feel that she could well have been raped or strangled to death.

I would therefore wish you to ensure that such instruction be given to all primary school pupils as a matter of course so that they too would be in a position to resist any such attack and instead of being the victim become the victor.

Cost is nothing in comparison with the life of a young one and I thank you and the education department for the life of my daughter."

The perpetrator of this attack was subsequently sentenced to seven years imprisonment at the High Court in Edinburgh in December 1991 having been convicted of assault with intent to ravish this child.

Summary of Findings

The findings show that the majority of the parents in the control group, in the absence of having viewed the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme, still felt the school had a key role to play in teaching children personal safety. Furthermore, all of these parents were of the
opinion that parents should be a partner with the school in keeping children safe.

Overwhelmingly, the parents in the experimental group valued the programme and were of the opinion that it was the role of school to teach personal safety in partnership with parents. They were unanimous in their view that the programme had had "a very good overall" effect on their children. Given the area of inquiry, some leading questions in the post questionnaire, and the sensitivity of the subject matter, socially desirable responses have undoubtedly influenced these findings in both the control and experimental groups (Crino et al 1985; Furnham 1986; Peters & Fox 1993). This said, the results contrast with the study by Hazzard et al (1991) whose sample of children were very similar in age and exposed to the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme. The American researchers found that only 69% of parents reported that the Programme had "a good effect overall". No parent rated the Programme as producing "a bad effect overall", but 31% had not noticed any effect.37

In direct contrast to the situation prior to the onset of the programme where the majority of parents in the sample found it difficult to talk to their children about sexual assault, the parents of the children in the experimental group were able to share the programme with their children and faced some difficult sensitive questions. It is reasonable to project that this opening up of communication between parents and children in the experimental group augurs well for the future, when these children in their adolescent years, will probably have to face many decisions in difficult and sensitive areas of their personal and social development e.g. HIV/AIDS, drugs, alcohol abuse.

Lastly, the data shows that, in this particular sample, some children were able to generalise programme strategies to the real world. Children, questioned the appropriateness of adults' requests, in five potential abductions. Of more serious consequence, for a child, not in the sample, there was evidence of the successful use of programme

37 The reader is reminded that only 46 % of the parents returned their questionnaires. Therefore, the views of more than half of the parents remain unknown.
strategies in an actual attempted abduction and rape.

Having completed the data analyses and answered the research questions, the implications of these findings are addressed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER NINE

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

"And nature has no use for the plea that one 'did not know'. Not knowing acts like guilt" (Jung 1954).

Introduction

As demonstrated in the Literature Review, it is difficult to think of an area where the applicability of the latter part of the above quotation could have more resonance and adverse reinforcing effects than with victims of child sexual abuse. As part of an overall strategy, society has to face up to how our children are to obtain information about the prevention of child abduction and child sexual assault if they are to be in a position to take some responsibility for their own health and safety. The findings in this study make a contribution to this debate.

This chapter addresses the following :-

▲ Overview of the study.
▲ Limitations of the study.
▲ Knowledge results.
▲ The consequences of stranger abduction.
▲ Attribution of fault for sexual assault.
▲ The stranger abduction simulation.
▲ The research questions.
▲ Generalisability of the findings.
▲ Theoretical issues.
▲ Future research recommendations.

Overview of the Study

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of the child abduction and sexual abuse prevention programme, 'Feeling Yes,
Feeling No’, on a knowledge and behavioural measure between children in an experimental and a control group. Six null hypotheses were tested and six research questions were investigated.

The sample consisted of fifty-five children, twenty-eight in the experimental group and twenty-seven in the control group. Prior to the Programme, tests were completed by the teachers to provide an ability, behavioural and cognitive style rating for each child. The children’s parents completed a pre-questionnaire which included demographic data and the advice they had given to their children on encounters with strangers. The children completed a pre- and post-knowledge test which included two vignettes on stranger abduction. At the time of nomination, the control school had no knowledge or experience of any child for whom they had responsibility having been sexually abused. However, after the schools had been matched and the standardised tests administered, a male member of staff was convicted of sexually abusing several children. Furthermore, the number of children directly affected by this, is unknown.

A sub-set of twenty-eight children drawn from both groups took part in a 'blind' simulation of a stranger abduction. Considerable care was taken and built-in safeguards were included in the research design to ensure no child was placed at risk. This group of children were subsequently interviewed about their views and feelings of being involved in the simulation. The views of the parents and the teachers were also sought on this. Specifically, the area of desensitisation to approaches by strangers through the usage of the simulation method was examined. The post-questionnaire for all the parents sought their views on personal safety programmes. The children were followed up for fifteen months to ascertain whether they were able to generalise any of the Programme strategies to real life situations.

Written informed consent was obtained from the parents of all subjects before the administration of the standardised tests and research instruments. Parents were offered access to the standardised tests as well as the ratings for their child, all the research instruments and the study findings. All parents of the children involved in the simulation
saw the audio-visual recording of their child and completed a further consent to allow these results to be reported in this study.

**Limitations of the Study**

The results of this study must be seen within the limitations in the scope and methodology:

- The sample size was relatively small and the sub-set of children in the simulation exercise involved only twenty-eight children.
- The reader is reminded that as Lothian Regional Council Education Department nominated both schools, randomisation was not possible. Consequently, the results may not be wholly representative. Despite this, these children are not atypical and are fairly representative of many primary schools in Lothian Region.
- The control group represented a skewed distribution on the Rutter Measure and would not therefore be considered representative on this behavioural measure.
- The Kagan Cognitive Style Test was not applied in its original form. Nevertheless, given the practical constraints, the style adopted was felt to be appropriate for the area of enquiry.
- Pre-test sensitisation was not controlled for.
- In the ratings of the simulation of the stranger abduction, in the quest to try and establish the beginnings of a body of normative data of risk factors to abduction, the research design had to be compromised and the writer's own ratings were used to make comparisons with other studies.
- In the data analyses, some of the assumptions applying to the use of statistical tests were violated.
- Given the sensitivity of the subject matter, social desirability of responses has undoubtedly been an influencing factor in the responses of all the respondents.

Campbell & Stanley (1963) differentiate possible confounding variables according to whether they pose threats to internal or external validity.

---

38 The writer is an advisor in personal safety and child abuse to 243 primary schools in Lothian Region.
Bracht & Glass (1968) later expanded these variables to include pre-test sensitisation. As the design of this study required that both control and experimental groups take the pre-test to check their equivalence and provide a knowledge base-line for the simulation exercise, pre-test sensitisation could not be controlled for. The post-test knowledge scores of the control group would suggest that pre-test sensitisation, and/or parental advice, and/or the incident in the school, probably influenced these results.

In relation to possible threats to internal validity, the following events must also be taken into account: -

- Between the control school being selected and the administration of the research instruments, a male member of staff was charged, and convicted of, sexually abusing three male pupils while using the school in the evening for youth activities. These children were one year older than the children in the study sample. Subsequently, however, another group of three pupils also stated they had been abused by the same person. Some of this latter group were in the study sample and it is impossible to say how many other children may have been affected. Unexpectedly, (and confirming that this Programme enables some children to take action to stop abuse - see Chapter Three re Aims of Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Programmes), the disclosures were made when the control group started the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme. What is not in doubt, however, is that these events have confounded the findings in this study.

- During the administration of the research instruments, events in Orkney (see page one, Chapter One) became public knowledge. The ensuing debate on the right of the state to intervene in the sanctity of family life and the appropriateness of the responses of the professionals involved received national publicity over a prolonged period. From the writer's experience of meeting parents in the control group, this situation created further anxiety, since throughout the data collection period, these parents did not know what the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme involved. It is to their credit that they agreed to their children's continuation in the study.
The last source of threat to the internal validity is that an interaction of selection and maturation may have taken place. It is acknowledged that even although both the control and experimental groups were matched on a number of dimensions and had approximately the same $t_1$ scores, in the absence of randomisation, the possibility exists that other differences which distinguished the group may have been mistaken for the independent variable.

Although this study involved data from pupils, parents and the teachers and observational data, the study was not set up as a multivariate analyses. The findings of the six null hypotheses and the six research questions are now discussed.

Knowledge Results

The first hypothesis ($H_{01}$) postulated:

'There will be no difference in the gain in mean knowledge scores between the experimental and control group.'

Contrary to most other research findings and all other evaluations of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, (Hamilton 1989; Hazzard et al 1991; Sigurdson et al 1987) broadly speaking, the post-test results showed significant gains in mean knowledge scores for both groups. Although evaluating a different personal safety programme ('Kidscape') and using different research instruments, the findings in this study concur with the only other Scottish study with primary school children conducted in Glasgow by Mayes et al (1991). These researchers suggested that the increased knowledge gains in the control group may well have been attributable to pre-test sensitisation or to schools who were already predisposed to personal safety training.

While pre-test sensitisation may have contributed to the increase in knowledge scores in both groups in this study, it does not fully explain why the control group did considerably better on those questions involving male abuse. It is the writer's opinion, that the extraneous event previously referred to, and/or action by parents, made an impact.
on the knowledge levels of some of the children in the control group. However, given Hazzard et al.'s (1991) findings that there was no correlation with knowledge gains with previous information on sexual assault prevention from parents, no firm conclusions can be drawn as to which factors had a direct/greater influence on the post-test results of the control group; however, the children in the Hazzard et al study did not experience abuse by a member of staff. It would appear that the victimisation of some children by a member of staff, the further disclosures from the children in the sample, the high profile of the court case and media coverage, may have prompted some of the parents in the control group, at the time the Programme was being taught, to provide their children with knowledge which might prevent their victimisation/further victimisation. Although highly speculative on the writer's part, these two factors appear the most plausible explanations as to why children in the control group scored particularly well on those knowledge questions dealing with male abuse.

In relation to parents providing their children with information on sexual assault, the post-test gains by the control group are in direct contrast to the situation pre-programme, when the majority of parents - forty-two (85.7%) of the forty-nine parents in the sample - felt unable to discuss with their children that sexual assault was a likely consequence of stranger abduction. Pre-programme, parents found it easier to discuss kidnapping and murder as a likely consequence of stranger abduction with their children in comparison with sexual assault. In the writer's opinion, this may well be attributable to their own cultural upbringing which probably included sexual matters not being discussed openly, thus placing these parents at considerable disadvantage in discussing this sensitive area with their children. This is confirmed in the research by (Finkelhor 1986) who stated:

"A more profound problem for parent as in talking about sexual abuse, and what differentiates sexual abuse from kidnapping, is that it concerns sex. Parents have a notoriously difficult to me talking to their children about sexual topics of all sorts. This generalised difficulty with sexual topics has not been well investigated, but sex educators (Roberts et al 1978) have posited a number of factors that are also possibly at work in the case of sexual abuse."
Firstly, parents often feel they lack the knowledge, vocabulary and practice to speak about sexual matters. They fear embarrassing themselves in front of their children by appearing ignorant, tongue-tied or confused. Secondly, sexual topics trigger strong emotional feelings for parents, reminders of sexual embarrassments, traumas or disappointments in their own lives. Lastly, parents are unsure about their own values in sexual matters, and are aware that sexual discussions may oblige them to talk about matters of value, opinion, or even personal experience. All of these concerns may be triggered when a parent contemplates a discussion of sexual abuse with their child.

The pre-programme responses of the parents in this study also contrast with the findings in the American studies (Berrick & Gilbert 1991; Nibert et al 1986), where the researchers found that pre-programme, 64% and 81% of the parents respectively had discussed sexual assault with their pre-school children. Finkelhor & Strapko (1987), comparing the latter results with their own findings in 1984, when only 29% of parents had discussed sexual assault with their children, suggested that the publicity surrounding the McMartin case (which involved allegations of multiple abuse against pre-school children) heightened the awareness of parents in these studies and caused them to take action. The daily media cover of the Orkney Inquiry (Clyde 1992) in Scotland one might have thought would have similarly caused parents to talk to their children about sexual assault but the findings pre-programme suggest otherwise. Thus, it would appear from the post-test results of the control group, that only when parents felt their own children were at direct risk of sexual assault or had been sexually assaulted were they able to raise these difficult and sensitive matters with them.

This said, the findings in the knowledge questionnaires cannot be passed over without some comment on cultural influences on child-rearing practices in Scotland and male socialisation processes. The pre-test data revealed a cultural norm whereby more than half (56%) of the children in the sample saw themselves as primarily passive and acquiescent when adults ask them to do things. Moreover, because the children did not have knowledge about what constitutes "good" and
"bad" secrets, more than half (53%) of the children also saw it as appropriate to keep a secret when asked by an adult to do so.

In relation to male socialisation, it is clear from the knowledge pre-test that despite actual on-site experience of sexual assault of some of the boys in the control group, thirty-three (60%) of the children in the sample did not know if boys were sexually assaulted. However, for the twenty-two (40%) children who answered correctly, fifteen were in the control group demonstrating a greater awareness of males as possible victims. The reader is reminded that the Orkney Inquiry (Clyde 1992), which included allegations against boys, was receiving full publicity throughout most of the period of this study. Therefore, all of the children had media exposure to this issue; moreover, the issue of sexual abuse had a high profile on-site at the control school, not only because boys were sexually abused, but also the court case of the member of staff took place at the time of the data collection. One conclusion which could be drawn is that the actual experience of sexual abuse on-site made a far greater impact on the children's knowledge in the control school, particularly those issues involving male abuse, than did national publicity or initial parental advice. This would appear to be the most likely explanation for the pre-test knowledge differences between the groups.

The irony of the sexual assault by the staff member was never lost on the writer. It merely served to confirm the need to provide children with information on sexual assault prevention, appropriate to their age and stage of cognitive development. While a matter of speculation, it is worth noting, that it was the view of both the teachers and parents in the control group that, had the children had the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, either this incident would not have happened or the matter would have reported at a much earlier stage. An unexpected benefit of the Programme was that the second group of boys who reported being sexually assaulted by the same member of staff did so as a direct consequence of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme.

The first null hypothesis was therefore accepted. It is the writer's opinion that the fact there was no difference (p <0.05) in the mean
knowledge scores between the experimental and control group could be attributed to sampling error, chance or extraneous variables. It is difficult, if not impossible, to extrapolate which, if any of these factors, had greatest influence.

The second hypothesis \((H_{O2})\) investigated:

'There will be no difference in the gain in mean knowledge scores between the experimental and control group between children of different :-

i) ability ratings;

ii) behavioural scores;

iii) cognitive styles.'

There was evidence to suggest that children in the experimental group in the highest ability range did better in knowledge gains in comparison with the same grouping in the control group. However, given the small numbers, further studies will be required to confirm this. Despite the control group being identified as a highly disturbed group of children on the Rutter Behavioural Measure, the findings confirmed that neither behavioural scores or cognitive styles were determinant factors in the mean knowledge gains of the children. With the exception of the increase in knowledge gain scores by children in the highest ability range in the experimental group, the second null Hypothesis was therefore retained.

The Consequences of Stranger Abduction

The third hypothesis \((H_{O3})\) predicted:

'There will be no difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to predict sexual assault as a likely consequence of stranger abduction.'

In the stranger vignettes, this null hypothesis was rejected at the 0.05 level of significance in respect of the male child, Stephen, but retained for the female child, Jane. However, the context of both vignettes were different and therefore the results were not comparable. It is evident that, for most of the children in the study, their perception pre-
programme was that a female child, in what is likely to have been a context that most children had been warned about by their parents (the request by the stranger to get into a car on her way home from school) was much more likely to be the victim of sexual assault than a male child (where the request by the stranger was to accompany him to the amusement arcade from a fairground).

The 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme, teaches children that both males and females can sometimes be victims of sexual abuse, thus requiring pre-pubescent males to recognise they can also be possible victims. The findings in this study support Programme effectiveness in that the experimental group were significantly more able than the control group to predict that the male child could be a victim of sexual assault in the post-test stranger vignettes. Although speculation on the writer's part, this may have wider implications. The reader is reminded that studies consistently found perpetrators in the same age range as children in this study (Hengller 1989; Horne et al 1991; Monck et al 1991) and that incestuous fathers consistently demonstrated difficulties in empathy, nurturance and caretaking (Williams & Finkelhor 1993). Thus it is possible to project that, if prepubescent males are able to identify (empathise) themselves as possible victims of sexual assault, this may go some way to reduce the conditions which predispose males to becoming abusers. While the writer acknowledges this is pure conjecture, it may well be worthy of follow-up study.

In part one of the Literature Review, there were indications from the research carried out on child molesters that abduction took place whenever the opportunity presented itself (Forgione 1976) and although girls are more 'at risk', boys are also potential victims. Indeed as a society, we allow boys greater unsupervised freedom than girls. Boys need to understand that they too are possible victims of abduction and sexual assault and that certain strategies can be adopted to try and prevent their victimisation. The reader is also reminded that the literature supports the view that there is an under-reporting of boys (Swift 1979). It is also worth speculating that if children (and particularly boys) do not know what to expect, when enticed by a stranger, they may be more likely to go away with him/her. This is
supported in part two of the Literature Review on social learning theory on learning by response consequences. Clearly, in many instances, behaviour is influenced if consequences of actions are understood, especially if they have serious negative outcomes. This was borne out in the qualitative data from the children in the simulation exercise.

The writer would conclude, that if we are to arm children, and particularly boys, with information about the prevention of child abduction and sexual assault, then the school has a crucial role to play in this as parents feel unable to do this on their own. Furthermore, although parents in this study wanted to be partners in helping to keep their children safe, the vast majority of them valued the school taking the lead role. The reader is reminded that pre-programme, only seven (14.3%) of the forty-nine parents who returned their questionnaires, had been able to discuss with their children that sexual assault was a likely consequence of stranger abduction. Where parents failed in this task, the Class Teacher of the children in the experimental group appears to have succeeded.

The need to involve parents remains a constant challenge in this field, particularly in light of the research findings on what perpetrators think is important in the prevention of child sexual abuse (Budin & Johnson 1989; Conte et al 1989). In identifying vulnerable victims, the researchers noted that offenders tended to select children from broken homes. Therefore, any attempt to inform parents (and particularly single parents) of the problem and bolster their parenting skills must be viewed positively. Furthermore, in the study by Budin & Johnson (1989), offenders specifically stated that involving parents in child sexual abuse prevention programmes would be of benefit to the children and increase their protection from such abuse.

Hypothesis Three was therefore retained in respect of the female vignette but rejected for the male vignette in that a significant result (p < 0.05) was obtained for the experimental group who were significantly more able to predict that sexual assault was a likely consequence than
were the control group. This finding, in the writer’s opinion, demonstrates Programme effectiveness.

**Attribution of Fault for Sexual Assault**

The fourth hypothesis ($H_{o4}$) postulated:

‘There will be no difference in the pre- and post-test comparisons between the experimental and control group being able to attribute fault appropriately for sexual assault.’

Despite the context of both vignettes being different, this null hypothesis was rejected at the 0.05 level of significance in respect of both the male and female vignettes, yet again, illustrating Programme effectiveness. No other study in this area could be traced by the writer. This, in the writer’s opinion, is an important finding, as blame, guilt and self-recrimination can have serious consequences for many victims of sexual assault (Finkelhor 1986; Summit 1983). While acknowledging this finding relates to stranger abduction, although more complex, it is reasonable to project that the principles underpinning such a concept may be transferable to situations of intra-familial abuse in which case there are greater implications.

As demonstrated in the Literature Review, a form of secondary victimisation of children who have been sexually assaulted by adults is to attribute fault to victims for the abuse (Adams-Tucker 1982; Browne & Finkelhor 1986). Victim-blaming is problematic for many reasons, particularly those in the mental health field as to absolve a victim’s guilt feelings and self-blaming is considered to be one of the primary treatment goals (Herman 1981; Sgroi 1982). According to Tsai & Wagner (1978), victims frequently suffer from self-blame and it has been suggested that the persistence of guilt feelings and self-recrimination later develops into psychological problems, including anxiety and depression (Herman 1981; Renshaw & Renshaw 1977).

Adults and children, retrospectively recounting their childhood experiences of sexual abuse, have consistently reported that they were made to feel guilty, responsible, dirty and ashamed e.g. Berliner &
Conte (1990). Victims have also felt confused about the conventions which should govern relationships between adults and children. Many mistrust (or hate) all men. As illustrated in part one of the Literature Review, those victims who subsequently form relationships with men often experience long-lasting marital difficulties (Armstrong 1978; Forward & Buck 1978; London Rape Crisis 1984; Sereny 1984).

There are many reasons why children (and later adult survivors) hold themselves responsible. The abusers may have told them it was their fault. This situation is also borne out in the writer's experience, having worked in prison with, and prepared Social Inquiry Reports on, sexual offenders: "She was asking for it" being a defence to justify their actions. If victims told, they might have been punished or blamed. Religious values may have reinforced this - sin, hell and damnation may have figured in the victim's self-recrimination. If it was intra-familial abuse, it can be less painful to take on the blame than to accept the reality of your situation - that the adults who were supposed to take care of you, and protect you, were trying to hurt you. There are certain circumstances that make survivors feel even more responsible for the abuse: if your body responded, if you experienced sexual pleasure or enjoyed the closeness that came with the abuse, you may take these things as proof that it was really your fault. If you did not say "No", sought out the attention, or were abused by a sibling you may feel particular shame. An additional direct consequence of blaming children for their own sexual victimisation has been suggested by Russell (1984). She has argued that when victims internalise responsibility for the abuse, guilt replaces or averts anger and the potential for self-protection is undermined. Ironically, this in turn, leaves the person vulnerable to subsequent victimisation.

Clearly, this finding of children being able to attribute blame appropriately within the context of the stranger vignettes, may not only reduce self-recrimination and aid victim recovery, but may also ensure that victims have some defence mechanisms to thwart any future abusive approaches. Anecdotally, the police have reported that interviews with the child who fought off the attempted rape and murder (reported in the previous chapter) were greatly helped by the
fact that the child's starting point was that it was not her fault.

However, the attribution of blame to the victim is not limited to abusers. The high incidence of child sexual abuse in Britain (Baker & Duncan, 1985), coupled with related problems in psycho-social adjustment that victims sometimes experience, suggests that the door is wide open for intervention by a variety of helping professionals. Although the concept of system-induced trauma has generally been applied to treatment of victims by the legal/medical/judicial system (Bander, Fein & Bishop 1982; Brassard & Tyler 1984; Burgess & Holstrom 1978; Butler-Sloss 1988; Clyde 1992), it is possible for any professional to revictimise the person through insensitive handling of the case. One of the ways in which such revictimisation can occur is by professionals either consciously or unconsciously attributing blame to the child victim for the sexual assault.

Some people may find it unlikely that professionals could further contribute to the child's victimisation but the literature reveals a different picture. Researchers and clinicians have often made statements in the literature that either explicitly or implicitly infer that the child is in some way to blame for the abuse. The child is frequently characterised as the seducer who actually instigates sexual relations (Brant & Tiszard 1977; Blumberg 1978; Krieger et al 1989; Schultz 1973). Child victims are also sometimes depicted as partially responsible for the assault because of failure to totally resist the adults' requests (Sloan & Karpinski 1942) or because of signs of responsiveness to the adult were in evidence (Harbert et al 1974).

Furthermore, Finkelhor (1984) concluded from his 1981 survey of Boston parents that children are viewed as substantially responsible for sexual victimisation by adults in any instances in which they do anything less than object strenuously. In another study by Waterman & Foss-Goodman (1984) involving 360 college students, 38.5% of the subjects assigned some degree of fault to the victim, the most common reason given was that the child "should have resisted." This experience has also been borne out by the writer during this study: the Head Teacher, in the control school, having initially failed to believe
the first group of boys who disclosed sexual abuse as they were "known trouble-makers", and "I could not believe the member of staff was capable of doing this," then proceeded to blame them as "they should not have been hanging about the school after cubs."

So we have the somewhat tragic situation from the victim's perspective that not only may they have blamed themselves for the abuse but the perpetrator will probably have made great efforts to attribute blame to them. Moreover, this might also be reinforced by intervening professionals. The tragedy is further compounded in that, if the blame is internalised and replaced by guilt, victims may leave themselves wide-open to further victimisation.

These findings that the experimental group were significantly more able to attribute blame appropriately for sexual assault in the stranger vignettes, again relate to one of the key Programme strategies, that is, "it is not the child's fault if they are sexually abused." This, in the writer's opinion, is an important finding as research findings (Finkelhor 1986), confirmed in the writer's experience, clearly show that children tend to self-recriminate when they have been sexually abused. This is also the case, for example, in divorce (Mitchell 1984; Wallerstein & Kelly (1980). The implications of both the child feeling guilty and that they are to blame for the sexual assault means that many of the professional services are unable to make progress with victims until these issues are dealt with.

Thus, it would appear that these findings of children in the experimental group being significantly more able to attribute blame appropriately for sexual assault than the control group, irrespective of the context of the abduction and/or the gender of the victim, whilst demonstrating Programme impact, may have implications in the therapeutic treatment process particularly if it could be demonstrated that such skills were transferable to situations involving trusted adults/intrafamilial abuse. Further studies will be necessary to examine this. Nevertheless, these finding makes an important

39 The Head Teacher in the control group has given her consent to her responses being reported in this thesis in the hope that it may alert others to these dangers.
contribution to the literature.

The Stranger Abduction Simulation

The fifth hypothesis (H05) examined:
'There will be no difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group.'

On the scores of the raters and the agreed scores of the raters and the writer, this hypothesis was retained as there was no significant finding in either scores; however, some qualification is necessary. As already fully explained in Chapter Six, due to factors outwith the writer's control, the sample size in the simulation was almost halved and the research design had to be compromised. The reader is reminded that every parent, except one, had said that they had given their children advice about stranger abduction. Moreover, in the paper and pencil exercise, with the exception of the child with special needs, every child said the children in the vignettes should not go with the stranger. Contrary to these predicted responses, on the writer's scores, the results showed that children in the experimental were significantly more likely, (twelve (80%) versus five (38.5%), to pass the simulation than children in the control group. Furthermore, despite his response in the vignettes, the child with special needs failed to agree to accompany the 'stranger' in the simulation. These results were achieved despite the fact that both the experimental and control groups were of a similar ability level, and had approximately the same post-test knowledge scores. However, the control group were identified as a much more disturbed group of children including behavioural characteristics and a cognitive style which may have made them more vulnerable to abduction. Weighed against this, however, the control group appeared to have had more parental input on the subject of stranger abduction and sexual assault as well as on-site experience of this problem.

Despite a non-significant finding by the raters, in contrast with the control group, the qualitative data confirmed that the responses of children in the experimental group who passed the simulation, were influenced by the fact that every child, with one exception, said they
had recognised the confederate as a 'stranger.' They also recognised the consequent inherent threat of sexual assault i.e. they had read the situation. As the data in Figures 6:7 and 6:8 demonstrate, the post programme, the experimental group were three times more likely to understand that the consequences of stranger abduction may result in sexual assault and this was evident in the data from the interviews with those children who took part in the simulation exercise. Therefore, in terms of social learning theory, this knowledge appears to have influenced their behaviour in the simulation exercise. Additionally, the experimental group (and, in particular, the child with special needs) had opportunities through the behaviourally-based learning of the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' to practise their personal safety skills. This said, the location and lures presented in the simulation exercise were unique in that they had not been presented as part of the Programme and they therefore required the children to generalise across situations. For the children in the experimental group who passed the simulation, the qualitative data presented in Chapter Six would appear to support further their ability to do this.

According to Jeffrey (1976), the highest level of observational learning is achieved by first organising and rehearsing the modelled behaviour symbolically and then enacting it overtly. Furthermore, through a process of abstract modelling, observers derive the principles underlying specific performances for generating behaviour that go beyond what they have seen or heard (Zimmerman & Rosenthal 1974). Thus, it would appear, that the Programme had greater impact in the responses of the experimental group in the simulation exercise than did any other influence, such as parents or media since the control group had also been subjected to these influences. It would appear that, in particular, the role-play in 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' impacted on these results.

Scored on the same criteria as in the Fryer et al (1987a & b) studies (who also used the simulation method although these researchers were evaluating a different programme and the children were much younger and exposed to a pre-test simulation), the scores by the writer are comparable with their findings. The findings in these studies
showed that the experimental group performed significantly better in the post-test simulation than did the control group. In the Fryer et al (1987b) study, seventeen (78%) of the twenty-three children (compared with twelve (80%) of the fifteen in this study) in the experimental group passed the post-test simulation in comparison to eleven (52%) of the twenty-one (compared with five (38.5%) of the thirteen in this study) in the control group. Furthermore, the improvement from pretest to post-test for the experimental group was also significant, \( p = 0.2 \).

However, a key difference between the studies is that the children in the studies by Fryer et al (1987a & b) had already been pre-tested on the lures. The researchers concluded that the testing showed children had developed the ability to avoid stranger abduction of the type used but that children may still be susceptible to lures not specifically included in the training. The same conclusion was reached by Peterson (1984) who commented that the generalisation of the influence of training on other non-trained problems was that little benefit was seen for either training method (either behavioural or non-behavioural) on areas for which the child had not received explicit training. Unlike the findings in this study, there was no support for the speculation that the less behaviourally specific and concrete method of training would show an advantage in cross-situational generalisation. Two techniques recommended by Stokes & Baer (1977) are part of the teaching methods in the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No'. The first technique is to make the role-play as much like the real situation as possible. The second is to use a cross-section of appropriate examples. The role-play component of the Programme offers such opportunities. This is further confirmed in the work of Yeaton & Bailey (1978) who demonstrated the effectiveness of training in life-like settings on skills being transferable to real life situations.

The reader is reminded from the Literature Review that the behaviourally-based prevention programmes directed at children have been applied in different areas of childhood vulnerability with very successful outcomes (Jones & Kazdin 1980; Jones et al 1981a & b; Rosebaum et al 1981) as well avoidance of contact with strangers who
might be child molesters (Fryer et al 1987a & b; Poche et al 1981). In addition, the study by Peterson (1984) offered a comparison of methods. She found that training children with a behavioural method, utilising modelling and behavioural rehearsal rather than with a discussion method, demonstrated increases in safety skills at post-test and at five month follow-up. Additionally, the two studies by McFall & Marston (1970) and McFall & Twentyman (1973) highlight the importance of rehearsal and modelling training in assertiveness training with adults.

These findings, on children and adults, would appear to concur with the albeit limited findings in evaluations of educational child sexual abuse prevention programmes as described in part one of the Literature Review i.e. those programmes involving a behaviourally-based learning component have more effective outcomes than those that do not. The findings in the simulation exercise in this study, based on the writer's marking and supported by the qualitative data, are no exception. Furthermore, the children in the experimental group, appear to have been able to generalise Programme strategies to a previously untested location and lures.

The last Hypothesis ($H_{O6}$) postulated:

'There will be no difference in the responses to the simulation of a stranger abduction between the experimental and control group between children of different:-

i) ability ratings;

ii) behavioural scores;

iii) cognitive styles.'

As mentioned in Chapter Seven, this analysis had to be abandoned and a more flexible approach adopted with the data.

The Research Questions

The first research question examined:

1. What characteristics make children vulnerable to abduction?
Traditional instrumentation which elicits written or verbal responses to cognitive questions was, on balance, not very helpful in assessing a child's vulnerability to abduction (witness the child with special needs performance in the simulation exercise). The analysis of the data in respect of the first question, however, provided some pointers for future research.

In the knowledge test, there were indicators that the less knowledgeable children, irrespective of grouping, were possibly more at risk. There appeared to be some indication of vulnerability to abduction on the Rutter Measure, particularly for those children who were assessed as having relationship problems. To expand on this, every female child, irrespective of grouping, who failed the simulation had scored on the relationship score on the Rutter Measure. Furthermore, some of these indicators of relationship problems e.g. loner, unable to make peer relationships appear to be supported in the studies on sexual abuse offenders which investigated the personality traits perpetrators identified in children (Budin & Johnson 1989; Conte 1989). The limited findings in this study confirm other studies which examined ability levels and self-esteem as contributory factors in vulnerability to abduction (Fryer et al 1987; Kolko et al 1987).

Despite the fact that the Kagan Test discriminates between impulsive and reflective children, contrary to the writer's expectation, there was no significant result. Nevertheless, it was the writer's observation from the television monitor during the simulation exercise, that the children who, when set to task by their teacher, were easily distracted, fidgety, (also a marker on the Rutter Measure of a child with relationship problems) and unable to concentrate, appeared more ready to go with the 'stranger.' In fact, several of these children were making their way out of the room to help the 'stranger' after he had spoken only seven words of either of the lures:

"Hello there, I'm a bit lost............."

The writer was left with a distinct impression that more imaginative use of the Rutter Measure and/or the Kagan Test, applied in their
original form, or with larger samples, might offer opportunities to
develop a screening device to identify children vulnerable to
abduction.

The only significant differences between the children who passed or
failed the simulation was in their ability to attribute blame
appropriately in the stranger vignettes. However, caution is urged in
all of these findings because of the small sample size, the violation of
some of the key assumptions of the statistical tests, and the skewed
distribution on the behavioural measure in the control group.
Nevertheless, these initial findings, offer some pointers to future
research endeavours.

The second research question investigated:
2. Does the simulation method desensitise children to approaches by
strangers?

These findings, triangulated by the writer, taking into account the
views of the children, their parents and the teachers are important.
Not only do they make a contribution to the literature in the child
sexual abuse prevention field but also to the wider debate of validating
such a research method as the simulation method itself. The reader is
reminded that no other study could be traced by the writer which
examined the effects of the simulation method of stranger abduction
on children.

Consistent with the literature on the importance of role-play and
modelling in behavioural learning, the children viewed their
involvement in the simulation as "good", "positive" and "a good
learning method." Moreover, in comparing it with other ways of
learning, for most of the children, the actual experience of participating
in the simulation had had the greatest learning impact, without
inducing unnecessary fear.

Despite the built-in safeguard of debriefing, two weeks after the
simulation, regrettably, there was some evidence that one child had
been desensitised to approaches by strangers through his involvement
parents nor his teacher felt this to be the case. This was greatly helped, in that, the writer immediately passed this information to the Class Teacher who was continuing with the child for another year (another built-in safeguard in the research design) in order to ensure that there would be opportunities to try and remedy this. On balance, therefore, it would appear that the benefits gained by the vast majority of the children outweighed the concerns of desentisisation expressed by some researchers in the field e.g. Conte (1987). As for the criticisms levelled by Melton (1992) of the simulation technique "being inherently deceptive and invasive of privacy" (p174), unlike previous studies involving this method, both children and parents were fully debriefed and parents asked to complete a further consent to allow the results to be reported in this thesis. Furthermore, even parents with initial reservations about the simulation technique (not shared with the writer) felt that their children had benefited through their involvement in the simulation exercise.

The writer would accept that the lures used in this study were limited. Nevertheless, these findings present limited evidence that some children were able to generalise knowledge and skills learned to new, untested, situations involving possible stranger abduction. In view of the evidence that perpetrators commonly use sophisticated techniques of persuasion and social reinforcement (Wolfe et al 1987), it is questionable whether training in stranger avoidance would significantly diminish children's vulnerability to sexual abuse by people they know and trust. This will have to await further research.

This discussion now looks at self-efficacy theory as it is felt to have particular relevance to the simulation of the stranger abduction. Self-efficacy is concerned with judgments about how well one can organise and execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations that contain many ambiguous, unpredictable and often stressful, elements such as the stranger abduction simulation. However, competent models can teach observers effective strategies for dealing with challenging or threatening situations. This contribution is especially important when perceived inefficacy reflects behavioural deficits rather than misappraisals of skills one possesses such as was in
evidence in the actual simulation. As already mentioned, the experimental group had been exposed to competent role models in the videos in the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme and through the role-play in the classroom. In direct contrast, the control group did not have such opportunities. Moreover, there was evidence that eleven (41%) children in the control group had behavioural problems which had been picked up on the Rutter Measure. Eight (29.6%) of these children also had scored on the relationship score which, according to the research conducted on offenders (Budin & Johnston 1989; Conte et al 1989), may have made them even more vulnerable. Moreover, the Rutter Measure is a reliable indicator of impoverished peer relationships. Considering peers are a major influence for the development and validation of self-efficacy (Bandura 1981), it is also reasonable to suppose that this group of children may also have a lower sense of self-efficacy than their peers. Based on the writer’s scores, this may further explain other reasons why so few of the children in the control group passed the simulation 38.5% compared with 52% in the study by Fryer et al (1987a).

As referred to in part two of the Literature Review, selective self-monitoring can also magnify precepts of self-efficacy if it is the personal successes that are especially noticed and remembered. Research on self-modelling provides suggestive evidence bearing on this enhancement effect (Dowrick 1977). Seeing oneself perform errorlessly can enhance proficiency; it provides further information on how to perform appropriately; and it strengthens self-beliefs that a person can succeed. Thus the simulation exercise may have clear benefits for the children who passed the simulation.

As evidenced in the qualitative data, the Class Teacher in the control school saw considerable value in using the audio-visual recordings in addition to the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme, extending into curricular work in the following year of teaching. She thought the more vulnerable children could benefit from this. To some extent, she was more in touch with this issue as she had a class where there was a disproportionate number of children with behavioural difficulties. The Literature Review on social learning theory illustrates that there
are other factors which prevent the individual translating appropriate behaviour to real life situations at a cognitive level. Skills are not perfected through observation alone, nor are they developed solely by trial-and-error. In most everyday learning, people usually achieve a close approximation of the new behaviour by modelling, refined through self-corrective adjustments on the basis of informative feedback from performance and from focused demonstrations of segments that have been only partially learned. Thus, the audio-visual recordings in their own right might have considerable value. This was particularly so for the control group who, at the time of the simulation, had not had any opportunity to role-play appropriate behaviours.

Emotional arousal provides another source of efficacy competency. People rely partly on their state of physiological arousal in judging their capabilities and vulnerability to stress. As high arousal usually debilitates performance, individuals are more likely to expect success when they are not beset by aversive arousal than if they are tense and agitated. Fear reactions generate further fear through anticipatory self-arousal. The study by Peterson (1984), where she trained eight to ten year old 'latch-key' children in home safety and survival skills (including a simulation of a 'repairman'), found that subjects trained with a behavioural method, utilising modelling and behavioural rehearsal rather than those children trained with a discussion method, demonstrated increases in these safety skills at post-test and five month follow-up. Both training methods produced small decreases in the children's self-report of general and home-safety anxiety. This decrease supports the notion that specific training for difficult situations tends to reduce anxiety. Results of a series of studies confirm that treatments relying on enactive, vicarious, or cognitive mastery experiences increase the level, strength, and generality of self-efficacy in coping with threats (Bandura & Adams 1977; Bandura et al 1977; Bandura et al 1980). The greater the perceived efficacy at the completion of treatment, the lower is the fear arousal and the higher are the performance accomplishments.

This would appear to be supported in the experience of the children in the simulation exercise. The interviews with them revealed that the
vast majority of the children had experienced some level of anxiety or fear arousal when confronted with the 'stranger'. However, there was no evidence in the experimental group that levels of reported anxiety impaired the children's performance. On the contrary, on the writer's scoring, they were significantly more likely to pass the simulation as their peers in the control group. They also read the situation better and recognised the inherent threat involved.

These results and the writer's observations throughout the simulation exercise, indicated that the children in the experimental group appeared to have a stronger sense of self-efficacy than the children in the control group. Moreover, the data from the parents, the children and the teachers would appear to support the notion that, for most of the children involved in the simulation exercise, their self-efficacy skills were enhanced by having been put through the simulation experience. Whether this was directly attributable to the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme requires further investigation. To elaborate, it appeared that the consciousness raising and the acquisition of personal safety strategies by the experimental group despite feeling anxious, led to greater self-efficacy in the execution of the behavioural measure used in this study. The qualitative data showed that the children in the control group were less likely to have recognised the confederate as a 'stranger' or the potential consequences, including that of sexual assault. Moreover, following the simulation, most of the control group still saw a stranger in fairly dramatic terms, with considerable embellishment or as a stereotype of the 'stranger' in the simulation exercise. This finding would appear to have some support in related literature. Cole & Loftus (1987), asking children to recall a crime episode, found for reasons which remain unclear, that compared to children of other ages:

"Eight to nine year old children are more likely to add extraneous and perhaps less plausible information to their accounts" (p.87).

Thus, in the absence of the Programme, children in the control group did not have their fantasies replaced by a realistic knowledge base. Moreover, for some of these children, their only definition of a
stranger was a description of the 'stranger' in the simulation itself. Additionally, most children in the control group tended to see a stranger as being only male. Conversely, the children in the experimental group, with one exception, by giving the Programme definition of a stranger and describing a stranger as possibly being of either sex, had a much broader and more realistic perception of a stranger and far greater awareness of the potential consequences of abduction. In contrast to their responses in the pre-test, no embellishments appeared in their answers when asked to describe a stranger after the simulation exercise.

The use of the simulation method was also supported by the vast majority of the parents, including three who had anxieties (not shared with the writer at the time of consent - in the writer's opinion, confirming socially desirable responses) about this type of research method. These three parents, unequivocally supported the simulation research method (including a parent whose child failed) as a positive learning experience for heightening their children's awareness to stranger abduction. Such was the concern of parents with regard to stranger abduction that every parent, without exception, returned a completed questionnaire on their child's involvement in the simulation exercise. The dilemma parents face between protecting their children's innocence and preparing them for encounters with strangers was aptly summed up by one of these parents in the experimental group who said:

"I was not sure about my child's involvement either in this programme or in the exercise. I am now in no doubt - both have greatly helped her confidence. I only pray that she never has to use it."

The teachers also supported the use of the simulation method in terms of yielding more meaningful discussion in the classroom, a useful enabling tool for looking at how life-threatening decisions are taken and a medium to help change behaviour. Additionally, the Class Teacher in the control school noted that the audio-visual recordings themselves could be used to further enhance personal safety skills in the children. Furthermore, if these were used sensitively and
effectively, they might also increase self-efficacy skills and be particularly helpful in targeting the more vulnerable children. In common with the findings of the only comparable study (Fryer 1987b), the two Class Teachers expressed some reservation that the most vulnerable children may not have gained as much Programme benefit as the more able children in the class.

Thus, it would appear that the experience of taking part in the simulation had a significant impact on the children's personal safety skills. Contrary to previous concerns expressed in the literature regarding the simulation method desensitising children to approaches by strangers, the findings in this study show that far from their vulnerability to stranger abduction being diminished, their personal safety, and for some, their self-efficacy skills appeared to be enhanced. One year after the simulation was completed, there was no evidence of desensitisation in any child. Consequently, the simulation method was not only validated as a behavioural measure but also as a positive research method, the views of the children, parents and the teachers confirmed this.

The next research question examined:

3. What are the children's perceptions of a stranger?

These findings confirmed that the children in the experimental group had a more realistic view of a stranger than did the control group. Unlike the latter, the experimental group did not have a stereotypical view of either the gender or physical characteristics of a stranger. Moreover, with one exception, every child in the experimental group was able to provide the Programme definition of a stranger.

On related data, the reasons - being understood, believed, protected receiving help and having confidences kept - children gave for trusting both family members and people outwith their family are of considerable interest. As demonstrated in the Literature Review, in many instances, it is these very areas which are often breached by sexual offenders in the 'grooming' process (e.g. Conte et al 1989) particularly in intra-familial abuse. Furthermore, more often than not,
these breaches are usually accompanied by threats which can also cause long term psychological and emotional damage in victims (Finkelhor 1986). These findings highlight the complexity of the tasks facing programme-makers in child sexual abuse prevention.

The next research question investigated:
4. What are the children's views of the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme?

The findings from these unsolicited views showed that every child in the experimental group felt positive about and valued, the Programme. They also felt their personal safety knowledge had been enhanced and that younger children should receive the Programme. The writer would again acknowledge the social desirability of these responses.

The fifth research question examined:
5. What are the parents' views of child sexual abuse prevention programmes?

While also acknowledging the social desirability of these responses, overwhelmingly, the parents in the experimental group valued the Programme. Together, with the vast majority of parents in the control group, they were of the opinion that it was part of the role of the school to teach personal safety. The parents in the experimental group were unanimous in their view that the Programme had had "a very good overall" effect on their children. They were also able to share the Programme with their children and faced some difficult questions on sensitive issues from them.

This contrasts with the findings by Hazzard et al (1991) whose sample of children were very similar in age and exposed to the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme. The American researchers found that only 69% of parents reported that the Programme had "a good effect overall". No parent rated the Programme as producing "a bad effect overall," but 31% had not noticed any effect.\textsuperscript{40} the findings in this

\textsuperscript{40} The reader is reminded that only 46% of the parents returned their questionnaires. Therefore, the views of more than half of the parents remain unknown.
study, however, concur with other research findings - Daro (1987), Kolko et al (1987) and Wurtele (1986). It is reasonable to project that this opening up of communication between parents and children in the experimental group may augur well for the future, when these children in their adolescent years, will have to face many decisions in their social development in difficult and sensitive areas of their personal and social development e.g. HIV/AIDS, drugs or alcohol.

The last research question investigated:

6. Are children able to generalise knowledge and skills from the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme to real life situations?

To answer this research question, all of the children were followed up for fifteen months after the completion of the Programme. The writer received seven reports of children using the Programme to keep themselves safe. Five of these reports involved the possible attempted abductions of children (including one involving a woman). The other reported instances, were of the adoption of a Programme strategy by two children of not going out unaccompanied to keep themselves safe.

On an extremely serious note, a report was brought to the writer's attention of a child using strategies taught in the Programme during an attempted rape and murder (the school concerned is situated half a mile from the experimental school). Although not in the study sample, this child was a year older and had been taught the Programme some six months earlier. She informed school staff that on being dragged into bushes by her assailant, Part II of the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' video (scene in the park with the lost puppy) flashed before her eyes, i.e. she read the situation and understood the likely outcome was one of sexual assault. The child's immediate reaction was to kick and scream "No" as loudly as she could in the hope that someone else would hear her. What in fact happened was, that the attacker having punched her to the ground could not proceed to do to the child what he had threatened, as a result of the child's resistance and verbal rebukes. He panicked and fled. The writer, having accessed the police report of the circumstances surrounding the attack, can confirm that the attacker actually threatened to rape and murder the child.
While the writer is in no doubt that, had the attacker used his full physical strength on the child, this attack could have turned out very differently, it nevertheless demonstrates that for this child, Programme strategies worked. Thus, there is limited evidence that this child not only retained the knowledge imparted in the classroom (some six months previously) but was able to apply it in an attempted abduction and rape.

To the writer's knowledge, this is only the second study to report children using strategies from a sexual abuse prevention programme in potentially dangerous situations. Interestingly, the other study by Hazzard et al (1991) also evaluated the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme. It is the first study, to report a child using the strategies taught in a child sexual abuse prevention programme in an actual attack with intent to rape. To reiterate the value placed by parents on this Programme, the reader is reminded of the last two paragraphs of the letter from this child's father:

"I would therefore wish you to ensure that such instruction be given to all primary school pupils as a matter of course so that they too would be in a position to resist any such attack and instead of being the victim become the victor.

Cost is nothing in comparison with the life of a young one and I thank you and the education department for the life of my daughter."

Despite the limitations of this study, the above excerpt highlights that stranger abduction is an issue which causes parents real concern even though the risk to their children does not justify the level of their fears (Elliot 1993). Nevertheless, abduction is a very serious offence against children, more often than not, resulting in sexual assault and death.

Generalisability of the Findings

The generalisability of the findings must be seen within the limitations of the study described at the beginning of this chapter, particularly the issues relating to internal external and validity. Despite these, the
results of this evaluation are important. The need for children to be informed about sexual abuse prevention has never been doubted by the writer. It has been reinforced by some of the unexpected developments in this study and the findings. Programme impact resulted in several positive outcomes. In comparison with the control group, the experimental group were:

- Significantly more able to predict that a male child could be a victim of sexual assault.
- Significantly more able to predict that sexual assault was a likely consequence of stranger abduction.
- Significantly more able to attribute blame appropriately for sexual assault in both stranger vignettes.
- On the writer’s scores, they were significantly more likely to have passed the simulation. Furthermore, their behaviour in the simulation exercise had been influenced by a much more realistic concept of a stranger, an ability to predict that sexual assault was a possible consequence of stranger abduction and therefore they were more able to read the inherent risks involved. There were indications that their self-efficacy skills had also been increased.
- In the follow-up, there was evidence that five children had been able to generalise the Programme strategies to avoid possible abduction.
- Most importantly, for one child, the generalisation of Programme strategies in an actual attempted rape had, according to her father, saved her life.

In respect of the control group:

- The second group of boys, who disclosed sexual abuse by the member of staff, did so as a direct result of the 'Feeling Yes Feeling No' Programme.

All of these outcomes are applicable to school-based prevention programmes aimed at children in main stream education in a similar age group. Furthermore, the findings in relation to specific concepts, if not already included in educational curricula, could be easily integrated. Most importantly, this study confirms that the behaviourally-based component was a contributory factor in providing
strategies for the experimental group to resist the 'strangers' requests to go with them. These findings have the potential of reaching an audience of children world-wide where school-based programmes are being used in the prevention of abduction and sexual abuse, providing they are compatible with a child's cognitive abilities.

Theoretical Issues

Mention has already been made in Chapter Three of one of the most fundamental criticisms of the educational programmes to prevent child sexual abuse, that they place the responsibility for prevention on the potential victims of abuse rather than on those perpetrating these assaults or upon a society that allows such assaults to be so prevalent. However, to change either the behaviour of offenders or the attitudes and priorities of society is likely to be such a slow process that there is understandably a need to help children to protect themselves. Programmes attempting to encourage self-protection can, however, work towards the changes that are required in adults and society in general in order to prevent abuse.

Gough (1991), in his review of the wider issues, addressed the central issue in this debate as being the power of children to exercise their rights relative to others. Children, like women, non-whites and the poor, are relatively disadvantaged compared to wealthy white adult males (Ennew 1986). The proportion of perpetrators of sexual abuse who are white and who have wealth is unclear, but the preponderance of male offenders has been repeatedly demonstrated (Finkelhor 1986). The power differential between children and offenders is even greater when the offender has parenting or other child care responsibilities. To counter this, prevention programmes often aim to enhance the power of children by providing them with information about what is not appropriate contact with adults and with strategies for avoiding abuse and seeking assistance. However, several authors e.g. Melton (1992) have questioned the basis on which these strategies of 'empowerment' are made.

The reality is that adults in many ways do have greater power than
children. They have greater physical strength, material resources and knowledge of the world. Furthermore, their views are taken more seriously by others with power, that is, other adults. Children cannot resist the physical strength of an adult male, and to suggest to them that they can, may increase the physical risks to themselves. Programmes need to address this issue. In addition, failing to resist more subtle pressures from perpetrators as described by Berliner & Conte (1990), may make children feel responsible for any abuse they suffer. Furthermore, other strategies such as passive submission may seem a more effective coping strategy for some children (Conte & Schuerman 1987; Kitzinger 1990). The latter argues that we need to take more notice of the children's view of their situation and the strategies children adopt in practice, such as running away from home, and making themselves physically unattractive or unwell. According to Gough (1991), whether or not these are the most useful strategies, they are what children sometimes choose to do in response to their situation.

The emphasis, therefore, needs to be on helping children to explore the realities of the power differentials and the strategies that they might use to fully exploit the available resources. Children have some knowledge about power and the ability one has to exercise one's rights. They learn about this everyday in the playground, in the classroom, and, in the family home. As evidenced in the findings in this study, it is not a topic, however, that is openly discussed by parents or teachers. If educational programmes were directly to address the realities of being a child and the abuse of power in sexual assault, the programmes might be made more relevant and effective in practice. In order to assess such effectiveness, the research studies would need to employ more sensitive outcome measures than those in current use and ethical considerations would have to be debated. In the absence of such studies, Gough (1991) suggested:

"Within certain parameters preventive educational programmes can be effective techniques. However, their contribution can only fully be assessed within a wider debate about adult-child relations, gender, sexuality, and power. Such a debate could include discussion about why some children themselves become perpetrators and how we could try to prevent this " (pp.184-185).
It is now proposed to address future research issues which flow from the findings of this study.

**Future Research Recommendations**

There is much scope for research to establish/clarify the potential of child abduction and sexual abuse prevention training to help maximise benefits for children. The findings in this study suggest several directions of refining the use of the simulation experience in particular and child sexual abuse prevention programmes in general. Although evaluations have enhanced our understanding of what can be accomplished from well conceived prevention programming, only one (Peterson 1984) of the three studies involving a simulation has involved wholly independent raters but only three children in the experimental group. This suggests the need to address an explicit research agenda. That agenda consists of the following objectives:

- Allow this work to inform and provide a basis for expansion of the simulation concept into other areas of risk which prevention programming addresses.
- The problems encountered in the scoring of the simulation in trying to establish a body of normative data have highlighted the need for clarification of more specific and explicit outcome measures to assess the impact of these programmes. It would enable the measures to become more sophisticated, sensitive and more relevant to the prevention of child abduction and child sexual abuse. There is also a need to establish age and sex appropriate sets of standardized simulations and outcome measures, which will facilitate large scale comparison of relative risk to children.
- Identify and evaluate other techniques, less cumbersome than simulations, which will allow classroom teachers to measure the efficacy of classroom-based prevention programming.
- Determine the duration of retention of prevention skills by children and explore the possible influence of various factors on retention.
Examine fully the causes and implications of the failure of some children to acquire prevention skills from participation in the programme, and identify modifications of programme and/or other remedial procedures to extend to them protective benefits.

The small sample size in this study requires replication. Larger, unbiased samples would be useful in future research.

In respect of the standardised tests, the use of the Kagan Test in its original form may shed more light on children's vulnerability to abduction. Similarly, more central use of the Rutter Behavioural Measure might yield some interesting results. e.g. putting children with and without relationship problems through a stranger abduction simulation before and after the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' or some other prevention programme. These behavioural and cognitive characteristics left a powerful impression on the writer in the simulation exercise. Future usage of these measurements could establish whether either the Rutter Measure and/or Kagan Test could be validated as a screening measure for vulnerability to abduction.

It is clear from the findings in this study that a paper and pencil exercise is not a reliable predictors of a child's actual behaviour, yet there are ethical dilemmas in simulation studies. One way forward is to further develop games and vignettes in which hypothetical situations can be acted out or discussed to both teach children and test their learning.

A study which incorporated abduction vignettes which replicated the context but varied the gender of the child presented may shed light on the socialisation processes about boys' and girls' understanding of likely victimisation. Vignettes which provided a variety of different contexts may also provide evidence of those situations children assess as being dangerous and whether the context influences their judgement of perceived risk. Vignettes also involving people known to, and/or trusted by the child, might yield valuable information on whether the concept of appropriate attribution of fault is transferable to situations of trusted adults or intra-familial abuse. Clearly, ethical issues would be a major consideration.
A study incorporating a measure of self-efficacy, combined with an audio-visual record of either a simulation or role-play of a stranger abduction (or other potentially dangerous related situations), both before and after a programme, would appear to offer opportunities to measure whether children's self-efficacy skills can be increased as a result of these programmes.

It would appear that certain characteristics of the child (e.g. emotional neediness, low self-esteem and isolation) or the child's environment (e.g. unavailability or inability of adult to protect child) may be associated with an increased risk of victimisation. While additional research will be necessary to confirm the role of these characteristics in the sexual abuse of children, careful consideration should be given to the importance of specific strategies which may enhance children's assertiveness skills. The reader's attention is drawn to part two of the Literature Review which looked at cognitive strategies. The inclusion of self-instructional training procedures such as those adopted by Gottman, Gosno & Rusmussen (quoted in Michenbaum 1977) and the cognitive behavioural treatment approach applied by Jabickuk & Smeriglio (quoted in Michenbaum 1977), may prove very useful adjuncts in child sexual abuse prevention programmes. Therefore, a study which compared a programme incorporating these, with one which did not, could be very valuable. Such a study involving children with special needs could make a considerable contribution to a grossly under-researched area this field of prevention.

Studies are increasingly comparing different programmes, but not contrasting the differential effects on different subjects. Subjects could be distinguished with respect to such factors as abuse status, such as high risk, or victims of previous abuse, and psychological variables such as self-esteem.

Children are being taught or 'empowered' to believe through educational prevention programmes that they own their bodies, will intuitively know if they have been victimised, and that they should say "No" and be assertive to ward off sexual abuse. However, this may be problematic for children who are victims and who may feel overwhelmed, confused, and guilty by the
content of prevention education programmes that attempt to teach them about empowerment and disclosure. Teaching of empowerment-based concepts may negatively affect the vulnerable children they were designed to protect. Research in this area is sadly lacking and again highlights the problem when programmes have a wide appeal but their development has outstripped their evaluation.

- Little is understood about children's evaluations of prevention materials. Children are consumers of prevention material along with the adults who favour and promote them. Little data are currently available that describe children's reactions to, and evaluation of, the programmes directed towards them. A study using a qualitative method would tap this area and identify important aspects of the child's experience. There also is a clear need for longitudinal studies to follow-up children for more than fifteen months to look at whether children continue to use the programme and whether disclosures are made in later years with regard to abuse at the time of the programme.

- Researchers working in the field of sexual offenders and those evaluating child sexual abuse prevention programmes need to work and liaise more closely on the role of victims and perpetrators. A most worthwhile conjoint longitudinal study, in the writer's opinion, would be to look at children who have been involved in prevention programmes to see if they themselves become perpetrators. Additionally, further studies to examine vulnerability factors to abduction and sexual assault could be jointly undertaken. It also would seem appropriate to understand which individuals assault which kind of children, in what circumstances, in order to ensure these are included in educational programmes.

- Many professionals in the field of sexual abuse prevention recognise that working with children is working with the weakest link. Children are smaller, less powerful, and inherently vulnerable to attack by adults. If we know how to prevent older persons from having sex with children, this would be a primary focus. Since we currently do not, we try to teach children concepts and skills which we hope will prevent their own abuse. Efforts to
understand the causes and associated conditions of sexual abuse of children should be encouraged with a view to eliminating or at least reducing them to a minimum.

- A research issue is the current use of programmes in Britain. There are likely to be gaps in educational provision, both geographically and in the age and type of pupils receiving programmes. Children with special needs and older pupils are probably significantly under-represented in the use of these programmes in Britain. It is also not clear which programmes are being employed. ‘Kidscape’ is probably the most widely used programme in Britain, but this is one of the few programmes not to have shown a learning effect in formal research studies (Mayes et al 1991). Even if programmes are relevant and effective, there is a potential problem of programmes not being implemented in the best possible way. We do not know with what skill, training prior negotiations, agency involvement, precautions and effects programmes are being currently implemented.

- Finally, a major limitation of most of the studies in this field is that they provide scant evidence that children are actually able to use their increased knowledge and safety discrimination skills to prevent either abduction or sexual assault. To examine this question, one would need to follow a large sample of trained and untrained children for several years and then gather abuse incidence data. In addition to the pragmatic and ethical problems involved in such a study, one is also faced with the dilemma of how to interpret disclosures. Since prevention programmes teach children both to avoid abuse and to disclose abuse, a high number of disclosures in the trained group does not necessarily mean the programme has failed. Rather, as Finkelhor & Strapko (1987) point out, one would expect the trained group to disclose more.

Until such a study is completed, this study offers encouraging results concerning the overall positive impact of a multi-media prevention programme over a fifteen month period. The final chapter examines the wider issues which flow from the findings in this study.
CHAPTER TEN

CONCLUSION

"The children are, everyone's heirs, everyone's business, everyone's future" (Piercy).

Introduction

The above quotation is a reminder of the importance of children in our society and that children's safety is everyone's responsibility.

The findings and implications of this study are only a starting point for how we, as a society, can prevent child abduction and child sexual assault. The main areas which were investigated also raised broader issues which are now addressed. As demonstrated in the Literature Review, it is clear that a multifarious approach to preventing sexual abuse is needed, one which simultaneously targets the potential victim, the potential perpetrator and those aspects of the social fabric which nurture abusive behaviours. The following is a summary of the conclusions reached in the areas which flow from the key findings in this study and suggestions made by Deborah Daro (1992) at the Ninth International Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect which I would fully support.41

Reliable Data on the Incidence of Child Sexual Abuse and Abduction

To the first issue raised by this study - reliable data on the incidence of child sexual abuse and abduction. The reader is reminded that I was unable to access any single comprehensive system which could give reliable statistics on either the incidence or prevalence rates of

---

41 The writer has adopted a personal style to record this chapter as it enables her to illuminate the implications of the study findings in the wider context.
abduction or child sexual abuse. The statistics produced by the Scottish Criminal Records and the police need to be more informative and record such basic information as whether the perpetrator is known to the victim of crimes of abduction and sexual assault. Furthermore, because of the way offences are codified by the police (in multiple offences only the most serious is recorded), precise figures on child abduction were impossible to retrieve. There needs to be National Guidelines for the registration of children on child Protection Registers in order to ensure consistency and comparability across regions. At the most fundamental level, the system of referrals to the Reporter to the Children's Hearing needs computerised. Furthermore, more concise categories need to be added for the grounds of referral in sexual abuse cases, (e.g. indecent assault, sodomy) as grounds are presently restricted and weighted in favour of female victims. Without reliable statistics, it is impossible to plan or allocate resources on a rational basis.

The Role of Parents

In answering the research questions, the role of parents in child abduction and sexual abuse prevention programmes raised many issues. One of the most enlightening findings in this study, is not what the parents told their children about child abduction, but what they did not tell, despite abduction being an issue that causes most parents considerable anxiety. It is clear from the data that communication between parents and their children on sexual abuse is a problematic area. Parents need to be educated not only about sexual abuse but also about broader parenting responsibilities, beginning with early attachment and bonding between parent and child. Fostering this bond may be the best protection that children can be offered against all forms of abuse. As the child matures, parents need assistance on how to talk with their children about sex in general and child sexual abuse in particular. Parents need to be given information on how to deal with a disclosure of sexual abuse in a manner which does not further complicate the investigation and treatment process. This is particularly important if the offender is a member of the child's family or the parent's spouse or partner. Parents, like professionals working with children, need to know how to report sexual abuse and how to detect
potential abuse in their children.

Child-Rearing Practices

The pre-programme findings in this study would lead to the conclusion that in many instances, a parent-child dynamic is created which could easily be exploited by those intent on sexually abusing children. As a society, we need to give children a voice and allow them to be more assertive as well as validating their right to question inappropriate adult behaviour. The adage that 'children should be seen and not heard' has had its day. Children need to be aware and have some knowledge of the appropriateness of adult behaviour as part of an overall strategy in the prevention of child sexual abuse. Parents have a crucial role to play in this.

Teachers, Schools and Education Systems

Teachers, schools and the education system have a crucial role for children as well in this field but the demands on teacher and school time are significant and increasing. Nevertheless, as evidenced in this study, a more gender balanced curriculum would be desirable in order to prevent the stereotyping of males as being unlikely victims of sexual assault. The expectations that schools teach material dealing with social problems, such as bullying, smoking, AIDS, and drugs mean that the curriculum has to be carefully analysed in terms of how likely it is that schools are going to be effective in dealing with such a range of problems.

It is recognised that schools can do more than teach and that a range of psychosocial interventions may take place in the school context. The current level of support for education will make it necessary to select from a range of worthy goals those which can be achieved in the school setting. As well as education in academic subjects, it will be necessary to prioritise what subjects or social problems can effectively be dealt with in school within the available resources. The continued evaluation of child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention programmes will make an important contribution to this debate.
Current Curricular Development

In acknowledging the size of the problem of sexual abuse and the effects on victims, I would suggest that the child has to be seen holistically; Therefore, given the onset of sexual abuse is most prevalent between eight and eleven years, then child sexual abuse prevention should be seen as a priority in health education in the primary school. Moreover, the latest 5-14 Curriculum Guidelines in Personal and Social Development (SOED 1993) in Scottish schools describe this curriculum's objectives to help pupils to:

"Have an appropriately positive regard for self, and for others and their needs;

Develop life skills to enable them to participate effectively and safely in society;

Identify, review and evaluate the values they and society hold and recognise that these affect their thoughts and actions;

Take increasing responsibility for their own lives" (p.1).

Thus, a door has been opened to place child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention programmes firmly on the agenda in Scottish schools.

At the same time, these programmes lay foundation skills for a variety of curricula addressing other prevention issues e.g. bullying, AIDS, drug and alcohol abuse and share some basic goals which can be applied to the specific concern. Many of these programmes call upon the child to think independently, resist peer pressure, while developing skills such as decision-making, assertiveness and effective communication skills. Essential to healthy, independent development, these skills will be used by the child in a variety of academic and non-school related situations. Prevention curricula designed to address these more general concerns, concentrating on promoting mental health and empowering individuals, and secondly applying these skills to specific circumstances may be very useful. Also important, is a reaffirmation of school counselling and social work programmes that meet the ongoing needs of pupils, both of these areas are grossly under-resourced in Scotland.
Reinforcement of Prevention Curricula

It remains important for children to receive quality prevention education at regular intervals. While the nature of the risk for sexual abuse may change over development (e.g. older children and teenagers are more at risk from acquaintance assault than younger children), it seems clear that effective prevention training will require ongoing lessons and booster sessions over time. Schools which implement prevention programmes will have to recognise that the content and training will need to be made available at various points throughout the time children are in school, if society seriously expects children to learn and maintain their learning of this subject matter.

There is another very important reason why child sexual abuse prevention programmes have a priority on the education agenda. The prevention of HIV and AIDS currently has a high political profile but child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention programmes have not received the same publicity or financial support in this country. Yet, for the many unwilling victims of sexual assault, there is always the distinct possibility of catching HIV. This said, hardly an organisation in Britain has a coordinated policy on this, Lothian Region is one of the few exceptions.

It is my opinion that, child sexual abuse prevention education can be most efficiently presented through schools, but nevertheless, all child and youth groups should offer opportunities for this type of education. Rather than focusing solely on child sexual abuse, this education should cover all forms of abuse and neglect. Schools and youth leaders need to create an environment in which a child feels comfortable talking about these experiences. Additionally, all children and adolescents need to receive education about healthy sexuality and appropriate displays of affection.

Training Implications for Teachers and Others

In order to deliver most of these programmes, training will be
necessary. Comprehensive training programmes need to be developed for all professionals who work with children. Most importantly, professionals e.g. social workers and police working in the investigation and detection of child sexual abuse need training in order to ensure that families from lower socio-economic groups do not disproportionately appear on the statistics of sexual abuse because of reading the 'wrong signals' e.g. poverty.

As part of an overall strategy, I would suggest that we owe it to our children to provide them with information on child sexual abuse which may at the end of the day protect their future well-being. In the absence of this coming from many parents, schools have a vital role to play in personal safety instruction. Specifically, teacher training needs to address this issue. From evaluations of the training of over two thousand teachers by myself and research carried out in Lothian Region (Mason 1991) such training should cover, among other things:

(i) Knowledge of sexual abuse and our attitudes towards it;
(ii) Knowledge of sexual offences;
(iii) Indicators of sexual abuse;
(iv) Procedures for reporting abuse;
(v) How to manage a disclosure of sexual abuse;
   (particularly how to question children so as not to destroy evidence)
(vi) Knowledge of the two main enquiries (Bulter-Sloss - Cleveland 1988 and Clyde - Orkney 1992) into the professional responses to the management of child sexual abuse in Britain.
(vii) How to teach children to protect themselves;
(viii) How to help parents better educate their children regarding sex and potential abusive situations; and,
(ix) How to screen and train staff and volunteers.

Reforms and training in the formal (multiple medicals), legal (multiple investigative interviews) and treatment responses (inappropriately attributing blame to the victim for the abuse) to sexual abuse disclosures will also be necessary so that children are not further 'abused' by professionals and systems.
In the special case of sexual abuse prevention education, teachers are asked to wear many hats. As discussed by Trudell & Whatley, (1988), teachers are expected to present sensitive and difficult information to children about the realities of sexual abuse. They are also expected to be advocates and provide emotional support to a child making a disclosure following prevention lessons, are required to report cases of suspected abuse, and still are expected to maintain a traditional alliance with parents who may feel threatened by or suspicious of sexual abuse education being taught at school. There are considerable resource implications for the training of teachers in these sensitive matters and the delivery of prevention programmes.

Institutional Issues

Over and above, institutional changes will be required within any agency which works directly with children to prevent initial and subsequent victimisation. All organisations working with children need to make a commitment to training children regarding self-protection and to involve parents in this. Further, managers have a responsibility to ensure that none of their staff members has a prior record of victimisation or behaves in a manner detrimental to a child's well-being.

Further Considerations

Looking towards the challenges for the future, available research indicates that most children can learn successfully much of the content that we believe helps prevent sexual abuse, that this learning may decay over relatively short periods of time after training, and that periodic post training booster sessions may maintain levels of learning. There is also evidence that skill learning can be very effective when modelling and behavioural rehearsal strategies are employed. There is some evidence to suggest that children can generalise these skills to real life situations. More research is warranted in child abduction and child sexual abuse prevention to make maximum use of these potentially effective programmes.
Finally, public awareness efforts regarding sexual abuse and its magnitude need to be expanded. A message needs to be given to the general public that preventing child sexual abuse, like all forms of maltreatment, is everybody's responsibility and everybody's problem. Specifically, all adolescents and adults need to know that child sexual abuse is a crime; help is available if they need it; abusive behaviour is chronic unless help is forthcoming - no one cures themselves; child sexual abuse hurts children; and children can never consent to abuse. Likewise, all children need to know that it is "ok to say no" to touching that makes them uncomfortable; it is not their fault if abuse occurs; they need to tell someone if they are being victimised; and that help is available.

**Wider Research Implications**

While common sense may suggest that this plan, if fully implemented, will move the field in the right direction, research findings supporting this approach are less clear and less available. A clear companion to the diversification of the child sexual abuse prevention package is the expansion of applied research and programme evaluations. Among other questions, further research is needed to determine the extent to which individual behaviour and attitudes can be altered as a result of various early intervention efforts and the extent to which any of these changes result in decrease vulnerability for children and less proclivity towards sexual abuse among adults. Attention also needs to be paid to determining if increased awareness regarding sexual abuse causes individuals any lasting discomfort or impinges upon healthy parent-child relationships or child development.

**Societal Implications**

Over and above these empirical concerns is a broader philosophical question regarding the advisability of prevention itself. It can be argued that prevention is extremely problematic within any reasonable scope of fiscal effort and within the values of a free society that gives people the right to be left alone. Also, to promote an appropriate level of sexual contact or define, explicitly, what constitutes "correct" and
"incorrect" sexual touching is dangerous in that it requires practitioners and policy makers to make value judgments as to what constitutes approved sexual conduct. Despite these difficulties, responding only after the fact ensures the continuous need for society to deal with the victims, dysfunctional families, and individuals, that such social policies will inevitably produce.

Self-protection by children is only one way of the many possible methods of reducing the availability of potential victims of perpetrators. It is my opinion that the best child protection system will be one that eventually is able to reduce its overall size and scope not by definition (i.e. by ignoring the precursors of specific social-ills) but rather by reducing the number of sexually abused children through thoughtful and coordinated early intervention from a multidisciplinary approach. Other methods include imprisonment of offenders, the screening of persons employed in child care provisions, and vigilance by parents of whom they allow their children to have contact with. The difficulty is that potential offenders against children are so numerous, and the obstacles against proving guilt so high, that these strategies would not alone protect children.

The long term goal is to try to prevent people from becoming offenders. As discussed in the Literature Review, Finkelhor (1986) has classified four preconditions for sexual abuse: -

(i) the emotional gratification from such acts;
(ii) sexual arousal to children;
(iii) blocks to other forms of sexual and emotional gratification;
(iv) why normal social inhibitions against such acts do not deter the abuse.

To intervene to prevent these four preconditions could be achieved by treating the individuals who display these characteristics or by making social changes in society that reduce the risks of such characteristics developing. Either strategy, even if effective, would take a considerable time and resources to significantly reduce the number of individuals who pose a threat to children. In these circumstances, it may be unethical not to forewarn children of the risks of abduction and sexual
assault and provide them with at least some strategies with which to protect themselves or to seek help. In my opinion, providing programmes are compatible with a child's age and stage of cognitive development universal child sexual abuse prevention education would be a start in the right direction.

The results of this evaluation have demonstrated the effectiveness of 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' in some key Programme objectives. This evaluation also presents limited evidence that, despite the power differential, some children were able to take action to avert their own victimisation. Furthermore, it is my contention, in accord with the father of the child whose child was abducted, that market forces alone should not be the sole determinant of child sexual abuse prevention policy. No price can be put on the suffering of victims of sexual assault or the life of a child who has been abducted.

Final Reminder

Overall, the findings in evaluation studies of child abduction and sexual abuse prevention programmes have been encouraging. The findings of this study are no exception. Following the publishing of the 5-14 Curriculum on Personal and Social Development (SOED 1993), the door is now wide open in Scottish schools for personal safety programmes to be firmly placed on the education agenda. This said, the findings in this study have global implications beyond the Scottish setting.

The recent abduction and murder of two year old Jamie Bulger in Liverpool has shocked the nation. The challenge of the nineties will be for all of us to face up to the problem of child abduction and sexual assault. Although teachers have a crucial role to play in this, it is everybody's responsibility and everybody's problem. The prevention of child abduction and child sexual abuse requires a commitment by society to safeguard future generations. It is my opinion, that such a commitment will make a meaningful and significant contribution to the physical, emotional, and psychological well-being of future generations of children.
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Child Abduction and Child Sexual Abuse Prevention: An Evaluation of the 'Feeling Yes, Feeling No' Programme
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Contact With Experts and Researchers in the Field of Child Sexual Abuse Prevention
CONTACT WITH EXPERTS AND RESEARCHERS IN THE FIELD OF
CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION

The following people have been contacted by letter for advice and copies of measuring instruments used in their studies.

Dr J Conte
University of Chicago
Chicago, ILL

Miss Sheryl Kerns Kraiser
Health education Systems Inc
P O Box GG
Palisacles
New York 10964

Ms Michele Chadwick
Children's Hospital and Health Centre
Centre for Child Protection
Santiago
CA 92123

Dr Mary Kenning
209 Burnett Hall
Department of Psychology
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Lincoln
NB 68588-308

Ms A Downer
Committee for Children
172 20th Avenue
Seattle, WA

Ms Carol A Plummer
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Department of Children & Family Services
1 North Old State Capitol Place
Springfield
ILL 62701

Dr G Mayes
Department of Psychology,
University of Glasgow, Strathclyde
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Appendix 2

Crime Tables


Table A 2:1
A Comparison of Scottish Criminal and Lothian and Borders Police Statistics for Sexual Offences (1989/90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME TYPE</th>
<th>SCOTTISH CRIMES</th>
<th>LOTHIAN &amp; BORDERS POLICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHILD STEALING</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABDUCTION</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCEST</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMOSEXUAL ACTS *</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BESTIALITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT TO COMMIT UNNATURAL CRIMES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPE</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT WITH INTENT TO RAPE</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDECENT Assault</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWD &amp; LIBIDINOUS PRACTICES</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDECENT EXPOSURE</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCURATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFILEMENT OF GIRL &lt; 13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFILEMENT OF GIRL &lt; 16</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARNAL KNOWLEDGE OF MENTAL DEFECTIVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEHOLDER PERMITTING CARNAL OF ABOVE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABDUCTING GIRL &lt; 18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROTHEL KEEPING</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON WITH CUSTODY ETC OF GIRL OR CAUSING HER SEDUCTION</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMORAL TRAFFIC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFENCES RELATED TO PROSTITUTION</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,512</strong></td>
<td><strong>916</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes 21 offences of sodomy, 8 cases of which were against boys under 16 years.

Table A 2:2
Reported Sexual Crimes for 1991 - Lothian and Borders Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME TYPE</th>
<th>RECORDED CRIME</th>
<th>VICTIM UNDER 16 YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABDUCTION</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCEST</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SODOMY</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPE</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDECENT ASSAULT</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWD &amp; LIBIDINOUS PRACTICES</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDECENT EXPOSURE</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCURATION</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFILEMENT OF A GIRL &lt;13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFILEMENT OF A GIRL &lt;16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>851</strong></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

List of Key Evaluation Studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Source of Sample</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Programme Presented</th>
<th>Evaluation Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Adams &amp; Llewelyn 1989</td>
<td>Nursery 3 - 5 years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Devised by Researchers</td>
<td>Puppets Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Barrett &amp; Doherty, 1989</td>
<td>6 - 7 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Personal Safety Programme (devised by Researchers)</td>
<td>Questionnaire/role play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - 9 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - 11 years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beland, 1986</td>
<td>Elementary schools Washington Sate 7 - 8 years</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>Talk about Touching (TAT)</td>
<td>Paper/pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berrick &amp; Gilberrt, 1991</td>
<td>Elementary school California 6 - 7 years</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>Comparison of Fifteen Programs</td>
<td>Paper/pencil Interview Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binder &amp; McNeil, 1986</td>
<td>Elementary school Western City Ages 5 - 12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Child Assault Prevention Program (CAP)</td>
<td>Role Play Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borkin &amp; Frank, 1986</td>
<td>Pre-school children Ages 3 - 5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Bubylonian Encounter (puppet show &amp; colouring book)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conte, Rosen, Saperstain &amp; Shermack, 1985</td>
<td>Day Care &amp; Elementary Cook Co., Chicago, Il Ages 4 - 5 6 - 10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Cook Co. Illinois Sheriff's Office Program</td>
<td>Paper/pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downer, 1986</td>
<td>Elementary school Seattle, WA Ages 9 - 10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>TAT Questionnaire</td>
<td>Puppet show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fryer, Kraizer, &amp; Miyoshi, 1987(a)</td>
<td>Elementary school Denver, CO</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Children Need to Know Personal Safety Training Program</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fryer, Kraizer, &amp; Miyoshi, 1987(b)</td>
<td>Elementary school Denver, CO</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Children Need to Know Personal Safety Training Program</td>
<td>Simulation of Stranger Abduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabarino, 1987</td>
<td>Elementary school Central PA 4 - 7 year olds</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Spiderman Comic Book</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hamilton, 1989</td>
<td>Lothian, Scotland Ages 9 - 10 (random sample of 32)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Feeling Yes, Feeling No</td>
<td>Questionnaire &amp; Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazzard, Webb, Kleemeir, Angert &amp; Pohl, 1990</td>
<td>Elementary school Mid Western State U.S.A.</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>Feeling Yes, Feeling No</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenning, Gallmeier, Jackson &amp; Plemons, 1987</td>
<td>Elementary school Mid Western Community &amp; North Eastern OK 6 year olds 7 year olds</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>CAP TAT</td>
<td>Standardized Anxiety Video Vignette Parent Questionnaire Disclosure data Questionnaire Vignette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolko, Moser, Litz &amp; Hughes, 1987</td>
<td>3 Elementary schools Washington CO, PA 8 - 9 yer olds</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Red Flag/Green Flag Safe than Sorry II (film)</td>
<td>Paper/pencil test Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leake, 1986(a)</td>
<td>3 Elementary schools San Joaquin Co., CA 6, 7 &amp; 8 year olds</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Role Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leake, 1986(b)</td>
<td>3 Elementary schools San Joaquin Co., CA 10 year olds</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>CAP &amp; No More Secrets</td>
<td>Role Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutter &amp; Wiesman, 1985</td>
<td>Campfire Program Massachusetts</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paper/pencil test Role Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mayes, Currie, Macleod, Gillies &amp; Warden, 1991</td>
<td>Strathclyde, Scotland 6 &amp; 10 year olds</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Kidscape</td>
<td>Picture Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Location/Setting</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Main Components</td>
<td>Additional Components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miltenberger &amp; Thiesse-Duffy</td>
<td>At Home study Mid Western Community</td>
<td>Ages 4 - 7</td>
<td>Red Flag/Green Flag</td>
<td>One-to-one training by parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostbloom, Richardson, &amp; Galey</td>
<td>Pre-schools &amp; Elementary schools throughout Iowa</td>
<td>Ages 3 - 7</td>
<td>Happy Bear</td>
<td>Skit/questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plummer, 1984</td>
<td>Elementary school Southern MI 10 - 11 year olds</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>EPSA (Education for the Prevention of Sexual Abuse)</td>
<td>Role play &amp; Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray &amp; Dietzel, 1984</td>
<td>Elementary school Spokane WA 8 year olds</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>My Very Own Book About Me</td>
<td>Workbook &amp; Movie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigurdson, Doig, &amp; Strang, 1985</td>
<td>Elementary school Manitoba, Canada</td>
<td>9 - 11 year olds</td>
<td>Feeling Yes, Feeling No</td>
<td>Videotape &amp; questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan, Press, &amp; Briggs, 1985</td>
<td>Elementary school Ages 8 - 11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Bubylionian Encounter</td>
<td>Vignettes/questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall, 1983</td>
<td>Elementary school Northern CA 9 - 12 year olds</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfe, MacPherson, Blount, &amp; Wolfe, 1986</td>
<td>3 Elementary schools Charleston, SC 9 - 12 year olds</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>You're in Charge</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Assoc. Consulting Inc.</td>
<td>Elementary school Toronto Grades K - 6</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>Missing from Ydub</td>
<td>Interview &amp; Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods &amp; Dean, 1985</td>
<td>Elementary schools Knoxville TN 5 - 7 year olds, 10 - 12 year olds</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>TAT Spiderman comic book</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurtele, Marrs, Marrs &amp; Miller-Perrin (1987)</td>
<td>Pre-schoolers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Behavioural Skills Training Programme</td>
<td>Role play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurtele, Saslawsky, Miller, Marrs, &amp; Britcher, 1986</td>
<td>Elementary school Eastern Washington State 6, 9 &amp; 10 year olds</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Touch Behavior Skills Training Program</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* British Study
@ Approximately
Appendix 4

Research Instruments

i) Parent Information Questionnaire (Pre) - Experimental and Control Group
ii) Hazzard et al Questionnaire (1991)
iii) Children's Knowledge Questionnaire (Pre and Post-test)
iv) Parent Information Questionnaire (Post) - Experimental Group
v) Parent Information Questionnaire (Post) - Control Group
vi) Structured Report Form
vii) Structured Interview Schedule
viii) Parental Questionnaire - Views of Simulation Exercise
ix) Teacher Questionaire - Views of Simulation Exercise
HAZZARD ET AL QUESTIONNAIRE
(1991)

What I Know About Touching Questions

Directions: For each question, circle yes; no, or I don't know.

Example: Is an elephant bigger than a mouse?
          yes      no      I don't know

1. Do you think children should always obey grown-ups?
   yes      no      I don't know

2. Do kids ever have touching problems with people they know and like?
   yes      no      I don't know

3. Are the private parts of your body the parts that one else has the right to touch without your permission?
   yes      no      I don't know

4. Are teenage girls the only people who are sexually abused?
   yes      no      I don't know

5. If someone touched your private parts without permission, would it be your fault because you weren't careful enough?
   yes      no      I don't know

6. Is it okay to say no even if you hurt someone's feelings?
   yes      no      I don't know

7. If something scary or embarrassing happens to you, should you keep quiet about it so you won't get into trouble?
   yes      no      I don't know
8. Are the people in your family the only ones who can help you if you have a problem?
   yes    no    I don't know

9. Do most touches make you feel good?
   yes    no    I don't know

10. Are strangers the only people who might want to touch children's private parts?
    yes    no    I don't know

11. Are boys ever sexually assaulted?
    yes    no    I don't know

12. If someone touches you in ways and you don't like, is it partly your fault?
    yes    no    I don't know

13. Do most touches make you feel bad?
    yes    no    I don't know

14. Is it a good idea to yell if someone touches you in a way that scares you?
    yes    no    I don't know

15. Does sexual assault mean getting beat-up?
    yes    no    I don't know

16. Is a stranger someone that looks scary?
    yes    no    I don't know
17. Should you always keep secrets when grown-ups tell you to?
   yes no I don't know

18. If someone touched a child's private parts and promised never to do it again, should the child tell someone?
   yes no I don't know

19. If a friend says he has been hurt, should you tell him to try to forget about it?
   yes no I don't know

20. Do women every sexually assault children?
   yes no I don't know

21. Does an exposor show his private parts to others?
   yes no I don't know

22. Can you tell from looking at someone whether or not that person will hurt you?
   yes no I don't know

23. Do you think children are bad if grown-ups touch their private parts?
   yes no I don't know

24. Do you have to let grown-ups touch you whether you like it or not?
   yes no I don't know

25. If the first grown-up you tell about a problem doesn't help you, should you solve the problem by yourself?
   yes no I don't know
PARENT INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE (POST)  
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

MY NAME IS SUE HAMILTON. AS YOU ARE PROBABLY AWARE, YOUR CHILD HAS NOW COMPLETED THE PERSONAL SAFETY PROGRAMME 'FEELING YES, FEELING NO'. I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE YOUR HELP IN FILLING IN THIS SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE IN ORDER TO FIND OUT YOUR VIEWS ON PERSONAL SAFETY PROGRAMMES

WHEREVER POSSIBLE IT SHOULD BE COMPLETED BY THE PARENT OR GUARDIAN OF THE CHILD.

I WISH TO EMPHASISE AGAIN THAT INFORMATION GIVEN BY YOU WILL NOT BE SHARED WITH ANY MEMBER OF SCHOOL STAFF.

WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE, COULD YOU PUT IT IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED AND I WILL PICK IT UP FROM THE SCHOOL AT 9am TOMORROW.

ONCE AGAIN MANY THANKS FOR YOUR TIME, HELP, COOPERATION AND CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS KEEPING CHILDREN SAFE.

SUE HAMILTON  
RESEARCHER
PARENT INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE - POST

1. SINCE BEING TAUGHT THE PERSONAL SAFETY PROGRAMME, "FEELING YES, FEELING NO", HAS YOUR CHILD ASKED YOU ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE TOPIC? (PLEASE TICK APPROPRIATE BOX)
   □ YES
   □ NO

1a) IF YES, PLEASE LIST MAIN QUESTIONS ASKED BY YOUR CHILD:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

2. SINCE BEING TAUGHT THE PERSONAL SAFETY PROGRAMME, "FEELING YES, FEELING NO", HAS YOUR CHILD TOLD YOU ABOUT ANY UNSAFE SITUATIONS THAT HE/SHE HAS FOUND THEMSELVES IN? (TICK APPROPRIATE BOX)
   □ YES
   □ NO

2a) IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE;

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

3. DID YOU REPORT THE INCIDENT TO ANYONE? (TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX)
   □ YES
   □ NO

4. IF YES, TO WHOM DID YOU REPORT THE INCIDENT?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
5. TO THE BEST OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE, HAS YOUR CHILD USED ANY PART OF THE PROGRAMME AT ANY TIME TO KEEP THEMSELVES SAFE?

☐ YES
☐ NO

5a) IF YES, COULD YOU DESCRIBE THE CIRCUMSTANCES IN WHICH YOUR CHILD USED THE PROGRAMME?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

6. HOW DOES YOUR CHILD GET ALONG WITH THEIR TEACHER?

☐ NOT GOOD  ☐ ALL RIGHT  ☐ VERY GOOD
DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS FRIGHTEN YOU?
(TICK ONLY ONE BOX ON EACH LINE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I'M NOT FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>I'M SOMETIMES FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>I'M VERY FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>NEVER HAPPENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Going to the Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Being cuddled by your mum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Going to bed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Your Relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Going out at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Being cuddled by your Dad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Female Strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Taking a bath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Male strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Female baby-sitters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Being alone in the dark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Male baby-sitters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Going to the Dentist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT EFFECT DID THE PERSONAL SAFETY PROGRAMME "FEELING YES, FEELING NO", HAVE ON YOUR CHILD? (PLEASE TICK RELEVANT BOX)

IT HAD A VERY GOOD EFFECT OVERALL □
IT HAD A BAD EFFECT OVERALL □
IT HAD NO EFFECT □

8a) PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR REASONS FOR THE BOX YOU HAVE TICKED:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

9 DO YOU THINK THE PERSONAL SAFETY PROGRAMMES SUCH AS THE "FEELING YES, FEELING NO" ARE GOOD FOR CHILDREN? (PLEASE TICK THE RELEVANT BOX) □ YES □ NO

10 HAVE YOU ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS TO MAKE ABOUT THE PROGRAMME?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THIS IMPORTANT RESEARCH ABOUT KEEPING CHILDREN SAFE
MY NAME IS SUE HAMILTON. AS YOU ARE PROBABLY AWARE, THE OTHER SCHOOL HAS NOW COMPLETED THE PERSONAL SAFETY PROGRAMME 'FEELING YES, FEELING NO'. I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE YOUR HELP IN FILLING IN THIS SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE IN ORDER TO FIND OUT YOUR VIEWS ON PERSONAL SAFETY PROGRAMMES

WHEREVER POSSIBLE IT SHOULD BE COMPLETED BY THE PARENT OR GUARDIAN OF THE CHILD.

I WISH TO EMPHASISE AGAIN THAT INFORMATION GIVEN BY YOU WILL NOT BE SHARED WITH ANY MEMBER OF SCHOOL STAFF.

WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE, COULD YOU PUT IT IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED AND I WILL PICK IT UP FROM THE SCHOOL AT 9am TOMORROW.

ONCE AGAIN MANY THANKS FOR YOUR TIME, HELP, COOPERATION AND CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS KEEPING CHILDREN SAFE.

SUE HAMILTON
RESEARCHER
1. Do you think your school should teach child sexual abuse prevention programmes? (Please tick relevant box)
   - □ Yes
   - □ No

2. Do you think parents should be partners with the school in keeping the children safe? (Please tick relevant box)
   - □ Yes
   - □ No

3. Does your child like school? (Please tick relevant box)
   - □ Yes
   - □ No

4. How does your child get along with their teacher? (Please tick relevant box)
   - □ Not good
   - □ All right
   - □ Very good
5. **DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS FRIGHTEN YOUR CHILDREN?**

(TICK ONLY ONE BOX ON EACH LINE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I'M NOT FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>I'M SOMETIMES FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>I'M VERY FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>NEVER HAPPENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Going to the Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Being cuddled by your mum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Going to bed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Your Relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Going out at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Being cuddled by your Dad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Female Strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Taking a bath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Male strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Female baby-sitters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Being alone in the dark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Male baby-sitters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Going to the Dentist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEELING

yes

FEELING

no
MY NAME IS SUE HAMILTON, I'D LIKE YOU TO HELP ME FIND OUT WHAT CHILDREN THINK ABOUT KEEPING SAFE. THIS IS NOT A TEST, IT IS A SET OF QUESTIONS SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR YOUR CLASS. YOU MAY FIND SOME OF THE QUESTIONS EMBARRASSING BUT IT IS REALLY IMPORTANT THAT YOU TRY AND ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS.

IF YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEM WITH ANY QUESTIONS, DO NOT WORRY. YOU CAN ASK YOUR TEACHER FOR HELP OR LEAVE IT BLANK.

WHEN YOU ARE FINISHED YOUR PAPER WILL BE IMMEDIATELY PLACED IN AN ENVELOPE AND SEALED. I WILL PICK THESE UP FROM THE SCHOOL.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR HELPING IN THIS VERY IMPORTANT EXERCISE ABOUT KEEPING CHILDREN SAFE.

SUE HAMILTON.
1 READ EACH QUESTION CAREFULLY

2 IN MANY OF THE QUESTIONS YOU HAVE THREE CHOICES. MAKE SURE YOU READ ALL CHOICES BEFORE TICKING THE BOX YOU FEEL IS RIGHT FOR YOU

3 WORK STRAIGHT THROUGH

4 DO NOT TURN BACK TO ANY PAGE OR QUESTION.
PLEASE FILL IN YOUR ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS AS WELL AS YOU CAN. WRITE YOUR OWN THOUGHTS.
DO NOT WRITE IN THE COLUMN WHERE IT SAYS CODING

PLEASE COMPLETE THESE SENTENCES:

1. THE PERSON I LIKE TO BE CUDDLED MOST BY IS ____________

2. THE PERSON I LIKE TO BE CUDDLED LEAST BY ____________

3. HOW DO YOU GET ALONG WITH YOUR CLASS TEACHER?
   □ NOT GOOD    □ ALL RIGHT    □ VERY GOOD
4 DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS FRIGHTEN YOU?

(TICK ONLY ONE BOX ON EACH LINE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I'M NOT FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>I'M SOMETIMES FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>I'M VERY FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>NEVER HAPPENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Going to the Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Being cuddled by your mum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Going to bed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Your Relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Going out at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Being cuddled by your Dad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Female Strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Taking a bath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Male strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j Female baby-sitters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k Being alone in the dark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l Male baby-sitters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m Going to the Dentist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5 HAS YOUR MUM OR DAD EVER SPOKEN TO YOU ABOUT STRANGERS?

TICK ONLY ONE BOX

☐ YES ☐ NO

6 HOW OFTEN HAS YOUR MUM OR DAD SPOKEN TO YOU ABOUT STRANGERS IN THE PAST MONTH?

TICK ONLY ONE BOX

☐ NEVER ☐ ABOUT 2 TIMES ☐ 3-5 TIMES

☐ MORE THAN 6 TIMES

7 DID THEY TELL YOU WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO YOU IF YOU WENT WITH A STRANGER?

TICK ONLY ONE BOX

☐ YES ☐ NO

8 WHAT DO YOU THINK WOULD HAPPEN TO YOU IF YOU WENT WITH A STRANGER?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
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YOU MAY HAVE HEARD OF SEXUAL ASSAULT, WHAT DO YOU THINK IT IS?

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE AS BEST YOU CAN

I THINK SEXUAL ASSAULT IS

TIME!

For The Next Sheet....
BELOW ARE SOME QUESTIONS. READ EACH QUESTION CAREFULLY AND TICK ONLY ONE BOX FOR EACH QUESTION.

FOR EXAMPLE: IS AN ELEPHANT BIGGER THAN A MOUSE?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ I DON'T KNOW

10 DO YOU THINK CHILDREN SHOULD ALWAYS OBEY GROWN-UPS?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ I DON'T KNOW

11 ARE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR FAMILY THE ONLY ONES WHO CAN HELP YOU IF YOU HAVE A PROBLEM?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ I DON'T KNOW

12 ARE BOYS EVER SEXUALLY ASSAULTED?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ I DON'T KNOW

13 IS IT A GOOD IDEA TO YELL IF SOMEONE TOUCHES YOU IN A WAY THAT SCARES YOU?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ I DON'T KNOW

14 DOES SEXUAL ASSAULT MEAN GETTING BEAT UP?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ I DON'T KNOW
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOES AN EXPOSER SHOW HIS PRIVATE PARTS TO OTHERS?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOULD YOU ALWAYS KEEP SECRETS WHEN GROWN-UPS TELL YOU TO?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF SOMEONE TOUCHED A CHILD'S PRIVATE PARTS SHOULD THE CHILD TELL SOMEBODY?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF SOMEONE TOUCHED A CHILD'S PRIVATE PARTS AND PROMISED NEVER TO DO IT AGAIN, SHOULD THE CHILD TELL ANYBODY?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN STRANGERS TELL FROM LOOKING AT SOMEONE WHETHER OR NOT THE PERSON WILL HURT YOU?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARE STRANGERS THE ONLY PEOPLE WHO MIGHT WANT TO TOUCH CHILDREN'S PRIVATE PARTS?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21 Below in the boxes are the names for the parts of the body. In the pictures below there are lines pointing to these parts of the body. Write the name for each part of the body on the line. You can use the same word twice and you do not have to use every word.

- Chin
- Thigh
- Penis
- Leg
- Vagina
- Head
- Arm
- Breast

Chin   Thigh   Penis   Leg
Vagina  Head   Arm   Breast
IT WAS FRIDAY NIGHT AND STEPHEN'S MUM HAD LET HIM GO TO THE SHOWS. A MAN THAT STEPHEN DID NOT KNOW CAME UP TO HIM. THIS MAN SAID THAT HE WOULD GIVE STEPHEN TWENTY POUNDS TO SPEND IF HE CAME WITH HIM TO THE LOCAL AMUSEMENT ARCADE TO PLAY THE MACHINES.

22 SHOULD STEPHEN GO WITH THIS MAN?

TICK ONLY ONE BOX

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ I DON'T KNOW

23 SHOULD STEPHEN TELL ANYONE ABOUT THIS?

☐ YES  ☐ NO  ☐ DON'T KNOW

24 IF STEPHEN DID DECIDE TO TELL ABOUT THE MAN, WHO SHOULD HE TELL?

25 DO YOU THINK THE MAN WOULD DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS?

TICK ONLY ONE BOX ON EACH LINE

a) GO AWAY

b) HIT STEPHEN

c) SEXUALLY ASSAULT STEPHEN

d) GIVE STEPHEN £20 TO GO WITH HIM

e) TAKE HIM AWAY

YES NO I DON'T KNOW

□1 □2 □3 □9

□1 □2 □3 □9

□1 □2 □3 □9

□1 □2 □3 □9

□1 □2 □3 □9

□1 □2 □3 □9
JUST TO REMIND YOU OF THE STORY:

IT WAS FRIDAY NIGHT AND STEPHEN'S MUM HAD LET HIM GO TO THE SHOWS. A MAN THAT STEPHEN DID NOT KNOW CAME UP TO HIM. THIS MAN SAID THAT HE WOULD GIVE STEPHEN TWENTY POUNDS TO SPEND IF HE CAME WITH HIM TO THE LOCAL AMUSEMENT ARCADE TO PLAY THE MACHINES.

26 IF STEPHEN SAID NO, AND THE MAN STARTED TO PULL HIM AWAY WITH HIM, WHAT SHOULD STEPHEN DO?

☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3
☐ 4  ☐ 9

27 IF THE MAN SEXUALLY ASSAULTED STEPHEN, Whose fault would it be?

TICK ANY OF THE BOXES YOU THINK ARE RIGHT.

☐ STEPHEN'S MUMS FAULT
☐ THE MAN'S FAULT
☐ STEPHEN'S FAULT

**Dearly Over!**

**Turn the page**
IT WAS POURING RAIN AND JANE WAS WALKING HOME FROM SCHOOL. A MAN JANE HAD NOT SEEN BEFORE STOPPED HIS CAR AND SAID JANE'S MOTHER HAD SENT HIM TO GIVE HER A LIFT. HE ASKED HER TO GET IN THE CAR.

27 SHOULD JANE GO WITH THE MAN?
TICK ONLY ONE BOX

□ YES □ NO □ I DON'T KNOW

28 SHOULD JANE TELL ANYONE ABOUT THIS?

□ YES □ NO □ I DON'T KNOW

29 IF JANE DID DECIDE TO TELL ABOUT THE MAN; WHO SHOULD SHE TELL?

30 DO YOU THINK THE MAN WOULD DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS?

TICK ONLY ONE BOX ON EACH LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>I DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) DRIVE AWAY ON HIS OWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) HIT JANE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) SEXUALLY ASSAULT JANE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) MAKE JANE GET IN THE CAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) TAKE HER AWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JUST TO REMIND YOU OF THE STORY:

IT WAS POURING RAIN AND JANE WAS WALKING HOME FROM SCHOOL. A MAN JANE HAD NOT SEEN BEFORE STOPPED HIS CAR AND SAID JANE'S MOTHER HAD SENT HIM TO GIVE HER A LIFT. HE ASKED HER TO GET IN THE CAR.

32 IF JANE SAID NO, AND THE MAN PULLED HER TOWARDS THE CAR, WHAT SHOULD JANE DO?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

33 IF THE MAN SEXUALLY ASSAULTED JANE, WHOSE FAULT WOULD IT BE?

TICK ANY OF THE BOXES YOU THINK ARE RIGHT.

☐ JANE'S MUMS FAULT  ☐ THE MAN'S FAULT  ☐ JANE'S FAULT

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR HELPING ME IN THIS IMPORTANT EXERCISE ABOUT KEEPING CHILDREN SAFE.

Finished - Now What?
PARENT INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

AS THE SAFETY OF CHILDREN IN THE COMMUNITY IS VERY IMPORTANT, I WOULD GREATLY APPRECIATE YOUR HELP AND CO-OPERATION IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. WHEREVER POSSIBLE, IT SHOULD BE COMPLETED BY THE PARENT OR GUARDIAN OF THE CHILD.

THE QUESTIONS ARE DESIGNED TO GATHER INFORMATION ABOUT THE CHILDREN AND FAMILIES IN THE PERSONAL SAFETY STUDY. I REALISE THAT SOME OF THESE QUESTIONS ARE PERSONAL, AND I WISH TO EMPHASISE THAT THIS INFORMATION IS FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY. IT WILL NOT BE GIVEN OR SHARED WITH ANY MEMBER OF THE STAFF IN THE SCHOOL. I ALSO WISH TO REASSURE YOU THAT ANY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.

I WOULD APPRECIATE IF YOU COULD ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS IN INK AS COMPLETELY AS YOU CAN. FOR ANY QUESTION THAT DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU OR YOUR FAMILY, COULD YOU PLEASE WRITE D/N/A (SHORT FOR DOES NOT APPLY)?

AFTER YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PLEASE PUT IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE AND SEAL IT. I WILL PICK UP FROM SCHOOL AT 9 a.m. TOMORROW.

THANK-YOU FOR YOUR TIME, CO-OPERATION AND CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THIS STUDY.

SUE HAMILTON
1. Child’s current age: __ __ Years __ __ Months

2. Child’s sex:
   (Tick one box)
   □ Male □ Female

3. What is your relationship to the child?
   (Tick relevant box)
   Mother □
   Father □
   Step-mother □
   Step-father □
   Guardian □
   Foster-Parent □
   Other: __ __ __ __

4. What age are you? __ __ __ __ Years

5. Please list the sex, age and relationship to your child of everyone living with the child (including yourself) currently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (Example)
PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE - (PRE)

1. Child's current age
   - _ _ _ Years
   - _ _ _ Months

2. Child's sex
   (Tick one box)
   - Male [ ]
   - Female [ ]

3. What is your relationship to the child?
   (Tick relevant box)
   - Mother [ ]
   - Father [ ]
   - Step-mother [ ]
   - Step-father [ ]
   - Guardian [ ]
   - Foster-Parent [ ]
   - Other [ ]

4. What age are you?
   - _ _ _ _ Years

5. Please list the sex, age and relationship to your child of everyone living with the child (including yourself) currently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (Example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 What is your present marital status?  
(Please tick relevant box)

Single □  
Married □  
Cohabiting □  
Divorced □  
Widowed □  
Re-married □  

7 Does the child's mother work?  
(Please tick only one box)

□ Yes □ No  

8 What is the child's mother occupation?  

9 What is the child's mothers weekly income before tax?  
(Please tick relevant box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Income</th>
<th>State Benefits</th>
<th>Under £70</th>
<th>£70-£100</th>
<th>£100-£250</th>
<th>£250-£400</th>
<th>£400-£500</th>
<th>Over £500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10 Does the child's father work?  
(Please tick only one box)

□ Yes □ No  

11 What is the child's father's occupation?  

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 9  

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 9  

□ 1 □ 2 □ 9  

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 9
12 What is the child's father's weekly income before tax?  
(Please tick relevant box)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Income</th>
<th>State Benefits</th>
<th>Under £70</th>
<th>£70-£100</th>
<th>£100-£250</th>
<th>£250-£400</th>
<th>£400-£500</th>
<th>Over £500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13 Under what religion, if any, is your child being raised?  

14 Has Your child ever been separated from you, for any of the following reasons?  
(tick all boxes that apply)  

- My child has never been separated from me
- In hospital for more than 2 weeks
- Lived outwith your care for more than 2 months
- In Foster-care
- Other reason  
(Please state reason and for how long below)  

15 Have you ever spoken to your child about strangers?  
(Tick only one box)  

- Yes
- No
16. How often have you spoken to your child about strangers in the past month?
   □ Never □ About 2 times □ 3-5 times
   □ More than 6 times

17. Have you told your child what would happen if they went with a stranger?
   (tick only one box)
   □ Yes □ No

18. What did you tell your child would happen if they went with a stranger?

   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
19 DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS FRIGHTEN YOU?
(TICK ONLY ONE BOX ON EACH LINE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I'M NOT FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>I'M SOMETIMES FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>I'M VERY FRIGHTENED</th>
<th>NEVER HAPPENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Going to the Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Being cuddled by your mum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Going to bed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Your Relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Going out at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Being cuddled by your Dad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Female Strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Taking a bath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Male strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j Female baby-sitters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k Being alone in the dark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l Male baby-sitters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m Going to the Dentist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20  Does your child like school?
   (Tick appropriate box)
   □ Yes    □ No

21  How would you describe your child's relationship with their teacher?
   (Tick appropriate box)
   □ Not good  □ Very good  □ Good

Please put the complete questionnaire into the pre-paid envelope. Thank you very much indeed for your help and co-operation in this research.
SCHEDULE OF NOTIFICATION OF USAGE OF THE PROGRAMME
(to be completed in respect of each child)

Name of Child  ____________  Date of Birth  ________

Referrer  ____________________________

Date of Incident  ________________

Have Parents been informed of incident?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
(Tick relevant box)

Was the matter referred to either police or social work department?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

What was the outcome?
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

Date notified to S Hamilton  ________________
Circumstances as narrated by referrer regarding use of programme

(Specify if child used a programme strategy)

Completed by ________________

Status ________________
SEMI-STRUCTURED CHILDREN'S QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What did you feel about being involved in the exercise?

2. How would you describe a stranger?

Prompt: Is that the only kind of stranger
3. Name one person in your family that you trust

☐ Mum
☐ Dad
☐ Sister
☐ Brother

4. Why do you trust that person?

5. Name one person outwith your family that you...
6. Why do trust that person?

7. Why did you go/not go with the man?
8. Did anyone in your class tell you about their trip to Cannonball House? What did they tell you.

9. Is there anything else you would like to say about being involved in the exercise.

Prompt: Did you learn anything?
Dear Parent,

It is now a year since your child was involved in the exercise at Canonball House where they were videoed meeting the 'stranger'. I would therefore very much appreciate if you could complete the attached form in order to help me decide whether this kind of exercise should be continued to be used for research purposes.

I cannot emphasise enough how important it is that you complete this if we are to take a decision as to how we can best help children to protect themselves from being abducted by strangers.

Can you please return the form to the school in the enclosed envelope by 30 May 1992 and I will pick it up next week.

Thank you for all your help and cooperation in this research study.

Yours sincerely

Sue Hamilton
RESEARCHER

Enc.
PARENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE (SIMULATION EXERCISE)

1. DO YOU THINK IT WAS HELPFUL FOR YOUR CHILD TO BE INVOLVED IN THE EXERCISE AT CANNONBALL HOUSE?
   YES ☐   NO ☐ (Please tick only one box).

1a Please explain the reasons for the box you have ticked.
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________

2. DO YOU THINK THE EXERCISE HAD POSITIVE EFFECTS ON YOUR CHILD?
   YES ☐   NO ☐ (Please tick only one box).

2a Please explain the reasons for the box you have ticked.
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________________
3. **DO YOU THINK THE EXERCISE HAD NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON YOUR CHILD?**

   YES [ ]  NO [ ]  (Please tick only one box).

3a **Please explain the reasons for the box you have ticked.**

   [Blank lines for explanatory text]

4. **IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO SAY ABOUT YOUR CHILD’S INVOLVEMENT IN THIS EXERCISE**

   YES [ ]  NO [ ]

4a **If yes, continue below.**

   [Blank lines for explanatory text]

Thank you for all your help and cooperation in this research.
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (SIMULATION EXERCISE)

1. DO YOU THINK IT WAS HELPFUL FOR THE CHILDREN TO BE INVOLVED IN THE EXERCISE AT CANNONBALL HOUSE?
   YES  □  NO  □  (Please tick only one box).

   1a Please explain the reasons for the box you have ticked.

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

2. DO YOU THINK THE EXERCISE HAD POSITIVE EFFECTS ON THE CHILDREN?
   YES  □  NO  □  (Please tick only one box).

   2a Please explain the reasons for the box you have ticked.

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
3. DO YOU THINK THE EXERCISE HAD NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON THE CHILDREN?

YES [ ] NO [ ] (Please tick only one box).

3a Please explain the reasons for the box you have ticked.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO SAY ABOUT THE CHILDREN’S INVOLVEMENT IN THIS EXERCISE

YES [ ] NO [ ]

4a If yes, continue below.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for all your help and cooperation in this research.
Appendix 5

$t$ Test Tables for Chapter Five
### Table A5:1(a)  
**t test Knowledge Scores - Experimental Group**  
**Below Average Ability**  
(N=4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>3.742</td>
<td>1.871</td>
<td>-1.5000</td>
<td>3.742</td>
<td>3.317</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5000</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A5:1(aa)  
**t test Knowledge Scores - Control Group**  
**Below Average Ability**  
(N=5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>6.8000</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>-1.2000</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0000</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A5:1(b)  
**t test Knowledge Scores - Experimental Group**  
**Average Ability**  
(N=19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>6.6632</td>
<td>2.446</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>-2.5789</td>
<td>2.446</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>-4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.8421</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A5:1(bb)  
**t test Knowledge Scores - Control Group**  
**Average Ability**  
(N=5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>6.0625</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>-2.0625</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>-3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1250</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table A5:1(c)</td>
<td>t test Knowledge Scores - Experimental Group Above Average Ability (N=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Sub Corr 2-tail Sig Mean SD SE of Mean Paired Differences t-value df 2-tail Sig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.320 0.599 7.4000 1.140 0.510 -2.8000 1.304 0.583 -4.80 4 0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2000 1.095 0.490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A5:1(cc)</th>
<th>t test Knowledge Scores - Control Group Above Average Ability (N=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Sub Corr 2-tail Sig Mean SD SE of Mean Paired Differences t-value df 2-tail Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A5:2(a)</th>
<th>t test Knowledge Scores - Experimental Group No Behavioural Problems (N=26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Sub Corr 2-tail Sig Mean SD SE of Mean Paired Differences t-value df 2-tail Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A5:2(aa)</th>
<th>t test Knowledge Scores - Control Group No Behavioural Problems (N=17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Sub Corr 2-tail Sig Mean SD SE of Mean Paired Differences t-value df 2-tail Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A5:2(b)  \ t test Knowledge Scores - Experimental Group

**Behavioural problems**

(N=2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-3.000</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0000</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A5:2(bb)  \ t test Knowledge Scores - Control Group

**Behavioural Problems**

(N=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>5.8000</td>
<td>2.098</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>-1.9000</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>7.7000</td>
<td>1.829</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A5:3(a)  \ t test Knowledge Scores - Experimental Group

**Reflective Cognitive Style**

(N=11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>5.9091</td>
<td>2.548</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>-2.9091</td>
<td>2.948</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>-3.27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>8.8182</td>
<td>2.183</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A5:3(aa)  \ t test Knowledge Scores - Control Group

**Reflective Cognitive Style**

(N=7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>6.7143</td>
<td>1.799</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>-1.5714</td>
<td>2.370</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>8.2857</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table A5:3(b)</td>
<td>t test Knowledge Scores - Experimental Group</td>
<td>Impulsive Cognitive Style</td>
<td>(N=17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Sub</td>
<td>Corr</td>
<td>2-tail Sig</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SE of Mean</td>
<td>Paired Differences Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SE of Mean</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>7.0588</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>-1.4706</td>
<td>2.239</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>-2.71</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5294</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.5285</td>
<td>2.239</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>-2.71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A5:3 (bb)</th>
<th>t test Knowledge Scores - Control Group</th>
<th>Impulsive Cognitive Style</th>
<th>(N=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Sub</td>
<td>Corr</td>
<td>2-tail Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.2000</td>
<td>1.989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A5:4(a)</th>
<th>t test Knowledge Scores - Experimental Group</th>
<th>High Inductive Reasoning Score</th>
<th>(N=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Sub</td>
<td>Corr</td>
<td>2-tail Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1667</td>
<td>2.714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A5:4(aa)</th>
<th>t test Knowledge Scores - Control Group</th>
<th>High Inductive Reasoning Score</th>
<th>(N=5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of Sub</td>
<td>Corr</td>
<td>2-tail Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.704</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.2000</td>
<td>1.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A5:4(b)  
**t test Knowledge Scores - Experimental Group**  
Low Inductive Reasoning Score  
(N=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences Mean</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-test</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>6.6818</td>
<td>2.644</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>-2.4091</td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-test</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>9.0909</td>
<td>1.659</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A5:4 (bb)  
**t test Knowledge Scores - Control Group**  
Low Inductive Reasoning Score  
(N=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No of Sub</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Paired Differences Mean</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-test</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>6.3636</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>-1.6364</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-test</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>8.0000</td>
<td>1.952</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6

Descriptive Statistics - Knowledge Tests
(All data in these tables relate to Chapter Five)
**Table A6:1(a)**
Are The People in Your Family The Only Ones Who Can Help If You Have A Problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(75.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A6:1(b)**
Are The People in Your Family The Only Ones Who Can Help If You Have A Problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(82.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A6:2(a)**
Is It A Good Idea To Yell If Someone Touches You In A Way That Scares You?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(75.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A6:2(b)**
Is It A Good Idea To Yell If Someone Touches You In A Way That Scares You?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(92.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A6:3(a)**
Does Sexual Assault Mean Getting Beat Up?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(21.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(60.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table A6:3(b)**
Does Sexual Assault Mean Getting Beat Up?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(75.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A6:4(a)
If Someone Touched A Child's Private Parts Should The Child Tell Anybody?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental N = 28</th>
<th>Control N = 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26 (92.9)</td>
<td>23 (85.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A6:4(b)
If Someone Touched A Child's Private Parts Should The Child Tell Anybody?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental N = 28</th>
<th>Control N = 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27 (96.4)</td>
<td>23 (85.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A6:5(a)
If Someone Touched A Child's Private Parts And Promised Never To Do It Again, Should The Child Tell Anybody?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental N = 28</th>
<th>Control N = 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20 (71.4)</td>
<td>24 (88.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 (14.3)</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>4 (14.3)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A6:5(b)
If Someone Touched A Child's Private Parts And Promised Never To Do It Again, Should The Child Tell Anybody?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental N = 28</th>
<th>Control N = 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27 (96.4)</td>
<td>26 (96.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A6:6(a)
Can Children Tell From Looking At Someone Whether Or Not The Person Will Hurt Them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental N = 28</th>
<th>Control N = 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19 (67.9)</td>
<td>13 (48.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>7 (25.0)</td>
<td>11 (40.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A6:6(b)
Can Children Tell From Looking At Someone Whether Or Not The Person Will Hurt Them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental N = 28</th>
<th>Control N = 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (14.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23 (82.1)</td>
<td>14 (51.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5 (17.9)</td>
<td>9 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A6:7(a)
Are Strangers The Only People Who Might Want To Touch Children's Private Parts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|               | N = 28       | N = 27  |%
| Yes           | 3 (10.7)     | 1 (3.6) |%
| No            | 16 (57.1)    | 17 (63.0)|%
| Don't Know    | 9 (32.1)     | 9 (33.3)|%
| No Response   | 0 (0)        | 0 (0)   |

### Table A6:7(b)
Are Strangers The Only People Who Might Want To Touch Children's Private Parts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|               | N = 28       | N = 27  |%
| Yes           | 1 (3.6)      | 2 (7.4) |%
| No            | 23 (82.1)    | 21 (77.8)|%
| Don't Know    | 4 (14.3)     | 4 (14.8)|%
| No Response   | 0 (0)        | 0 (0)   |
Appendix 7

Pre-programme Responses by Parents and Children to the Consequences of Stranger Abduction
(All data in these tables relate to Chapter Six)
Table A7:1(a)
What Did You Tell Your Child Would Happen If They Went With A Stranger?
Pre-Parental Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental N=26</th>
<th>Control N=23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnap</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(26.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy.Ass.*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(30.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex.Ass.*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.S.F.A.*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(38.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Phy.Ass. = Physical Assault
* Sex.Ass. = Sexual Assault
* N.S.F.A. = Not See Family Again

Table A7:1(b)
What Do You Think Would Happen If You Went With A Stranger?
Pre-Test Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental N=28</th>
<th>Control N=27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnap</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(28.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy.Ass.*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(32.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex.Ass.*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.S.F.A.*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Phy.Ass. = Physical Assault
* Sex.Ass. = Sexual Assault
* N.S.F.A. = Not See Family Again
Appendix 8

Descriptive Statistics - Stranger Vignettes
(All data in these tables relate to Chapter Seven)
### Table A7:2(a)

#### Should Stephen Tell Anyone About This?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26 (92.9%)</td>
<td>26 (96.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:2(b)

#### Should Stephen Tell Anyone About This?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27 (96.4%)</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:3(a)

#### Who Should Stephen Tell?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>12 (42.9%)</td>
<td>13 (48.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>7 (25.0%)</td>
<td>13 (48.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted Adult</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (14.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4 (14.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:3(b)

#### Who Should Stephen Tell?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>11 (39.3%)</td>
<td>15 (55.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>3 (10.7%)</td>
<td>10 (37.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted Adult</td>
<td>11 (39.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (7.1%)</td>
<td>1 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A7:4(a)
**Go Away?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td>(11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>(71.4)</td>
<td>(81.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don't Know</strong></td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:4(b)
**Go Away?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>(71.4)</td>
<td>(88.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don't Know</strong></td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:5(a)
**Hit Stephen?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
<td>(14.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don't Know</strong></td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(48.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:5(b)
**Hit Stephen?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>(35.7)</td>
<td>(51.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don't Know</strong></td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(40.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A7:6(a)

Sexually Assault Stephen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9 (32.1)</td>
<td>11 (40.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 (17.9)</td>
<td>9 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>13 (46.4)</td>
<td>7 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A7:6(b)

Sexually Assault Stephen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19 (67.9)</td>
<td>12 (44.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>9 (32.1)</td>
<td>12 (44.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A7:7(a)

Give Stephen £20.00 To Go With Him

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 (17.9)</td>
<td>7 (25.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16 (57.1)</td>
<td>15 (55.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5 (17.9)</td>
<td>5 (18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A7:7(b)

Give Stephen £20.00 To Go With Him

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 (10.7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23 (82.1)</td>
<td>23 (85.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>4 (14.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A7:8(a)
#### Take Him Away?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(60.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(82.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:8(b)
#### Take Him Away?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(60.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(82.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:9(a)
#### What Should Stephen Do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shout</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(85.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shout</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(92.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:9(b)
#### What Should Stephen Do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shout</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(85.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A7:9(c)
Number of Action Strategies - Stephen
Post-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ Strategies</td>
<td>11 (39.3)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Strategies</td>
<td>7 (25.0)</td>
<td>10 (37.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strategy</td>
<td>9 (32.1)</td>
<td>14 (51.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A7:10(a)
Attribution of Fault For Sexual Assault - Stephen
Pre-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mum</td>
<td>8 (28.6)</td>
<td>5 (18.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>14 (50.0)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>4 (14.3)</td>
<td>7 (25.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mum</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Stranger</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Stranger</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (14.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mum</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (18.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A7:10(b)
Attribution of Fault For Sexual Assault - Stephen
Post-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 28</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mum</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>8 (29.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>27 (96.4)</td>
<td>4 (14.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (11.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mum</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>2 (7.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Stranger</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (14.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Stranger</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (18.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mum</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A7:11(a)
**Who Should Jane Tell?**
**Pre-Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>14 (50)</td>
<td>17 (62.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>6 (21.4)</td>
<td>10 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted Adult</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3 (10.7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4 (14.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:11(b)
**Who Should Jane Tell?**
**Post-Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>12 (42.8)</td>
<td>14 (51.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>12 (44.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted Adult</td>
<td>11 (39.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:12(a)
**Drive Away on His Own?**
**Pre-Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 (7.1)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20 (71.4)</td>
<td>23 (85.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5 (17.9)</td>
<td>4 (14.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A7:12(b)
**Drive Away on His Own?**
**Post-Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22 (78.6)</td>
<td>21 (77.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>6 (21.4)</td>
<td>5 (18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>