

PERCEPTIONS OF SEXUAL ACTIVITY FROM STAFF AND YOUTH IN A STATE
JUVENILE FACILITY

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University-San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements

For the Degree

Master of SCIENCE

By

Karly D. Watson, B.S.

San Marcos, Texas
December 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank first and foremost my thesis committee members: Dr. William Stone, Dr. Albert S. Dietz, and Dr. Michael Supancic. Their support, help, and guidance have been greatly appreciated. Secondly, I would like to thank Dr. Donna Vandiver, the graduate advisor for the department of criminal justice, for her continued support and encouragement throughout the thesis completion process. Finally, I would like to thank the Center for Society, Law & Justice for allowing me to use data gathered during a grant supported research project.

This manuscript was submitted on October 31, 2008.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
CHAPTER	
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Review of Relevant Literature.....	2
III. Research Methods and Procedures.....	20
IV. Results.....	25
V. Discussion.....	34
VI. Conclusion.....	36
APPENDICES	
A. Texas State Consent Form.....	38
B. Survey Instrument.....	39
C. Survey Response Numbers.....	43
D. Frequency Distribution.....	47
REFERENCES.....	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1: Reliability.....	25
2.1 Chi-Square test results part 1	26
2.2 Chi-Square test results part 2	27
2.3 Chi-Square test results part 3	28
2.4 Chi-Square test results part 4	29
3.1 Frequencies for first youth-on-youth scenario	30
3.2 Frequencies for second youth-on-youth scenario	30
4.1 Frequencies for first staff-on-youth scenario	31
4.2 Frequencies for second staff-on-youth scenario	31

ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF SEXUAL ACTIVITY FROM STAFF AND YOUTH IN A STATE JUVENILE FACILITY

by

Karly D. Watson, B.S.

Texas State University-San Marcos

December 2008

SUPERVISING PROFESSOR: WILLIAM STONE

This paper continues the body of knowledge on the topic of juvenile sexual activity and assaults in correctional facilities. This study used data collected through a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA). The grant research team conducted a survey in a juvenile facility of a mid-western state asking staff and juvenile participants to give their perceptions of the occurrences, on a scale from never to very often, of a range of sexual activity including consensual sex, sexual jokes, gestures, and touches, bribery for sexual acts and sex by force in which the victim was received minor injuries, serious injuries, or death. Using statistical tools and tests such as frequency distributions, Cronbach's alpha reliability test, and Chi-Square to test for significance, this study found a significant difference in the perceptions of juveniles and staff.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

There has been a broad range of studies on sexual assault and sexual activity in correctional facilities; these studies include the use of official reports, victimization surveys, and ethnographic reports. The majority of the studies of prison sex have been conducted in adult correctional facilities. This study uses a survey instrument, created by the Center for Society, Law, & Justice for a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) grant, to gather the perceptions of prohibited sexual activity from youth and staff who have high contact with youth in a state male juvenile facility. This study seeks to answer the question: do perceptions of sexual activity in a juvenile facility differ between the staff and the incarcerated youth? It can be hypothesized that the perceptions of sexual activity are different between staff and youth based upon either the inmate subculture of silence or prison rape elimination training given to staff that sensitizes them to the sexual activity in the facility.

CHAPTER II

Review of Relevant Literature

In 2003, the national Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) became a law. The Act was to provide for the “analysis of the incidence and effects of prison rape in Federal, State, and local institutions and to provide information, resources, recommendations, and funding to protect individuals from prison rape” (Prison Rape Elimination Act, 2003, 117 STAT. 972). The purposes of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 are to:

1. “Establish a zero-tolerance standard for the incidence of prison rape in prisons in the United States”;
2. “Make the prevention of prison rape a top priority in each prison system”;
3. “Develop and implement national standards for the detection, prevention, reduction, and punishment of prison rape”;
4. “Increase the available data and information on the incidence of prison rape, consequently improving the management and administration of correctional facilities”;
5. “Standardize the definitions used for collecting data on the incidence of prison rape”;
6. “Increase the accountability of prison officials who fail to detect, prevent, reduce, and punish prison rape”;

7. “Protect the Eighth Amendment rights of Federal, State, and local prisoners”;
8. “Increase the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal expenditures through grant programs such as those dealing with health care; mental health care; disease prevention; crime prevention, investigation, and prosecution; prison construction, maintenance, and operation; race relations; poverty; unemployment; and homelessness; and”
9. “Reduce the costs that prison rape imposes on interstate commerce”.

(Prison Rape Elimination Act, 2003, 117 STAT. 974 & 975)

PREA allows for the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to define rape for the purpose of statistical review and analysis. BJS, through consultation with experts, correctional administrators, and practitioners, has created three categories of sexual violence. The three categories are: completed non-consensual sexual acts, attempted non-consensual sexual acts, and abusive sexual contacts (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2004).

BJS defined abusive sexual acts as “intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of an inmate” (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2004, p 2). The Bureau of Justice Statistics also defined all sexual acts in which staff members were involved as prohibited sexual misconduct. These acts include:

- “Any behavior of a sexual nature directed toward an inmate by an employee, volunteer, official visitor, or agency representative”
- “All completed, attempted, threatened, or requested sexual acts between staff and inmates”

- “Any incident of intentional touching of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks with the intent to abuse, arouse, or gratify sexual desire”
- “Incidents of indecent exposure, invasion of privacy for sexual gratification, or staff voyeurism”

(Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2004, p. 2)

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, there were a total of 5,528 reported allegations of sexual violence in correctional facilities in 2004. For inmate-on-inmate nonconsensual sexual acts, 152 claims were substantiated allegations of sexual violence comprising 17.6% of all nonconsensual sexual acts claims. For staff sexual misconduct, there were 321 counts of substantiated allegations of sexual violence comprising 29.9% of all staff sexual misconduct claims (Beck & Hughes, 2005, p. 6).

In state prisons, there were 611 cases of substantiated sexual violence comprising .52 incidences per 1,000 inmates (Beck & Hughes, 2005, p. 7). In adult state prisons, there were 148 victimization reports and 159 reports of perpetrators of substantiated claims of nonconsensual sexual acts. Of those 148 victim reports, 133 victims were male and 15 victims were female. Of the 159 inmate perpetrator reports, 145 perpetrators were male, and 14 perpetrators were female. In cases of substantiated staff sexual misconduct in adult state prisons, there were 274 reports of victimization and 247 reported incidences of perpetrators. The victims consisted of 188 male and 86 female reports. The perpetrators were mostly female with a count of 165 incidents, and male perpetrators had 82 incidents (Beck & Hughes, 2005, p. 8).

The annual report of sexual violence in prisons for the year 2005 was more extensive than the report for 2004. The 2005 report also includes statistics on where the attack took place, age of victim and perpetrators, race of victims and perpetrators, type of staff involved in reports of staff misconduct, the type of after-treatment the victim received, and other characteristics. There were 6,241 reports of sexual attacks in adult correctional facilities. For Inmate-on-Inmate nonconsensual sexual acts, there were 163 counts of substantiated allegations of sexual violence comprising 13.7% of all nonconsensual sexual acts claims. Males consisted of 84.8% of victim reports and females consisted of 15.2% of victim reports (Beck & Hughes, 2006, p. 5).

The majority of the victims in inmate-on-inmate sexual attack were white (78.1%) and age 18-24 (41.4%). Inmate-on-Inmate perpetrators are 85.7% male and 14.3% female. The majority of perpetrators were either 35-39 or 45+ years of age, (both 17.3% of perpetrators) and either white or black (both 42.1% of perpetrators) (Beck & Hughes, 2006, p. 6).

Inmate-on-Inmate sexual attacks mainly took place in the victim's cell/room (58.7%). Most of the attacks took place between 6pm and midnight (44.5%). Force or threat of force was used on the victim in half of the substantiated incidents of sexual violence. The offering of protection from other inmates to the victim inmate was used in 5% of cases. Victims were held down or restrained in 28% of cases and physically harmed or injured in 12% of cases. Reports were mainly made by the victim (80.2%) (Beck & Hughes, 2006, p. 7).

The victims of inmate-on-inmate sexual assault were not injured 80% of the time, medical examinations only happened for 58.9% of the victims, and only 43.5% of victims

were provided counseling or mental health treatment. Placement in administrative segregation/protective custody was the result for victims in 44% of the cases. Legal action was taken against the perpetrator in only 51% of 163 counts of substantiated incidents (Beck & Hughes, 2006, p. 8).

In 2005, there were 195 substantiated allegations of staff sexual misconduct comprising 14.9% of all staff sexual misconduct claims (Beck & Hughes, 2006, p. 5). The majority of inmates involved in staff sexual misconduct and/or harassment in state prisons were male (67.5%), age 30-34 (27.5%), and white (54.2%). The staff involved in staff sexual misconduct and/or harassment in state prisons were chiefly female perpetrators (62.3%), perpetrators were mainly age 45-54 (25.1%), and white (69.4%) (Beck & Hughes, 2006, p. 10).

Only 11.6% of victims of staff sexual misconduct received a medical examination. Most of the substantiated incidents of staff sexual misconduct and/or harassment (73.6%) were romantic in nature (Beck & Hughes, 2006, p. 9). Reports of staff incidents were primarily made by another inmate (28.9%). Over half of the staff-inmate incidents took place in a program service area (57.3%), and occurred between noon and 6 p.m. (50%) (Beck & Hughes, 2006, p. 9).

Of the staff involved in sexual misconduct, 57% were correctional officers (Beck & Hughes, 2006, p. 10). Of staff involved in incidents with inmates, 81.7% lost their jobs (Beck & Hughes, 2006, p. 11). Only 11.6% of victims from staff-on-inmate incidents received a medical examination, while 78.4% of inmate victims received no medical follow-ups (Beck & Hughes, 2006, p. 11).

From the statistics, certain observations about the differences between inmate-on-inmate and staff-on-inmate incidences can be made. First, inmate-on-inmate attacks primarily take place between 6 p.m. and midnight, while staff-on-inmate attacks take place between noon and 6 p.m. Second, reports of incidents with inmate-on-inmate attacks were mainly made by the victim, in staff-on-inmate attacks, reports were mainly made by another inmate. Third, while 58.9% of victims from inmate-on-inmate attacks received a medical examination, only 11.6% of victims from staff-on-inmate received a medical examination. Finally, the location of where attacks took place is different between the two groups. Inmate-on-Inmate attacks mainly happened in the victims' cell/room, while staff-on-inmate attacks mainly took place in a program service area.

For 2006, the Bureau of Justice Statistics provides the data in which there were 6,528 allegations of sexual violence in adult correctional facilities. Of those 6,528 allegations, 967 allegations were substantiated. The majority of the victims of inmate-on-inmate sexual assault in 2006 were male (82%), under the age of 25 (44%), and white (72%). The majority of the perpetrators of inmate-on-inmate sexual assault in 2006 were male (85%), age 25-39 (53%), and black (49%) (Beck, Harris, & Adams, 2007, p. 4).

The majority of victims of inmate-on-inmate sexual assault in 2006 were forced or had been threatened with the use of force (58%), were not injured (80%), were attacked in their cell/room (64%) during the hours of 6 p.m. to midnight (45%), and reported the assault themselves (70%) (Beck, Harris, & Adams, 2007, p. 5).

Substantiated allegations of staff sexual misconduct and harassment in 2006 consisted of 282 incidents in State prisons. A large percentage (62%) of the substantiated incidents of

staff sexual misconduct and/or harassment included willing (staff and inmate) participants (Beck, Harris, & Adams, 2007, p. 6).

The majority of victims of staff sexual misconduct in State prisons were male (65%), age 25-29 (29%), and white (54%). Reports of staff incidents were primarily made by the victim (29%). Over half of the staff-inmate incidents took place in a program service area (49%), and occurred between noon and 6 p.m. (53%) (Beck, Harris, & Adams, 2007, p. 7).

Of the staff involved in staff-inmate misconduct in State prisons, 58% were female, 24% of the staff were age 45-54, and 70% of the staff were white. Full/part-time employees made up 80% of staff perpetrators. Over half (54%) of the staff perpetrators were correctional officers (Beck, Harris, & Adams, 2007, p. 8).

No medical response (79%) was given to the inmate victims of staff sexual misconduct in State prisons. Only 19% of inmate victims were transferred to another facility. No change in custody level or housing was the result for 50% of the inmate victims. Loss of job for the staff member was the sanction given in 79% of cases (Beck, Harris, & Adams, 2007, p. 9). While purely statistical studies by official agencies did not start until 2003, what about other forms of research studies?

While not highly studied in the past, prison sex and prison rape research has a colorful past in the terms of theory. Karpman conducted one of the early studies on prison sex in 1948. Karpman wrote about the “abnormal” sexual practices of masturbation and homosexuality in male prisons and its effects. Without a reference to a scientific fact, Karpman uses examples of “knowing of stories” leaving his research to be viewed as pure supposition. Karpman states:

Any individual, who has served any sort of sentence and has yielded to the pressure of abnormal sexual practices, can be considered on his discharge from prison as abnormal, even if superficially he does not show any obvious evidence of abnormality. If he was married, he cannot now be the good husband that he was before. If, previous to confinement, he was single and heterosexual, the experiences in prison incapacitate him for normal sexual adjustment. He is more likely to remain single with no urge or capacity for marriage and with a greater possibility for leading a bisexual, rather than only heterosexual life.

(Karpman, 1948, p. 483)

Karpman believed that sexual abnormalities (masturbation, homosexuality) and criminality in general were a disease and can be cured. He concluded his study with:

When prisons are abolished and hospitals take their place; when the warden, the jailer, and the guard are replaced by the doctor and the nurse, abnormal sex practices in prison will disappear as the devil withdraws in the light of day.

(Karpman, 1948, p. 486)

No matter how this is viewed by today's standards of research, this article is a view into the attitudes of the past in regards to prison sex. In one of the first studies on prison sexual aggression in male prisons, Davis (1968) conducted a study of sexual coercion in the jail system of Philadelphia. Using interviews and polygraph examinations, Davis sought to gain information on the number inmates had sexually assaulted in custody. While having some inmates admit to being sexually assaulted, Davis believed that over half of his sample had failed to report victimization and that the numbers he had discovered was a low estimate of what was actually occurring (Davis, 1968).

Studies designed to gain a pure count of sexual assaults in prison continued from the 1970s and 1980s (Fuller & Orsagh, 1977; Wooden & Parker, 1982). The mid to late 1970s also saw a move to identify perpetrators and victims of prison sexual assault. Carroll (1975), interviewed staff and inmates to find that three quarters of prison sexual assaults consisted of black perpetrators and white victims. In another example of prison rape's interesting research history, Carroll (1977) along with Scacco (1975) pushed the theory that black-on-white sexual assaults in prison were revenge for the oppression that black Americans suffered in a white dominated society.

The 1980s through the 1990s saw a theme in research regarding coercion to obtain sex in prisons. Nacci and Kane's 1983 and 1984 studies in the Federal Bureau of prisons looked at counts of sexual aggression and the occurrence of coercion and showed reports of pressure for sex, and pressure for sex in return for favors or gifts. In a 1996 study of men and women in prison, Struckman-Johnson et al. found that of the 101 male targets of sexual assault, 50% were assaulted by one perpetrator and 54% reported the perpetrator was an inmate who was known to the target (Struckman-Johnson et al., 1996, p. 71). A greater number of male and female victims were age 26-36, and white (Struckman-Johnson et al., 1996, p. 71). When staff and inmate survey participants were asked about preventive measures for prison rape, the most common response from inmates was to segregate vulnerable inmates and to allow conjugal visits; staff responses consisted of hiring more staff and increasing supervision as well as screening and segregation of vulnerable inmates (Struckman-Johnson et al., 1996).

The 1990s also saw a branch out into the area of prevention. In 1996, *Corrections Today* published an article by Dallao, which listed resources to establish a sexual assault

prevention program (Dallao, 1996). The resources listed included “The Correctional Officer: Recognizing and Preventing Closed custody Male Sexual Assaults” which is a training video produced by AIMS Media, “Handling Sexual Assault complaints” which is a lesson plan written by Felix Stevens and Ronnie White of Glades Correctional Institute, “The Federal Bureau of Prisons Program Statement 5324.02, Inmate Sexual Assault Prevention/Intervention Programs” which is a document that informs staff of interventions and how to investigate sexual assaults, and “The Prison Rape Education Project Kit” that offers audio tapes for staff and inmates on rape prevention and coping strategies for rape victims (Dallao, 1996, p.3).

Prison sexual assault research was kicked off in the new millennium by a look at the past (Hensley, Struckman-Johnson, & Eigenberg, 2000; Tewksbury & West, 2000; Hensley & Tewksbury, 2002). Studies published in 2001 reported the effects of prison rape and characteristics of perpetrators and victims. Struckman-Johnson et al. (2001) found that the most common effect of prison rape on male victims included distrust of people, nervousness around some people, dislike of others getting to physically close, and concern over it happening again (Struckman-Johnson et al., 2001).

The Human Rights Watch (HRW) published a report in 2001 on male rape in prison. The report gathered information from over 200 inmates in 37 states. The report states that the most likely inmates to become victims of inmate rape are young, small in size, physically weak, white, gay, first offender, having long hair or a high voice, being unassertive, shy, intellectual, not street-smart, passive, or having been convicted of a sexual offense against a minor. Perpetrators were stated to have the opposite characteristics with the exception of age. Perpetrators are also young, but not as young as

their victims. Gang membership is also a characteristic of perpetrators. African American and Hispanic had very little sexual assaults by other ethnic groups, while white non-Hispanic victimization by African American or Hispanic perpetrators was common (Human Rights Watch, 2001).

The year 2001 also witnessed a study that looked at correctional officer's involvement in prison rape. Marquart, Barnhill, and Balshaw-Biddle (2001) collected the personnel files of 508 correctional employees who had been investigated by internal affairs in Texas between 1995 and 1998. Of the 508 files, 42 included sexual contact occurrences. The employees who were investigated for sexual contact reached an average of three years of employment as correctional officers before they were investigated (Marquart, Barnhill, & Balshaw-Biddle, 2001). Termination resulted in 62% of the investigations, while resignation was allowed in 33% of the investigations (Marquart, Barnhill, & Balshaw-Biddle, 2001, p. 893). Sexual contact between staff and inmates primarily happened in areas away from public view such as closets, bathrooms, offices, laundry rooms, the chapel and the kitchen (Marquart, Barnhill, & Balshaw-Biddle, 2001).

Before Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) became law in 2003, there was little research on the subject of prison rape as compared to other topics in the field of criminal justice. However, when the Prison Rape Elimination Act was signed, it brought national attention to the topic and the interest of more researchers. From 2003 to present day, researchers have expanded/re-tested previous research paths and created new avenues to explore the topic of prison rape.

Hensley et al. (2003a) interviewed 174 male inmates in Oklahoma, 24 of those inmates had identified themselves as being sexual targets. The ethnic makeup of both

samples had whites as 58% of the targeted sample, and only 44% of the overall inmate sample. African Americans represented 29% of the target sample, and 39% of the overall inmate sample. The ethnic makeup of perpetrators consisted of African Americans (58%), white (38%), and Hispanic (4%). Of the 24 inmate targets, the average age was 20.5 and average length of time between day of incarceration and the first contact with a perpetrator was 143 days (Hensley et al., 2003a, p. 601).

English and Heil (2005) compiled a list of facilities that have a high risk for sexual assaults. These high-risk facilities:

- Have a higher number of violent offenders
- Have dormitory or barrack housing
- Have a high racial conflict
- Are crowded
- Are understaffed
- Have poor supervision or insufficient security
- Have inadequate programming
- Have blind spots

(English & Heil, 2005, p. 3)

English and Heil (2005) also compiled previous research to make a list of victim and perpetrator characteristics, which can be viewed on the next page:

Victim	Perpetrator
Inmates who are young, inexperienced in prison culture and easily intimidated	Under age 30 but older than the victim
First-time, nonviolent offenders	Stronger than the victim
Those convicted of an offense against a minor	More accustomed to incarceration
Inmates who are middle class, not streetwise	More likely to have spent time in juvenile facilities
White inmates, although inmates of any race can be victims	More likely to have lived in an urban area prior to incarceration
Those who are physically small or weak	More likely to have committed a violent crime
Those possessing traits viewed as effeminate	More likely to be affiliated with a gang
Inmates suffering from mental illness and/or developmental disabilities	More likely to break prison rules
Offenders who are not gang affiliated	
Those who are known to be homosexual or bisexual	
Those who are disliked by staff or other inmates	
Those who reported prohibited behavior (snitching).	

(English & Heil, 2005, p. 2)

Literature has shown the differences in characteristics between male and female inmate sexual assault victims. One disparity between male and female victim characteristics is shown in the studies by Hensley et al. (2003). For female sexual assault victims, the average age of the victim was 33.9 years (Hensley et al., 2003b), while the average age for males was 20.5 (Hensley et al., 2003a). Another study also found a high female age range for victims, ages 37-47, but unlike the Hensley et al. study, there were a higher percentage of white female perpetrators than African American or Hispanic perpetrators (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 2002). The average age of all

inmates was not given in any of the afore mentioned studies, so it is unclear whether or not there is a true difference in age of victim, or if the female inmate population is on average older than the male inmate population.

Wolff, Blitz, Shi, Bachman, and Siegel (2006) conducted a study that looked at male and female inmate-on-inmate sexual assault and staff-on-inmate sexual assault. Wolff et al. (2006) used the adult prison system of one State to conduct computer assisted self-administered interviews to survey 6,964 men and 564 women. The male participants had an average age of 34 while the female participants had an average age of 35.5 (Wolff et al., 2006, p. 837). The Wolff et al. (2006) survey was adapted from the National Violence against Women and Men Survey, and did not look at consensual sexual acts between inmates or between staff and inmates. The survey looked at incidences overall (anytime while incarcerated) and within a six month time period. The survey only looked at nonconsensual sexual acts, which were defined as forced sex acts, and abusive sexual acts, which were defined as intentional touching of certain body parts (Wolff et al., 2006).

The results of the Wolff et al. (2006) study showed the female rate of inmate-inmate sexual assault (39 per 1,000) to be two times higher than the male rate (16 per 1,000) (p. 839). Staff-inmate sexual assault was 1.6 times higher for female inmates (53 per 1,000) as compared to male inmates (34 per 1,000) (Wolff et al., 2006, p. 839). Over a six-month time period, females reported a higher amount of inmate-inmate sexual victimization (212 per 1,000) than male inmates (43 per 1,000) (Wolff et al., 2006, p. 841). The numbers of male and female inmates reporting any incidents of staff-inmate sexual victimization were the same (76 per 1,000) (Wolff et al., 2006, p. 841).

Fleisher and Krienert (2006) conducted a qualitative analysis of inmate's perceptions of sexual activity in adult correctional facilities. The study was designed using an ethnographic approach. The study used 30 correctional institutions (23 male, 7 female) in 10 states that were geographically diverse. A sample of 400 male and 200 female high-security inmates from the general prison population were chosen for the study. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with the inmate participants. The face-to-face interview questions were derived from interviews conducted with ex-inmates. The final interview instrument for the inmate participants included questions in categories such as: demographic information, prison history, mental health, rape, social dynamics, free list (single word or short phrase response to focused questions), lexical elicitation, inter-personal relationships, staff, institutional factors, and perceptions of social roles (Fleisher & Krienert, 2006).

Fleisher and Krienert (2006), in analysis of the inmate interviews, found several themes. Some of these themes coincide with findings from research previously discussed such as: most rapes occur at night in cells, new inmates are vulnerable to rape, physically small inmates are more likely to be raped than large inmates, inmates convicted of sexual offense against children, and mentally ill are more likely to be victims. One of the findings that is not addressed in any other study is that an inmate cannot be raped unless he wants to be:

A prison worldview holds a 'real' man incapable of sexual victimization unless he "wants" to be raped. A real man embodies attitudes about men's defensive strength and gender identity. Real men aren't weak minded. A real man stands up

and fights. A man who gives up and gives in to physical force carries a damning label forever. (Fleisher & Krienert, 2006, p. 1153)

The interviews revealed two types of sexual predators in prison. The first being a rapist, a rapist takes by force and is not viewed well by the general population. A rapist has no power within the social network of the general population. The second type of predator is a turnout artist. A turnout artist uses coercion by offering a commissary item or letting the victim into a card game, which leads to debt. However, comments made by inmate participants indicate that all turnouts are not rape and that sex for materials or protection is a fair exchange (Fleisher & Krienert, 2006).

Fleisher and Krienert (2006) asked the participants questions regarding their perceptions of rape inside prison. When asking about for-sure knowledge of rape, men and women who have served five years or less responded that they did have some for-sure knowledge of rape; knowledge about for-sure rape increases for men and women when serving more than 10 years. When the participants were asked whether or not they had heard about prison rape, the answer of yes was at a higher percentage than for-sure knowledge. Hearing about prison rape also increased from serving less than five years to serving more than 10 years. Regardless of time served, male and female inmates reported low levels of worry about being raped. Perceptions of sensationalized rape were also asked of the participants. Female inmates reported low levels of media-like (media images of prison rape) prison rape regardless of the amount of time served. However, male inmate reporting of perceptions about the occurrence of media-like rape increased as time served increased (Fleisher & Krienert, 2006).

Participant inmates were also asked about staff relationships with inmates and staff management of sexual assault in prison. The majority of the participants had not heard of staff talking about prison rape. Nevertheless, over half of inmate participants knew of incidents of staff and inmates having sex. Although participant inmates reported knowing of sex between staff and inmates, the majority of participants did not report knowledge of staff raping an inmate. The perceptions of the inmates on the topic of management of sexual assault were not a favorable one. Over half of the respondents reported that inmate transfers do not solve problems of sexual pressure; protective custody does not ensure the safety of a targeted inmate; rape guidelines (educational literature) is not posted on the prison bulletin boards; and the correctional system cannot protect an inmate from rape. While stating that the system cannot protect an inmate, the majority of the participants did however, report that staff does try to prevent rape (Fleisher & Krienert, 2006).

The common factors of almost all of the research found on the topic of prison rape were interracial victimizations, sexual orientation of victims and perpetrators, age of victims and perpetrators, and type of crime that resulted in incarceration for the victims. With a few exceptions, the aforementioned studies also only focused on forced anal, oral, or vaginal rape. PREA covers a broad range of sexual activities such as sexual harassment, and non-consensual touching. Sexual banter in prison is a slippery slope, which can lead to rape, violence or both. The aforementioned studies also only used adult inmates for their data sample. Sexual activity does occur in juvenile facilities, yet there is little light being shined on this issue compared to the spotlight that is on adult inmate sexual activity. Some of what has been published on juvenile facilities and sexual activity

includes how PREA should be applied to juvenile facilities (Beck, Harrison, & Hughes, 2004; Asbridge, 2007; Pihl-Buckley, 2008), and a statistical report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

According to a 2008 report on Sexual Violence in Juvenile Facilities in 2005-2006 conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, of the 271 substantiated incidents of sexual violence (which includes voluntary acts) in state juvenile facilities, overall 39% of assaults were committed during 6 p.m. to midnight, and 29% of assaults were committed in a program service area (Beck, Adams, & Guerino, 2008, pp. 4 & 5). Noon to 6 p.m. (35%) and a common area (26%) were the second most common time and place for an assault (Beck, Adams, & Guerino, 2008, p. 5). Youth-on-youth assaults most commonly took place from noon to 6 p.m. (37%) and in the victim's room (37%) compared to staff-on-youth which most commonly took place from 6 p.m. to midnight (59%) and outside the facility had the highest percentage for location at 31% (Beck, Adams, & Guerino, 2008, p. 5).

CHAPTER III

Research Methods and Procedures

It can be hypothesized that the perceptions of sexual activity are different between staff and youth based upon either the inmate subculture of silence or prison rape elimination training given to staff that sensitizes them to the sexual activity in the facility. This study seeks to add to the knowledge of sexual activity in juvenile facilities by answering the question: do perceptions of sexual activity in a juvenile facility differ between the staff and the incarcerated youth? To answer this question, this study used responses from a survey instrument created by the Center for Society, Law, & Justice for a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) grant to gather information from a male juvenile facility in the northern mid-east of the United States.

The state used for this youth and staff survey was chosen by the grant research team through recommendation. This state has a history and reputation of training and proactive policy creation and implementation in regards to sexual activity among inmate-staff and inmate-inmate. Institutional Review Boards for Texas State University-San Marcos and the State correctional system in which the juvenile facility is housed have approved the administration of this survey. The Process of certification through the Texas State Institutional Review Board included submission of the survey instrument and consent form for approval. The process for approval in the study state included an

application, and submission of consent forms and the survey instrument. Participation in this study was completely voluntary. Consent forms required by Texas State and the state correctional system in which the juvenile facility is housed were given to and signed by the participants. A copy of the Texas State release form is included in appendix A, copies of the study state's forms have been omitted to ensure confidentiality of the state. No compensation was given to participants for taking part in this study.

The Center for Society, Law & Justice (CSLJ) as part of a PREA grant created the survey for the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). Permission has been given by CSLJ to use the survey for this study. The survey was designed with two concepts in mind. First, the Department of Defense sexual harassment research was used as an archetype for the survey. Second, based upon previous research, the survey was designed under the belief that:

Official records usually only maintain a small subset of the most severe events and that victimization surveys will produce an underestimation of the events because of reporting reluctance. Accounting for such intervening factors as fear of reprisal, victim shame, complexity of PREA prohibited behavior, or simple memory loss, even short term victimization surveys are probably very limited as a measurement tool.

To adapt to these realities we are approaching the problem through a perceived occurrence approach to measuring PREA activity. The perceived occurrence approach attempts to take a measurement of the *PREA sexual climate* of the institution; but does not attempt to determine the exact number of PREA violations. (Center for Society, Law, & Justice, n.d)

This survey includes a range of questions from sexual jokes to rape and murder; which allows the researcher to gather the perceptions of all sexual activity in the facility (See Appendix B for survey instrument). This survey does not measure actual incidents of sexual activity, but only how often the respondent feels a certain activity occurs. The measurement scale of this survey uses the categories of “Never, Once or Twice, Sometimes, Often, and Very Often” to allow for perception measurement. The survey uses categorical responses; therefore the data resulting from the survey is ordinal. Chi-square was used to test for significance.

The survey was administered to all youth and staff available on that day of testing who were available and met the study criteria. The study criteria for youth, was that the youth were ages 18 and above to avoid the legal and ethical complication of research involving minors. Using youth under the age of 18 would require permission from the parents of those youth, which would be logistically very difficult. The youth used in the survey also had to be housed in the general population. Youth who were confined to segregation were excluded from the study. The study criterion for staff was that the staff must have a high degree of contact with the youth. The basis for this criterion is that staff who have a high degree of contact with the youth, such as correctional officers or instructors, are more likely to have a greater knowledge of what is actually taking place inside the facility than correctional administrators whose information comes from reports or the rumor mill.

The state used in this study housed multiple juvenile detention facilities; only one facility met the researchers’ desire for a sensible sized male population. The facility chosen was a medium security institution with American Correctional Association (ACA)

accreditation. The housing capacity of the facility was under 500. The youth housed in the facility were mostly of black ethnic/racial origin, Caucasian was the second highest ethnic/racial population; a high percentage of the incarcerated youth were confined for property crimes. The management of the facility was said to be excellent and knowledgeable of PREA issues (Center for Society, Law, & Justice, n.d).

Surveys were administered to youth in groups of 15-20 in a visiting room, which allowed for adequate space for confidentiality between survey participants. Surveys were administered to staff in groups of two to five in a separate area from the youth. All available youth who were age 18 and over and were not in segregation, as well as all available day-shift staff who had a high degree of youth contact were asked to take the survey. The youth participants had around a 70% response rate, while the staff participants had a 100% response rate (Center for Society, Law, & Justice, n.d).

However, it should be noted that not all surveys submitted were answered in full. A breakdown of the survey by questions answered is included in Appendix C. Staff appeared to have a slightly higher inclination to skip questions than the youth respondents.

Reliability of the survey was established using Cronbach's alpha test. Cronbach's alpha test "correlates the score for each item with the total score for each individual, and compares that to the variability present for all individual item scores" (Salkind, 2007, p. 107). In other words, Cronbach's alpha randomly divides up the data and compares it against each other.

For validity, this survey is unlike other survey instruments in the field of PREA research and therefore there is nothing to compare it to. Without a comparative source,

face validity must be used to justify the survey. Face Validity occurs when an instrument is shown to people who are considered experts in an instrument's field of study, and they say that the instrument does measure what it is intended to measure. The survey used in this study was shown to correctional personnel and correctional administrators at two national conferences and in correctional facilities; all persons asked have validated the instrument (Center for Society, Law & Justice, n.d.).

CHAPTER IV

Results

The results from the Cronbach's alpha test can be seen in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Reliability

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.960	.959	36

A perfect reliability score is 1.0; the test results of this survey show a nearly perfect reliability and a strong survey. The grant research team also conducted this survey on an adult population in a western state. The Cronbach's alpha reliability test showed a score of .98 for the western state administration. With such high reliability scores from two separate testing's of the same instrument, reliability can be confirmed.

Responses to the surveys were analyzed by frequency distributions and chi-square. While frequency distributions were computed to paint a picture of the responses, chi-square was used to test for significance. Chi-square tests are used by taking the null hypothesis and trying to prove that the data results are not just coincidence. A chi-square probability (Asymp. Sig.) of .05 or less is a good reason for rejecting the null hypothesis. For this study the null hypothesis is that there is no significant difference between the

answers of staff and youth on the occurrences of sexually motivated actions inside the facility. The following Tables (2.1-2.3) show the results of the chi-square test:

Table 2.1: Chi-Square test results part 1

Scenario	Pearson Chi-square		
	Value	Degrees of Freedom	Asymp. Sig
A youth willingly has sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth which is not allowed	41.384	4	0.000
A youth repeatedly tells sexual stories or jokes that are offensive to another youth	37.194	4	0.000
A youth makes unwelcome attempts to get another youth into a discussion of sexual matters	41.056	4	0.000
A youth makes sexual gestures that embarrasses or offends another youth	44.260	4	0.000
A youth makes unwelcome attempts to have a sexual relationship with another youth	52.501	4	0.000
A youth makes another youth feel like they are being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal)	49.328	4	0.000
A youth makes another youth feel threatened for not being sexually cooperative	43.970	4	0.000
A youth touches another youth in a way that makes them feel sexually uncomfortable	55.980	3	0.000
A youth makes unwelcome attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss another youth	40.110	4	0.000
A youth offers better living conditions or better treatment if another youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal)	28.163	3	0.000

Table 2.2: Chi-Square test results part 2

Scenario	Pearson Chi-square		
	Value	Degrees of Freedom	Asymp. Sig
A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth in return for candy or snacks	42.227	3	0.000
A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth in return for protection	44.240	4	0.000
A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received minor injuries	53.667	2	0.000
A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received minor injuries	17.431	2	0.000
A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received serious injuries	6.379	2	0.041
A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received serious injuries	8.948	2	0.011
A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and then murders the youth	2.865	2	0.239
A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and then murders the youth	2.865	2	0.239
A youth willingly has sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a staff member which is not allowed	20.086	4	0.000
A staff member repeatedly tells sexual stories or jokes that are offensive to a youth	24.791	4	0.000
A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to get a youth into a discussion of sexual matters	11.556	4	0.021
A staff member makes sexual gestures that embarrasses or offends a youth	33.051	3	0.000
A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to have a sexual relationship with a youth	14.218	4	0.007

Table 2.3: Chi-Square test results part 3

Scenario	Pearson Chi-square		
	Value	Degrees of Freedom	Asymp. Sig
A staff member makes a youth feel like they are being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal).	12.252	3	0.007
A staff member makes a youth feel threatened for not being sexually cooperative	8.498	3	0.037
A staff member touches a youth in a way that makes them feel sexually uncomfortable	18.572	3	0.000
A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss a youth	13.909	4	0.008
A staff member offers better living conditions or better treatment if a youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal)	6.582	3	0.086
A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a staff member in return for candy or snacks	18.620	4	0.001
A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a staff member in return for protection	8.785	3	0.032
A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received minor injuries	4.706	4	0.319
A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received minor injuries	6.365	3	0.095
A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received serious injuries	5.671	3	0.129
A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received serious injuries	2.891	3	0.409
A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and then murders the youth	3.534	2	0.171

Table 2.4: Chi-Square test results part 4

Scenario	Pearson Chi-square		
	Value	Degrees of Freedom	Asymp. Sig
A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and then murders the youth	2.798	3	0.424

According to the results, for the youth on youth scenarios, there is a significant difference in all scenarios except for the two scenarios resulting in murder. All staff on youth scenarios that resulted in injury or murder does not have a significant difference in responses. Also, the scenario “A staff member offers better living conditions or better treatment if a youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal)” does not show a significant difference in the chi-square results.

When the survey results were imputed into the SPSS statistical analysis program, the resulting frequency distribution showed staff reporting more sexual activity among the juveniles with other juveniles and juveniles with staff than the juveniles reported. Juveniles answered nearly every question with a higher percentage of “never” occurs answers than staff. A full report of the frequency distribution can be found in Appendix D. Two example scenarios and frequency distributions for juvenile and staff responses are given in the following Tables (3.1-3.2, 4.1-4.2) on the next two pages.

Table 3.1: Frequencies for first example of youth on youth scenario

Scenario: A youth makes unwelcome attempts to have a sexual relationship with another youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	54	88.5
	Once or Twice	1	1.6
	Sometimes	4	6.6
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	0	0
Staff			
	Never	8	19
	Once or Twice	12	28.6
	Sometimes	19	45.2
	Often	2	4.8
	Very Often	1	2.4

Table 3.2: Frequencies for second youth on youth scenario

Scenario: A youth makes another youth feel threatened for not being sexually cooperative			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	51	83.6
	Once or Twice	7	11.5
	Sometimes	3	4.9
	Often	0	0
	Very Often	0	0
Staff			
	Never	8	19.0
	Once or Twice	16	38.1
	Sometimes	14	33.3
	Often	3	7.1
	Very Often	1	2.4

Table 4.1: Frequencies for first staff on youth scenario

Scenario: A staff member makes sexual gestures that embarrasses or offends a youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	49	80.3
	Once or Twice	5	8.2
	Sometimes	5	8.2
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	0	0
Staff			
	Never	12	28.6
	Once or Twice	21	50
	Sometimes	9	21.4
	Often	0	0
	Very Often	0	0

Table 4.2: Frequencies for second staff on youth scenario

Scenario: A staff member touches a youth in a way that makes them feel sexually uncomfortable			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	50	82
	Once or Twice	4	6.6
	Sometimes	3	4.9
	Often	4	6.6
	Very Often	0	0
Staff			
	Never	22	52.4
	Once or Twice	14	33.3
	Sometimes	6	14.3
	Often	0	0
	Very Often	0	0

The scenarios regarding sexual assaults resulting in injury or death deviates from the patterns presented throughout the rest of the survey questions. For the scenarios regarding sexual assaults perpetrated by a group of youths or single perpetrator youth that result in minor or serious injury, youth responses of “never” occurs are still higher than staff; however, the differential in percentage response between youth and staff are smaller than other scenarios. For example, in Table 2, the youth “never” occurs response for the first scenario is 69.5% higher than the staff “never” response percentage.

The differential between the “never” response between youth and staff to “A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received serious injuries” is 22.5%, youth “never” response: 82%, staff “never” response: 59.5%. The two scenarios regarding resulting death for a youth from a sexual assault perpetrated by a single youth or group of youth have the same responses for both scenarios. The response of an occurrence of “never” is indicated by a youth response of 93.4%, the staff response of “never” was 100%.

The responses for the scenarios regarding staff or group of staff sexual assault on a youth that results in minor or serious injury show staff reporting an occurrence of “never” at a higher percentage than was reported by the “never” occurrence percentage staff answers of the youth on youth assaults. For the scenario “A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received serious injuries” the youth response of an occurrence of “never” was 93.4% while the staff response of an occurrence of never was 92.9%.

The scenarios of sexual assault that result in death for a youth show a responses of “never” occur of 91.8% by youth when the perpetrator is one staff member, and a “never”

occurrence response of 93.4% when a group of staff are the perpetrators. The staff responses to both scenarios are the same with a response of a “never” occurrence 97.6% with one no-answer response comprising of 2.4%, essentially making the response 100% “never.” The results of the study show support for the hypothesis and a rejection of the null hypothesis. There is a significant difference in the reporting of perceptions of sexual activity between youth and staff regarding youth-on-youth incidents and staff-on-youth incidents.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

With the data showing an acceptance of the hypothesis of a significant difference in perceptions, the question now becomes: why is there a difference in perceptions? While that question could be a study in and of itself, the answer will be speculated here. There are at least two plausible theories that could explain the difference.

The first theory is that the difference could be attributed to the long held belief in a “code of silence” among inmates and in correctional facilities. This theory could account for the high percentage of “never” occurring responses given by the juvenile participants. Granted, there is also a belief in a “code of silence” among correctional staff members as well, which could explain the higher percentages of “never” occurring answers on scenarios involving staff-on-youth than were given on youth-on-youth scenarios. However, for the majority of the staff-on-youth scenarios, there is still a significant difference in responses between youth and staff participants in which youth response percentages of “never” occurring are still higher than staff response percentages. While the “code of silence” is a plausible explanation for the youth responses, the “code of silence” does not appear to be present in the responses of staff. If the “code of silence” is in affect in this institution for staff, the response percentages of “never” occurring to a scenario should be higher than they are.

The second theory is that the difference could be contributed to PREA training for staff members. As stated earlier in this paper, some of the purposes of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 are to prevent prison rape; establish national standards for detection, prevention, reduction and punishment of prison rape; and increase accountability of prison officials who fail to prevent, reduce, and detect prison rape (Prison Rape Elimination Act, 2003, 117 STAT. 974 & 975). Since 2003, institutions have implemented programs, which include staff training to be compliant with the new law. It is possible that youth in the study facility might have higher percentage responses of “never” occurs to scenarios than staff because, in truth, they do not have a great deal of awareness of the sexual activities that take place inside the facility; while staff have been trained to identify and prevent all forms of sexual activity.

CHAPTER VI

Conclusion

This study and the grant this study is derived from are unlike anything that has previously been conducted in the field of sexual activity in correctional facilities. The main limitation of this study in terms of accumulating greater knowledge is that the data is from a grant and the grant is narrowed to only perceptions of sexual activity in the institution. This study would have benefited from additional questions such as perceptions of facility climate, and questions designed to bring illumination to the reasons of why youth and staff answered the surveys in the manner in which they did.

As the limitations to this study stand, the door for future research needed on this subject is wide open. Future research is needed to explain: why there is such a difference in perception responses and if other juvenile facilities report the same differences in perceptions between youth and staff. If the staff responses of sexual activity taking place inside the facility are given greater weight than the youth responses, for this facility, (and other facilities if future research shows the pattern of difference in perceptions holds true) correctional administration may want to consider implementing new policies and procedures that would encourage youth to be more candid in acknowledging sexual activity. However, the limitation in this policy suggestion is that it is not known why youth are denying the occurrence of sexual activity at a higher percentage than staff.

Without a researched hypothesis to address the issue of why, an attempt to create policies for more candid answers from youth could be imprudent.

Since 2003, funding has become available for the study of sexual activity in correctional institutions, so what does this study contribute? This study is a pioneer in the sense of using perceptions/beliefs of occurrences of a range of sexual activities from sexual jokes, gestures, and touching to sexual assault ending in murder, rather than reported and known incidents of pure sexual assaults or sex with staff members. While juvenile sexual activity has been studied and published on in the mainstream/free world, very little has been published regarding sexual activity among incarcerated youth. The majority of prison sexual assault studies have been conducted in adult prisons; this piece of research helps to push open the door even more on the subject of sexual activity in juvenile correctional facilities. This door should be wide open, if only to answer the question: why?

APPENDIX A

Texas State University Consent Form

CSLJ/Texas State University Consent Agreement Attachment

The Center for Society, Law and Justice (*CSLJ*) at Texas State University has received a national Bureau of Justice Assistance cooperative agreement award to develop a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) risk assessment tool. The risk assessment survey instrument is currently in a developmental (beta) stage with a pool of questions that needs to be tested then reduced into a final instrument. The final instrument is designed to measure residents' and staffs' perceived levels of PREA prohibited sexual activities.

The administration of this simple paper and pencil survey does not represent any known risk to the subjects. No information about personal behavior or experiences is being collected. There will be no identifying information collected on the research subjects and subjects are requested to not make any identifying marks on the survey form. The survey should take less than 30 minutes to complete and please make every effort to not allow your responses to be seen by other people taking the survey. There will be no compensation or rewards for participation in this research project. Subjects are free to refuse to take the survey, or to discontinue taking the survey at any time. If you have any questions about this project the CSLJ research staff will be happy to answer them to your satisfaction. The data from this project will be stored at Texas State University, Department of Criminal Justice, *** University Dr. San Marcos, TX and will be available upon request.

Any questions pertaining to your rights as a research subject, or a research-related injury should be brought to the attention of the IRB administrator, Becky Northcut, at phone number ***-***-****. Any question about the conduct of this research project should also be brought to the attention of Dr. Peter Scharf or Dr. William E. Stone, Principal Investigators, at phone number ***-***-****.

APPENDIX B

Survey Instrument

Youth Survey

The purpose of this survey is to determine your **perceptions** of how often prohibited sexual behavior is occurring in this institution. These questions are not about your experiences. We want to know how frequently you believe these events have occurred **in the past year**. Some of the events are considered to be very rare and you may never have heard of them occurring at all. **Please circle the best response.**

	Never	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
Youth to Youth Experiences:					
1. A youth willingly has sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with another youth which is not allowed.	a	b	c	d	e
2. A youth repeatedly tells sexual stories or jokes that are offensive to another youth.	a	b	c	d	e
3. A youth makes unwelcome attempts to get another youth into a discussion of sexual matters.	a	b	c	d	e
4. A youth makes sexual gestures that embarrasses or offends another youth.	a	b	—c	d	e
5. A youth makes unwelcome attempts to have a sexual relationship with another youth.	a	b	c	d	e
6. A youth makes another youth feel like they are being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to have sex (oral, vaginal or anal).	a	b	c	d	e
7. A youth makes another youth feel threatened for not being sexually cooperative.	a	b	c	d	e

	Never	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
8. A youth touches another youth in a way that makes them feel sexually uncomfortable.	a	b	c	d	e
9. A youth makes unwelcome attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss another youth.	a	b	c	d	e
10. A youth offers better living conditions or better treatment if another youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal or anal).	a	b	c	d	e
11. A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with another youth in return for candy or snacks.	a	b	c	d	e
12. A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with another youth in return for protection.	a	b	c	d	e
13. A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with another youth, and the youth received minor injuries .	a	b	c	d	e
14. A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with another youth, and the youth received minor injuries .	a	b	c	d	e
15. A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with another youth, and the youth was seriously injured .	a	b	c	d	e
16. A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with another youth, and the youth was seriously injured .	a	b	c	d	e
17. A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with another youth, and then murders the youth.	a	b	c	d	e
18. A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with another youth, and then murders the youth.	a	b	c	d	e
Staff and Youth Experiences:					
19. A youth willingly has sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with a staff member.	a	b	c	d	e

	Never	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
20. A staff member repeatedly tells sexual stories or jokes that are offensive to a youth.	a	b	c	d	e
21. A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to get a youth into a discussion of sexual matters.	a	b	c	d	e
22. A staff member makes sexual gestures that embarrasses or offends a youth.	a	b	c	d	e
23. A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to have a sexual relationship with a youth.	a	b	c	d	e
24. A staff member makes a youth feel like they are being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to have sex (oral, vaginal or anal).	a	b	c	d	e
25. A staff member makes a youth feel threatened for not being sexually cooperative.	a	b	c	d	e
26. A staff member touches a youth in a way that makes them feel sexually uncomfortable.	a	b	c	d	e
27. A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss a youth.	a	b	c	d	e
28. A staff member offers better living conditions or better treatment if a youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal or anal).	a	b	c	d	e
29. A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with a staff member in return for candy or snacks.	a	b	c	d	e
30. A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with a staff member youth in return for protection.	a	b	c	d	e
31. A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with a youth, and the youth received minor injuries .	a	b	c	d	e
32. A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with a youth, and the youth	a	b	c	d	e

	Never	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
received minor injuries .					
33. A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with a youth, and the youth received serious injuries .	a	b	c	d	e
34. A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with a youth, and the youth received serious injuries .	a	b	c	d	e
35. A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with a youth, and then murders the youth.	a	b	c	d	e
36. A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal or anal) with a youth, and then murders the youth.	a	b	c	d	e

If you wish to write any additional comments please use the back of the page.

APPENDIX C

Survey Response Numbers

Scenario	Youth		Staff	
	Valid Response	Missing	Valid Response	Missing
A youth willingly has sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth which is not allowed	61	0	41	1
A youth repeatedly tells sexual stories or jokes that are offensive to another youth	61	0	42	0
A youth makes unwelcome attempts to get another youth into a discussion of sexual matters	61	0	42	0
A youth makes sexual gestures that embarrasses or offends another youth	61	0	42	0
A youth makes unwelcome attempts to have a sexual relationship with another youth	61	0	42	0
A youth makes another youth feel like they are being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal).	61	0	42	0
A youth makes another youth feel threatened for not being sexually cooperative	61	0	42	0

Scenario	Youth		Staff	
	Valid Response	Missing	Valid Response	Missing
A youth touches another youth in a way that makes them feel sexually uncomfortable	61	0	42	0
A youth makes unwelcome attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss another youth	61	0	42	0
A youth offers better living conditions or better treatment if another youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal)	60	1	42	0
A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth in return for candy or snacks	61	0	42	0
A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth in return for protection	61	0	42	0
A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received minor injuries	61	0	42	0
A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received minor injuries	61	0	42	0
A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received serious injuries	61	0	42	0
A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received serious injuries	61	0	42	0
A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and then murders the youth	61	0	42	0
A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and then murders the youth	61	0	42	0

Scenario	Youth		Staff	
	Valid Response	Missing	Valid Response	Missing
A youth willingly has sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a staff member which is not allowed	60	1	42	0
A staff member repeatedly tells sexual stories or jokes that are offensive to a youth	61	0	42	0
A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to get a youth into a discussion of sexual matters	60	1	42	0
A staff member makes sexual gestures that embarrasses or offends a youth	61	0	42	0
A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to have a sexual relationship with a youth	59	2	42	0
A staff member makes a youth feel like they are being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal)	61	0	41	1
A staff member makes a youth feel threatened for not being sexually cooperative	61	0	42	0
A staff member touches a youth in a way that makes them feel sexually uncomfortable	61	0	42	0
A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss a youth	60	1	42	0
A staff member offers better living conditions or better treatment if a youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal)	60	1	41	1

Scenario	Youth		Staff	
	Valid Response	Missing	Valid Response	Missing
A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a staff member in return for candy or snacks	60	1	41	1
A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a staff member in return for protection	61	0	39	3
A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received minor injuries	61	0	41	1
A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received minor injuries	61	0	41	1
A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received serious injuries	61	0	41	1
A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received serious injuries	61	0	41	1
A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and then murders the youth	61	0	41	1
A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and then murders the youth	61	0	41	1

APPENDIX D

Frequency Distribution

Scenario: A youth willingly has sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth which is not allowed			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	46	75.4
	Once or Twice	6	9.8
	Sometimes	5	8.2
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	2	3.3
Staff			
	Never	6	14.3
	Once or Twice	13	31.0
	Sometimes	19	45.2
	Often	3	7.1
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A youth repeatedly tells sexual stories or jokes that are offensive to another youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	43	70.5
	Once or Twice	4	6.6
	Sometimes	8	13.1
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	4	6.6
Staff			
	Never	5	11.9
	Once or Twice	6	14.3
	Sometimes	11	26.2
	Often	12	28.6
	Very Often	8	19.0
Scenario: A youth makes unwelcome attempts to get another youth into a discussion of sexual matters			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	48	78.7
	Once or Twice	6	9.8
	Sometimes	6	9.8
	Often	1	1.6
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	7	16.7
	Once or Twice	10	23.8
	Sometimes	14	33.3
	Often	9	21.4
	Very Often	2	4.8

Scenario: A youth makes sexual gestures that embarrasses or offends another youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	46	75.4
	Once or Twice	7	11.5
	Sometimes	4	6.6
	Often	1	1.6
	Very Often	3	4.9
Staff			
	Never	5	11.9
	Once or Twice	10	23.8
	Sometimes	15	35.7
	Often	9	21.4
	Very Often	3	7.1
Scenario: A youth makes unwelcome attempts to have a sexual relationship with another youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	54	88.5
	Once or Twice	1	1.6
	Sometimes	4	6.6
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	8	19
	Once or Twice	12	28.6
	Sometimes	19	45.2
	Often	2	4.8
	Very Often	1	2.4

Scenario: A youth makes another youth feel like they are being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal)			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	54	88.5
	Once or Twice	1	1.6
	Sometimes	5	8.2
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	1	1.6
Staff			
	Never	9	21
	Once or Twice	15	35.7
	Sometimes	16	38.1
	Often	1	2.4
	Very Often	1	2.4
Scenario: A youth makes another youth feel threatened for not being sexually cooperative			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	51	83.6
	Once or Twice	7	11.5
	Sometimes	3	4.9
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	8	19.0
	Once or Twice	16	38.1
	Sometimes	14	33.3
	Often	3	7.1
	Very Often	1	2.4

Scenario: A youth touches another youth in a way that makes them feel sexually uncomfortable			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	51	83.6
	Once or Twice	4	6.6
	Sometimes	3	4.9
	Often	3	4.9
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	4	9.5
	Once or Twice	20	47.6
	Sometimes	13	31.0
	Often	5	11.9
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A youth makes unwelcome attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss another youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	52	85.2
	Once or Twice	4	6.6
	Sometimes	1	1.6
	Often	3	4.9
	Very Often	1	1.6
Staff			
	Never	12	28.6
	Once or Twice	12	28.6
	Sometimes	15	35.7
	Often	3	7.1
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A youth offers better living conditions or better treatment if another youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal)			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	51	83.6
	Once or Twice	5	8.2
	Sometimes	3	4.9
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	1	1.6
Staff			
	Never	15	35.7
	Once or Twice	8	19.0
	Sometimes	17	40.5
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	2	4.8
Scenario: A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth in return for candy or snacks			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	53	86.9
	Once or Twice	2	3.3
	Sometimes	5	8.2
	Often	1	1.6
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	10	23.8
	Once or Twice	13	31.0
	Sometimes	17	40.5
	Often	2	4.8
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth in return for protection			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	54	88.5
	Once or Twice	4	6.6
	Sometimes	1	1.6
	Often	1	1.6
	Very Often	1	1.6
Staff			
	Never	11	26.2
	Once or Twice	10	23.8
	Sometimes	17	40.5
	Often	3	7.1
	Very Often	1	2.4
Scenario: A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received minor injuries			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	53	86.9
	Once or Twice	5	8.2
	Sometimes	3	4.9
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	6	14.3
	Once or Twice	25	59.5
	Sometimes	11	26.2
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received minor injuries			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	55	90.2
	Once or Twice	2	3.3
	Sometimes	4	6.6
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	24	57.1
	Once or Twice	13	31.0
	Sometimes	5	11.9
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received serious injuries			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	50	82.0
	Once or Twice	10	16.4
	Sometimes	1	1.6
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	25	59.5
	Once or Twice	15	35.7
	Sometimes	2	4.8
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and the youth received serious injuries			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	56	91.8
	Once or Twice	4	6.6
	Sometimes	1	1.6
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	29	69.0
	Once or Twice	10	23.8
	Sometimes	3	7.1
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A youth has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and then murders the youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	57	93.4
	Once or Twice	2	3.3
	Sometimes	2	3.3
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	42	100.0
	Once or Twice	0	0.0
	Sometimes	0	0.0
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A group of youths has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with another youth and then murders the youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	57	93.4
	Once or Twice	2	3.3
	Sometimes	2	3.3
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	42	100.0
	Once or Twice	0	0.0
	Sometimes	0	0.0
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A youth willingly has sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a staff member which is not allowed			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	39	63.9
	Once or Twice	6	9.8
	Sometimes	9	14.8
	Often	5	8.2
	Very Often	1	1.6
Staff			
	Never	10	23.8
	Once or Twice	16	38.1
	Sometimes	12	28.6
	Often	3	7.1
	Very Often	1	2.4

Scenario: A staff member repeatedly tells sexual stories or jokes that are offensive to a youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	43	70.5
	Once or Twice	9	14.8
	Sometimes	6	9.8
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	1	1.6
Staff			
	Never	10	23.8
	Once or Twice	19	45.2
	Sometimes	12	28.6
	Often	1	2.4
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to get a youth into a discussion of sexual matters			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	45	73.8
	Once or Twice	8	13.1
	Sometimes	5	8.2
	Often	1	1.6
	Very Often	1	1.6
Staff			
	Never	20	47.6
	Once or Twice	16	38.1
	Sometimes	6	14.3
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A staff member makes sexual gestures that embarrasses or offends a youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	49	80.3
	Once or Twice	5	8.2
	Sometimes	5	8.2
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	12	28.6
	Once or Twice	21	50
	Sometimes	9	21.4
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to have a sexual relationship with a youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	48	78.7
	Once or Twice	5	8.2
	Sometimes	4	6.6
	Often	1	1.6
	Very Often	1	1.6
Staff			
	Never	21	50.0
	Once or Twice	15	35.7
	Sometimes	5	11.9
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	1	2.4

Scenario: A staff member makes a youth feel like they are being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal)			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	50	82.0
	Once or Twice	6	9.8
	Sometimes	4	6.6
	Often	1	1.6
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	21	50.0
	Once or Twice	15	35.7
	Sometimes	4	9.5
	Often	1	2.4
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A staff member makes a youth feel threatened for not being sexually cooperative			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	50	82.0
	Once or Twice	4	9.8
	Sometimes	3	6.6
	Often	4	1.6
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	24	57.1
	Once or Twice	13	31.0
	Sometimes	4	9.5
	Often	1	2.4
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A youth touches another youth in a way that makes them feel sexually uncomfortable			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	50	82.0
	Once or Twice	4	6.6
	Sometimes	3	4.9
	Often	4	6.6
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	22	52.4
	Once or Twice	14	33.3
	Sometimes	6	14.3
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A staff member makes unwelcome attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss a youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	50	82.0
	Once or Twice	5	8.2
	Sometimes	3	4.9
	Often	1	1.6
	Very Often	1	1.6
Staff			
	Never	22	52.4
	Once or Twice	14	33.3
	Sometimes	5	11.9
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	1	2.4

Scenario: A staff member offers better living conditions or better treatment if a youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal)			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	48	78.7
	Once or Twice	4	6.6
	Sometimes	7	11.5
	Often	1	1.6
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	24	57.1
	Once or Twice	9	21.4
	Sometimes	7	16.7
	Often	1	2.4
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a staff member youth in return for candy or snacks			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	51	83.6
	Once or Twice	3	4.9
	Sometimes	3	4.9
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	1	1.6
Staff			
	Never	20	47.6
	Once or Twice	12	28.6
	Sometimes	7	16.7
	Often	2	4.8
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A youth agrees to have sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a staff member in return for protection			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	49	80.3
	Once or Twice	5	8.2
	Sometimes	6	9.8
	Often	1	1.6
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	21	50.0
	Once or Twice	10	23.8
	Sometimes	6	14.3
	Often	2	4.8
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received minor injuries			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	56	91.8
	Once or Twice	0	4.9
	Sometimes	3	1.6
	Often	1	1.6
	Very Often	1	0.0
Staff			
	Never	38	90.5
	Once or Twice	2	4.8
	Sometimes	1	2.4
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received minor injuries			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	56	91.8
	Once or Twice	0	0.0
	Sometimes	3	4.9
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	39	92.9
	Once or Twice	2	4.8
	Sometimes	0	0.0
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received serious injuries			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	57	93.4
	Once or Twice	0	0.0
	Sometimes	1	1.6
	Often	3	4.9
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	39	92.9
	Once or Twice	2	4.8
	Sometimes	0	0.0
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and the youth received serious injuries			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	55	90.2
	Once or Twice	2	3.3
	Sometimes	2	3.3
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	40	95.2
	Once or Twice	1	2.4
	Sometimes	0	0.0
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0
Scenario: A staff member has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and then murders the youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	56	91.8
	Once or Twice	3	4.9
	Sometimes	0	0.0
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	41	97.6
	Once or Twice	0	0.0
	Sometimes	0	0.0
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0

Scenario: A group of staff members has forced sex (oral, vaginal, or anal) with a youth and then murders the youth			
Youth or Staff Member	Response Category	Frequency	Percent
Youth			
	Never	57	93.4
	Once or Twice	1	1.6
	Sometimes	1	1.6
	Often	2	3.3
	Very Often	0	0.0
Staff			
	Never	41	97.6
	Once or Twice	0	0.0
	Sometimes	0	0.0
	Often	0	0.0
	Very Often	0	0.0

REFERENCES

- Asbridge, C. (2007). Sexual assault in juvenile corrections: A preventable tragedy. *Corrections Today*, 69(5), 80-81, 84-85. Retrieved August 23, 2008 from ProQuest Database.
- Beck, A., Adams, D. & Guerino, P. (2008). Sexual violence reported by juvenile correctional authorities, 2005-2006. Retrieved August 23, 2008 from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/svrjca0506.htm>
- Beck, A., Harrison, P. & Hughes, T. (2004). Implementing the 2003 prison rape elimination act in juvenile residential facilities. *Corrections Today*, 66(4), 26-28 & 64. Retrieved August 23, 2008 from ProQuest Database.
- Beck, A. & Hughes, T. (2005) Sexual violence reported by correctional authorities, 2004. Retrieved August 01, 2007 from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/dcprea03.htm>
- Beck, A. & Hughes, T. (2006). Sexual violence reported by correctional authorities, 2005. Retrieved August 01, 2007 from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/svrca05.htm>
- Carroll, L. (1977). Humanitarian reform and biracial sexual assault in a maximum security prison. *Urban Life*, 5(4), 417-437. Retrieved October 26, 2008 from JSTOR database.
- Center for Society, Law, & Justice. (n.d). Managing PREA risks: Assessing and controlling PREA Risks in correctional facilities using the CSLJ PREA Risk Assessment Instrument. Retrieved August 3, 2008 from the Center from Society, Law & Justice.
- Dallao, M. (1996). How to make your facility safer. *Corrections Today*, 58(7), 100-104. Retrieved July 12, 2007 from ProQuest Database.
- Davis, A. (1968). Sexual assaults in the Philadelphia prison system and sheriff's vans. In A. M. Scacco, Jr. (Ed), *Male rape: A casebook of sexual aggressions* (pg 107-120). New York: AMS Press.

- English, K. & Heil, P. (2005). Prison rape: What we know today. *Corrections Compendium*, 30(5), 1-5 & 42-44. Retrieved July 12, 2007 from ProQuest Database.
- Fleisher, M. & Krienert, J. (2006). The culture of prison sexual violence. Retrieved August 22, 2007 from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/216515.pdf>
- Fuller, D. & Orsagh, T. (1977). Violence and victimization within a state prison system. *Criminal Justice Review*, 2(2), 35-55. Retrieved October 26, 2008.
- Hensley, C., Struckman-Johnson, C. & Eigenberg, H. (2000). Introduction: The history of prison sex research. *The Prison Journal*, 80(4), 360-367. Retrieved October 26, 2008 from Sage Publications.
- Hensley, C. & Tewksbury, R. (2002). Inmate-to-inmate prison sexuality: A review of empirical studies. *Trauma, Violence, Abuse*, 3(3), 226-243. Retrieved October 26, 2008 from Sage Publications.
- Hensley, C., Tewksbury, R., & Castle, T. (2003a). Characteristics of prison sexual assault targets in male Oklahoma correctional facilities. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(6), 595-606. Retrieved July 12, 2007 from EBSCO Database.
- Hensley, C., Tewksbury, R., & Castle, T. (2003b). Inmate-to-inmate sexual coercion in a prison for women. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 37(2), 77-87. Retrieved July 12, 2007 from EBSCO Database.
- Human Rights Watch (2001). No escape: male rape in U.S. prisons; section IV: predators and victims. Retrieved July 12, 2007 from http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/prison/rcport4.html#_1_23
- Karpman, B. (1948). Sex life in prison. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (1931-1951)*, 38(5), 475-486. Retrieved October 26, 2008 from JSTOR Database.
- Marquart, J., Barnhill, M., & Balshaw-Biddle, K. (2001). Fatal attraction: An analysis of employee boundary violations in a southern prison system, 1995-1998. *Justice Quarterly*, 18(4), 877-910. Retrieved on July 5, 2007 from EBSCO database.
- Nacci, P. & Kane, T. (1983). Sex and sexual aggression in federal prisons. *Federal Probation*, 47(4), 31-36. Retrieved October 26, 2008 from EBSCO Database.
- Nacci, P. & Kane, T. (1984). Sex and sexual aggression in federal prisons: Inmate involvement and employee impact. *Federal Probation*, 48(1), 46-53. Retrieved October 26, 2008 from EBSCO Database.
- Pihl-Buckley, H. (2008). Tailoring the prison rape elimination act to a juvenile setting. *Corrections Today*, 70(1), 44-45 & 47. Retrieved on August 23, 2008 from ProQuest Database.

- Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, Pub. L. No. 108-79, 117 Stat. 972 (2003).
- Salkind, N. (2008). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Scacco, A. (1975). *Rape in prisons*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Struckman-Johnson, C., Struckman-Johnson, D., Rucker, L., Bumby, K., & Donaldson, S. (1996). Sexual coercion reported by men and women in prison. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 33(1), 67-76. Retrieved July 12, 2007 from EBSCO database.
- Struckman-Johnson, C. & Struckman-Johnson, D. (2002). Sexual coercion reported by women in three Midwestern prisons. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 39(3), 217-227. Retrieved July 12, 2007 from EBSCO database.
- Tewksbury, R. & West, A. (2000). Research on sex in prison during the late 1980's and early 1990's. *The Prison Journal*, 80(4), 368-378. Retrieved October 26, 2008 from Sage Publications.
- Wolff, N., Blitz, C., Shi, J., Bachman, R., & Siegel, J. (2006). Sexual violence: Inside prisons: rates of victimization. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 83(5), 835-848.
- Wooden, W. & Parker, J. (1982). *Men behind bars*. New York: Plenum.

VITA

Karly D. Watson was born in Austin, Texas in 1983. She received the degree of Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice from Texas State University-San Marcos in May 2006.

The next step of her academic journey was to enter Texas State's graduate program in Criminal Justice. During her enrollment, she attended multiple academic conferences and worked as a graduate research assistant.

Permanent Address: P.O. Box 1043

Dripping Springs, Texas 78620

This thesis was typed by Karly D. Watson.

