

Lifetime victimization among Spanish adolescents

Sílvia Indias García and Joaquín De Paúl Ochotorena
Universidad del País Vasco - Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea

Abstract

Background: The damaging effects of direct and indirect experience of interpersonal violence on children's development are widely acknowledged. The objective of the present study was to analyze lifetime victimization among adolescents of a community sample. **Method:** Participants were 608 adolescents aged 12-18 from Northern Spain. The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire was used to measure lifetime victimization. **Results:** Over 90% of the adolescent population has been exposed to some kind of victimization. Participants reported an average of 5.50 lifetime victimization experiences and 75% of the sample reported the experience of at least two forms of victimization. The 10% most victimized part of the sample, participants reporting 11 or more victimizations, were classified as polyvictims. **Conclusions:** Victimization is very frequent even among community adolescents, especially peer victimization and witnessing community violence.

Keywords: Lifetime victimization, adolescent, child maltreatment, bullying, JVQ.

Resumen

Victimización en adolescentes españoles. Antecedentes: está reconocido el efecto negativo en el desarrollo infantil de las experiencias directas o indirectas de violencia interpersonal. El objetivo de este estudio era analizar la victimización a lo largo de su vida en adolescentes de una muestra de la población general. **Método:** la muestra está conformada por 608 participantes del norte de España de 12 a 18 años de edad. Para medir la victimización a lo largo de la vida se utilizó el Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ). **Resultados:** más del 90% de esta muestra de adolescentes notificaron haber sido expuestos a algún tipo de victimización. Los participantes notificaron una media de 5.50 experiencias de victimización a lo largo de su vida y un 75% de la muestra notificó haber experimentado al menos dos formas de victimización. A partir del 10% de la muestra que había notificado más experiencias, los participantes con 11 o más victimizaciones fueron clasificados como polívictimas. **Conclusiones:** se concluye de los resultados de este estudio que la victimización es frecuente entre adolescentes de la población general, siendo especialmente relevante la producida por "iguales" y la que supone ser testigo de situaciones de violencia.

Palabras clave: víctimas, adolescentes, maltrato infantil, bullying, JVQ.

Studies in a variety of species have shown that adverse experiences early in life can have long-term effects on development (Meaney & Szyf, 2005). The damaging effects of the direct and indirect experience of interpersonal violence on children's development are widely acknowledged (Finkelhor, 1995; Kendall-Tackett, 2009). In order to prevent victimization in children or treat any of its consequences, it is essential to have enough knowledge about the real prevalence of this kind of events during childhood and adolescence. The *off-the-record numbers* are thought to be very high in child victimization (Finkelhor, 2008), so assessment by self-report has been considered a good option to obtain more accurate rates of lifetime victimization.

One of the most increasingly used instruments to assess violent experiences in young people is the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ; Hamby, Finkelhor, Ormrod, & Turner, 2004a, 2004b). The JVQ is a very comprehensive scale that provides reports on different forms of offenses against youth spread across five general

areas of concern: Conventional Crime, Child Maltreatment, Peer and Sibling Victimization, Sexual Victimization, and Witnessing and Indirect Victimization. It offers many scoring options and can be used to assess different time periods (i.e. past-year, lifetime).

The JVQ has been used in several countries around the world. Rates for the prevalence of at least one episode of victimization among adolescents are 71.4% in China (Chan, 2013), 84.1% in Sweden (Aho, Gren-Landell, & Svedin, 2016), 94.3% in Vietnam (Le, Holton, Nguyen, Wolfe, & Fisher, 2015), and almost 80% among 2-to-17-year-old children in the USA (Finkelhor, Ormrod, & Turner, 2009). In Spain, over 90% of 15 to 18 years old adolescents reported at least one victimization during lifetime (Játiva & Cerezo, 2014), and so did more than 80% of adolescents aged between 12 and 17 (Pereda, Guilera, & Abad, 2014).

The mean for the total amount of different victimization experiences during lifetime ranged between 2.8 (Turner, Shattuck, Finkelhor, & Hamby, 2016) and 3.7 (Finkelhor et al., 2009) in the USA. In Sweden the mean was 4.1 (Aho et al., 2016), and 3.85 in Spain (Pereda et al., 2014).

Sexual victimization prevalence, including contact and non contact offenses, was under 10% in China (8.5%; Chan, Fong, Yan, Chow, & Ip, 2011) and the USA (9.5%; Finkelhor, Turner, Shattuck, & Hamby, 2013), over 20% in Sweden (21.8%; Aho et al., 2016)

and Vietnam (26.8%; Le et al., 2015), and ranging between 8.7% and 26.0% in Spain (Forns, Kirchner, Soler, & Paretilla, 2013; Játiva et al., 2014; Pereda et al., 2014).

Regarding child maltreatment, which implies forms of physical and psychological abuse and neglect, prevalence rates were 24% in Sweden (Aho et al., 2016), 31% in China (Chan et al., 2011), and ranging between 25.3% and 47.7% in Spain (Forns et al., 2013; Játiva et al., 2014; Pereda et al., 2014). In the USA, prevalence was over 13% for physical and emotional abuse (Finkelhor, Shattuck, Turner, & Hamby, 2015) and neglect (Finkelhor et al., 2013).

Other victimization types are much more frequent and/or prevalent than child maltreatment or sexual victimization. Nonetheless, peer victimization has been found to be strongly related to distress (Finkelhor, Shattuck, Turner, & Hamby, 2012), so it seems to be a potentially harmful experience.

Prevalence of peer victimization ranges from 48.8% to 62.9% in Spain, (Forns et al., 2013; Játiva et al., 2014; Pereda et al., 2014), it is over 25% in China (Chan et al., 2011) and over 50% in Sweden (Aho et al., 2016). Physical and emotional bullying prevalences are over 50% and 20% respectively in the USA (Finkelhor et al., 2009) and both are close to 30% in Vietnam (Le et al., 2015).

Conventional crimes (thefts, assaults...) are usually the most prevalent type of victimization. Rates are 50.4% in China (Chan et al., 2011), and over 60% in Sweden (Aho et al., 2016) and between 61.5 and 76.0% in Spain (Forns et al., 2013; Játiva et al., 2014; Pereda et al., 2014).

Prevalence rates of indirect violence (including community and family violence witnessing) are over 35% in China (Chan et al., 2011), over 40% (6.8% for domestic violence witnessing) in the USA (Finkelhor et al., 2009), over 54% in Sweden (Aho et al., 2016), and between 48.9% and 74.4% in Spain (Forns et al., 2013; Játiva et al., 2014; Pereda et al., 2014). In Vietnam, near 57% and 76% of adolescents have witnessed family and community violence, respectively (Le et al., 2015).

Several studies have assessed "polyvictimization" (the accumulation or co-occurrence of multiple victimization experiences) in adolescents and children using the JVQ (Finkelhor, Ormrod, Turner, & Hamby, 2005b). Polyvictimization could be strongly associated with adverse health and psychosocial consequences (Turner, Finkelhor, & Ormrod, 2010). Based on Finkelhor et al.'s (2005a) criteria for polyvictimization (four or more types of victimization), 14% of adolescents in China (Chan, 2013) and 74.5% of adolescents in Vietnam (Le et al., 2015) were polyvictims.

These data suggest that although the general population is often perceived to be safe and rarely involved in violent or harmful situations, it is common for children and young people to suffer some sort of victimization.

The main objective of this study was to assess victimization prevalence in a community sample of adolescents from a northern Spanish region (Basque Country) in order to compare findings with those obtained in similar studies conducted in other Spanish regions (Catalonia and Valencia).

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 608 adolescents, 47.2% boys, ranging from 12 to 18 years of age ($M_{age} = 14.45$, $SD = 1.61$), who were recruited from the seventh to twelfth grades in a middle school and

a high school in San Sebastian (Basque Country, North Spain). To evaluate age effects, the sample was divided into two age groups: younger adolescents aged 12 to 14 years (50.1% of the sample) and older adolescents aged 15 to 18 years.

Instruments

Data were collected using the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ; Finkelhor, Hamby, Ormrod, & Turner, 2005). The JVQ is a 34-item scale available in a self-administration format for children aged 12 years and older. It assesses 34 forms of victimization divided into five major areas or modules: 1) Conventional crime, subdivided into a) Property crimes and b) Crimes against persons, 2) Child maltreatment, 3) Peer and sibling victimization, 4) Sexual victimization, subdivided into a) With physical contact and b) Without physical contact, and 5) Indirect victimization, subdivided into a) Family violence and b) Community violence. Participants indicate whether they have ever experienced each specific situation and, if so, how many times. The Spanish version of the bilingual translation by the GREVIA (Group for Research on Child and Adolescent Victimization) was used (Forns et al., 2013). The item 25 of the scale, which refers to statutory rape, does not fit the Spanish law and was not used in this study, following the procedure of other previous Spanish studies (Pereda et al., 2014; Segura et al., 2015).

Procedure

The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of the Basque Country. Permission and written consent was obtained from school principals, participants and their parents. Data collection was carried out in schools mostly with both the presence of a project staff member and the group's tutor. Participation was always voluntary, confidential and anonymous. Response rates were not recorded.

Data analysis

Descriptive statistics were calculated for all items, modules and sub-modules of the JVQ along with the lifetime screener sum (total score). Differences between genders and age groups were assessed using ANOVA and χ^2 . Sample sizes were not identical in every analysis due to missing data.

Results

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) for each item and for each module of JVQ, as well as for the total score. The overwhelming majority of participants (91% of the sample) had experienced at least one form of victimization. Findings showed that participants reported an average of 5.50 ($SD = 4.46$) lifetime victimization experiences, that 75% of the sample reported the experience of at least two forms of victimization, and 25% reported at least eight.

No age ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 1.49, p = .14$) or gender ($\chi^2(1, 585) = .75, p = .23$) effects were observed for victimization prevalence rates. Prevalence for 12-to-14-year group (89.5%) was not significantly different than for 15-to-18-year group (92.3%). Similarly, victimization prevalence rates were similar for boys (92%) and for girls (90%). Regarding the total victimization score (number of total different forms of victimization), no gender effect was observed ($F(1, 583) =$

Table 1
Descriptive statistics for the total sample, and separated by gender and age group, for each item, domain and total score of the JVQ

	M	SD	Victims		Gender (%)		Age (%)	
			n	%	M	F	12-14	15-18
Conventional Crime	.54	.72	464	76.3	81.5	72.2	73.0	79.3
- Property victimization	.79	1.00	411	67.6	70.3	65.4	63.8	71.0
1. Robbery	.45	1.12	116	19.1	21.7	17.8	16.1	22.0
2. Personal theft	.82	1.27	257	42.3	42.8	41.7	36.8	47.0
3. Vandalism	1.10	1.43	319	52.5	53.6	51.8	49.7	55.7
- Crimes against persons	.39	.68	277	45.6	51.4	41.4	41.8	49.7
4. Assault with weapon	.24	.82	71	11.7	15.6	9.1	7.6	15.7
5. Assault without weapon	.79	1.47	192	31.6	36.2	27.8	27.0	36.3
6. Attempted Assault	.43	1.05	132	21.7	28.6	16.2	20.4	23.0
7. Kidnapping	.03	.33	11	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.6	2.0
8. Bias Attack	.44	1.25	93	15.3	14.1	17.5	11.8	19.0
Child Maltreatment	.29	.62	199	32.7	33.0	32.7	31.6	33.7
9. Physical abuse by caregiver	.40	1.08	100	16.4	18.5	14.6	14.5	18.3
10. Psychological/emotional abuse	.59	1.29	152	25.0	23.6	26.5	23.0	26.7
11. Neglect	.06	.41	18	3.0	2.5	3.6	3.0	2.7
12. Custodial interference	.10	.60	26	4.3	2.9	5.5	4.3	4.3
Peer and Sibling Victimization	.63	.77	442	72.7	76.1	70.9	67.4	78.0
13. Gang or group assault	.23	.82	68	11.2	14.1	8.7	8.2	14.3
14. Peer or sibling assault	1.32	1.77	303	49.8	56.2	45.3	46.7	52.7
15. Nonsexual genital assault	.41	1.04	121	19.9	31.9	8.7	18.1	21.7
16. Physical intimidation by peer	.54	1.31	130	21.4	19.9	23.0	19.1	23.3
17. Relational aggression by peers	1.23	1.74	289	47.5	44.9	51.5	42.1	53.0
18. Dating violence	.05	.35	21	3.5	5.8	1.6	2.0	5.0
Sexual Victimization	.19	.39	117	19.2	13.0	24.9	14.5	23.7
- With physical contact	.02	.12	28	4.6	3.3	5.8	3.0	6.3
19. Sexual assault by known adult	.01	.18	4	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.7	0.7
20. Sexual assault by unknown adult	.02	.14	9	1.5	1.1	1.6	1.3	1.7
21. Sexual assault by peer/sibling	.03	.26	10	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.7
22. Forced sex (including attempts)	.04	.26	15	2.5	1.8	3.2	1.0	4.0
- Without physical contact	.20	.56	104	17.1	10.9	22.7	13.5	20.3
23. Flashing/sexual exposure	.08	.40	35	5.8	3.6	8.1	5.3	6.0
24. Verbal sexual harassment	.31	.96	83	13.7	9.4	17.2	9.9	17.0
Witnessing/Indirect Victimization	.28	.40	398	65.5	67.4	63.1	58.2	72.7
- Family violence	.15	.51	72	11.8	10.1	13.6	8.2	15.7
26. Witness to domestic violence	.16	.71	43	7.1	6.9	7.1	5.9	8.3
27. Witness to parent assault /sibling	.15	.64	38	6.3	4.7	7.8	3.6	9.0
- Community violence	.32	.45	383	63.0	64.9	60.5	55.6	70.3
28. Witness to assault with weapon	.48	1.03	158	26.0	27.5	25.2	19.7	32.3
29. Witness to assault w/out weapon	1.19	1.61	303	49.8	53.6	46.6	45.4	54.3
30. Burglary of family household	.19	.56	84	13.8	12.3	15.2	11.2	16.3
31. Murder of family member/friend	.08	.40	37	6.1	6.2	6.5	7.6	4.7
32. Witness to murder	.05	.29	21	3.5	4.0	2.9	3.9	2.7
33. Exposure to shootings/terrorism/riots	.21	.69	77	12.7	16.3	9.4	8.2	17.0
34. Exposure to war/ethnic conflict	.02	.29	7	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.6	0.7
JVQ TOTAL	5.50	4.46	553	91.0	92.0	90.0	89.5	92.3

2.55, $p = .11$). However, an age effect ($F(1, 602) = 15.43, p < .001$) was observed for the total victimization score: older adolescents reported ($M = 6.19, SD = 4.59$) more victimization experiences than younger adolescents ($M = 4.79, SD = 4.16$). Additionally, gender and age differences were observed for several items and areas of victimization. These are described below.

Conventional crime

The majority of participants (76.3%) reported an experience of some sort of conventional crime, with boys being more likely

than girls to report having experienced conventional crime ($\chi^2(1, 585) = 7.11, p = .008$), particularly crimes involving assault.

Property crimes were more prevalent than crimes against persons (67.6% vs. 45.6%), with vandalism and personal theft showing the highest occurrence rates. Significant age differences were found (see Table 1): older adolescents reported more experiences of personal theft ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 6.40, p = .01$) and more assaults with weapon ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 9.67, p < .01$) and without weapon ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 6.12, p = .01$) than the younger adolescents.

Child maltreatment

A group of adolescents (32.7%) reported having experienced caregiver victimization. Experience of psychological abuse was more frequent than experience of physical abuse (25.0% vs. 16.4% respectively). There was no gender or age effect in child maltreatment (see Table 1).

Peer and sibling victimization

Participants reported high rates of peer and sibling victimization (72.7%). Statistically significant differences were found for age groups: older adolescents were more likely to report having been victimized by peers and siblings than younger adolescents ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 8.49, p = .004$). Additional age differences were found when responses to single items were analyzed. Older adolescents reported more gang or group assaults ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 5.64, p < .05$), more relational aggression by peers ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 7.19, p < .01$) and more dating violence ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 4.12, p < .05$) than the younger group. Moreover, boys were more likely than girls to report gang or group assault ($\chi^2(1, 585) = 4.24, p < .05$), peer and sibling assaults ($\chi^2(1, 585) = 6.87, p < .05$), nonsexual genital assault ($\chi^2(1, 585) = 49.45, p < .001$) and dating violence ($\chi^2(1, 585) = 7.36, p < .01$) than females (see Table 1).

Sexual victimization

Up to the 19.2% of this sample reported having experienced some kind of sexual victimization, with girls reporting higher prevalence of general sexual victimization than boys ($\chi^2(1, 585) = 13.19, p < .001$). However, the gender differences regarding sexual victimization were only due to higher prevalence for girls in offenses not involving contact ($\chi^2(1, 585) = 14.29, p < .001$): girls reported higher prevalence of flashing or sexual exposure ($\chi^2(1, 585) = 5.17, p < .05$) and verbal sexual harassment ($\chi^2(1, 585) = 7.46, p < .01$) than boys, but not higher prevalence of any victimization involving sexual contact ($p > .05$). Sexual victimization not involving contact was more prevalent than sexual victimization involving contact (17.1% vs. 4.6% respectively; see Table 1).

Older adolescents reported higher prevalence than younger adolescents of general sexual victimization ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 8.28, p < .01$), both contact ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 3.88, p < .05$) and non contact ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 5.04, p < .05$), of forced sex ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 5.66, p < .05$) and verbal sexual harassment ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 6.61, p < .05$, see Table 1).

Witnessing and indirect victimization

Among the total sample, 65.5% reported having witnessed or experienced indirect victimization. Exposure to violence in the community (63.0%) was more prevalent than exposure to family violence (11.8%).

Older adolescents reported higher prevalence than younger adolescents of indirect victimization ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 13.92, p < .001$) and of exposure to family ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 7.97, p < .01$) and community violence ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 14.06, p < .001$, see Table 1). More specifically, there were age differences in the prevalence of witnessing a parent-to-sibling assault ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 7.42, p < .01$) and assaults with ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 12.45, p < .001$) and without a weapon ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 4.83, p < .05$). Moreover, older adolescents were more likely to report exposure to shootings, terrorism or riots ($\chi^2(1, 604) = 10.57, p < .01$) than younger adolescents, and the prevalence of exposure to shootings, terrorism and riots was higher for boys than for girls ($\chi^2(1, 585) = 6.32, p < .05$). No differences between genders were observed for rates of witnessing violence, nor family nor community based ($p > .05$).

Polyvictimization

Several findings about polyvictimization can be observed in Table 2. Among participants reporting at least one experience of victimization, the mean number of victimization episodes was 6.04 ($SD = 4.30$, $Mdn = 5.00$, $IQR = 5$, range: 1 to 23, 95% CI [5.69, 6.40]). Finkelhor et al.'s (2009) method for determining the threshold for polyvictimization was used, identifying the top 10% of the sample as lifetime polyvictims. Thus, the polyvictimization threshold was set at 11 episodes for this sample.

Results were compared to previous Spanish findings, where the polyvictimization threshold was set at 8 episodes (Pereda et al., 2014), which is lower than the threshold observed in the present study. Applying the 8 victimizations threshold to the sample of the present study, 28.1% of participants would be considered polyvictims.

Discussion

The aim of this study was to describe victimization prevalence among adolescents in a Spanish region. The prevalence of at least one exposure to victimization was extremely high (91%). Lifetime prevalence of at least one victimization was higher in this study than in previous Spanish studies conducted in other regions (83% in Pereda et al., 2014), even though they used an enhanced

Table 2
Descriptive statistics for polyvictimization in two age groups

	12-14	15-18	Total
Non-victims (%)	32 (10.5)	23 (7.7)	55 (9.0)
Victims (%)	233 (76.6)	238 (79.3)	471 (77.5)
Polyvictims (%)	39 (12.8)	39 (13.0)	82 (13.5)
Mean number of victimizations among victims (SD)	5.35 (4.04)	6.70 (4.40)	6.04 (4.30)
Children with JVQ total score above mean (%)	35.2	33.7	34.7
Number of victimizations in the top 10 th percentile	10+	12+	11+
Number of victimizations in the top 10 th percentile based on previous Spanish study ^a	7+	9+	8+
Children above top 10 th percentile based on previous community sample (%)	29.3	27.7	28.1

^a Previous study is Pereda et al., 2014.

36-item version of the JVQ. The reported lifetime prevalence of victimization observed in this sample was also higher than those observed in studies conducted in Malaysia (22%, although they used a modified version of the JVQ; Choo, Dunne, Marret, Fleming, & Wong, 2011), China (71%; Chan, 2013), and the USA (80%; Finkelhor et al., 2009), and comparable but lower than those observed in Vietnam (94%; Le et al., 2015). The mean number of different episodes of victimization reported by adolescents in this sample was also higher than those observed in other studies conducted in the USA ($M = 3.7$, Finkelhor et al., 2009; $M = 2.8$, Turner et al., 2016), but again lower than those observed in the study conducted in Vietnam ($M = 7$, Le et al., 2015).

Prevalence ranges observed in the present study are (1) within those observed in studies conducted in Catalonia (Forns et al., 2013; Pereda et al., 2014) for conventional crime, witnessing/indirect victimization, child maltreatment and sexual victimization, and (2) similar to those observed in Valencia (Játiva & Cerezo, 2014) for conventional crime and sexual victimization.

Exposure to peer and sibling victimization, which includes several types of assault, intimidation and violence perpetrated by youngsters of similar age, was 10% higher in this study (72.7%) than the highest rate observed in previous Spanish studies (values ranged from 48.8% to 62.9%; Forns et al., 2013; Játiva & Cerezo, 2014; Pereda et al., 2014).

Prevalence of any type of victimization (areas) was remarkably higher in the sample of the present study than the one observed in studies conducted in China, with the exception of child maltreatment (Chan et al., 2011). While rates of family violence observed in our study were lower than those observed in studies conducted in USA (Finkelhor et al., 2013), rates of peer and sibling victimization were similar.

We found a similar pattern of age and gender effects than those observed in a previous Spanish study (Pereda et al., 2014). Conventional crime, crimes against the person, peer and sibling victimization, nonsexual genital assault and gang or group assault were more frequently reported by boys. Girls were more likely to report having experienced sexual victimization, but only that one not involving contact, and especially verbal sexual harassment. Older adolescents were more likely than younger adolescents to report experience of gang or group assault, witnessing victimization or indirect victimization in both family and community contexts, and sexual victimization, as well as a higher number of total different episodes of victimization, which agrees with the consistent accumulation of experiences over time found in previous research (Turner, Finkelhor, & Ormrod, 2010).

Concluding, it seems like adolescents in the Basque Country (Northern Spain) could be a population that is more exposed to interpersonal violence than youngsters from other areas of Spain or from other countries. Basque adolescents might be especially more likely to become involved in victimization performed by other adolescents, such as assaults or intimidation of a physical, emotional and/or relational nature, than adolescents from Catalonia or Valencia (Eastern Spain). At the same time, family environment seems to be more secure for Basque adolescents (and Spanish adolescents in general) than for those living in China or the USA (Chan et al., 2011; Finkelhor et al., 2013). Hypotheses based on belonging to minorities or disadvantaged groups are presumably not adequate to explain why adolescents in this sample reported such high rates of victimization. Basque Country is considered to be the Spanish region with the highest-income and the lowest immigration rates in Spain. Therefore, further research is needed in order to find what factors are causing victimization differences between adolescents in the Basque Country and other locations.

Findings of the present study, along with those obtained in previous research show a broader picture of victimization experiences among adolescents in Spain, although studies covering other Spanish regions are needed. It is a limitation that participants from this study (and also from other Spanish studies, as far as we know) were recruited in an urban area. Differences regarding victimization (total prevalence or predominant types, for example) might exist between rural and urban environments. Data was collected only through self-reports, which are recommended over official records or parent-reports as a method of assessing victimization in old-enough children (Hamby & Finkelhor, 2000, 2001), but findings are not comparable with those obtained using other measurement strategies, for low agreement is frequent (Compier-de Block et al., 2017; Negri, Schneiderman, & Trickett, 2017). Furthermore, we analyzed victimization situations only through the JVQ total score, prevalence of different types of victimization and polyvictimization thresholds. This provides a broad overview of interpersonal violence during childhood, but does not allow for more detailed exploration.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU)'s 2013's Predoctoral Fellowship. The authors gratefully acknowledge the students, principals and teachers who participated in this study.

References

- Aho, N., Gren-Landell, M., & Svedin, C. G. (2016). The Prevalence of Potentially Victimized Events, Poly-Victimization, and Its Association to Sociodemographic Factors. A Swedish Youth Survey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 31*, 620-651. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514556105>
- Chan, K. L. (2013). Victimization and poly-victimization among school-aged Chinese adolescents: Prevalence and associations with health. *Preventive Medicine, 56*, 207-210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2012.12.018>
- Chan, K. L., Fong, D. Y. T., Yan, E., Chow, C. B., & Ip, P. (2011). Validation of the Chinese Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire. *Hong Kong Journal of Paediatrics, 16*, 17-24.
- Choo, W., Dunne, M. P., Marret, M. J., Fleming, M., & Wong, Y. (2011). Victimization experiences of adolescents in Malaysia. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 49*, 627-634. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2011.04.020>
- Compier-de Block, L. H., Alink, L. R., Linting, M., van den Berg, L. J., Elzinga, B. M., Voorthuis, A., ..., & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (2017). Parent-Child Agreement on Parent-to-Child Maltreatment. *Journal of Family Violence, 32*, 207-217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-016-9902-3>
- Finkelhor, D. (1995). The victimization of children: A developmental perspective. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 65*, 177-193. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0079618>

- Finkelhor, D. (2008). *Childhood victimization: Violence, crime, and abuse in the lives of young people*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195342857.001.0001>
- Finkelhor, D., Hamby, S. L., Ormrod, R., & Turner, H. (2005a). The juvenile victimization questionnaire: Reliability, validity, and national norms. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *29*, 383-412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2004.11.001>
- Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R. K., & Turner, H. A. (2009). Lifetime assessment of poly-victimization in a national sample of children and youth. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *33*, 403-411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2008.09.012>
- Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R. K., Turner, H. A., & Hamby, S. L. (2005b). Measuring poly-victimization using the juvenile victimization questionnaire. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *29*, 1297-1312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2005.06.005>
- Finkelhor, D., Shattuck, A., Turner, H., & Hamby, S. (2012). Improving the Adverse Childhood Experiences Study scale. *JAMA Pediatrics*, *167*, 70-75. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.420>
- Finkelhor, D., Shattuck, A., Turner, H., & Hamby, S. (2015). A revised inventory of Adverse Childhood Experiences. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *48*, 13-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2015.07.011>
- Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., Shattuck, A., & Hamby, S. L. (2013). Violence, crime, and abuse exposure in a national sample of children and youth: An update. *JAMA Pediatrics*, *167*, 614-621. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2013.42>
- Forns, M., Kirchner, T., Soler, L., & Paretilla, C. (2013). Spanish/Catalan version of the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ): Psychometric properties. *Anuario de Psicología*, *43*, 171-187. Retrieved from <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=97029454003>
- Hamby, S. L., & Finkelhor, D. (2000). The victimization of children: Recommendations for assessment and instrument development. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *39*, 829-840. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-200007000-00011>
- Hamby, S. L., & Finkelhor, D. (2001). *Choosing and using child victimization questionnaires*. PsycEXTRA Dataset. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e317972004-001>
- Hamby, S. L., Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R. K., & Turner, H. A. (2004a). *The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ): Child self-report version*. Durham, NH: Crimes against Children Research Center.
- Hamby, S. L., Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R. K., & Turner, H. A. (2004b). *The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ): Administration & scoring manual*. Durham, NH: Crimes against Children Research Center.
- Játiva, R., & Cerezo, M. A. (2014). The mediating role of self-compassion in the relationship between victimization and psychological maladjustment in a sample of adolescents. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *38*, 1180-1190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.04.005>
- Kendall-Tackett, K. (2009). Psychological trauma and physical health: A psychoneuroimmunology approach to etiology of negative health effects and possible interventions. *Psychological Trauma*, *1*, 35-48. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015128>
- Le, M. T. H., Holton, S., Nguyen, H. T., Wolfe, R., & Fisher, J. (2015). Poly-victimisation among Vietnamese high school students: Prevalence and demographic correlates. *PLOS One*, *10*, e0125189. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125189>
- Meaney, M. J., & Szyf, M. (2005). Environmental programming of stress responses through DNA methylation: life at the interface between a dynamic environment and a fixed genome. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, *7*, 103-123. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3181727/pdf/DialoguesClinNeurosci-7-103.pdf>
- Negriff, S., Schneiderman, J. U., & Trickett, P. K. (2017). Concordance Between Self-Reported Childhood Maltreatment Versus Case Record Reviews for Child Welfare-Affiliated Adolescents: Prevalence Rates and Associations With Outcomes. *Child Maltreatment*, *22*, 34-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559516674596>
- Pereda, N., Guilera, G., & Abad, J. (2014). Victimization and polyvictimization of Spanish children and youth: Results from a community sample. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *38*, 640-649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.01.019>
- Segura, A., Pereda, N., Abad, J., & Guilera, G. (2015). Victimization and polyvictimization among Spanish youth protected by the child welfare system. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *59*, 105-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2015.10.011>
- Turner, H. A., Finkelhor, D., & Ormrod, R. (2010). Poly-victimization in a national sample of children and youth. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *38*, 323-330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.11.012>
- Turner, H. A., Shattuck, A., Finkelhor, D., & Hamby, S. (2016). Polyvictimization and youth violence exposure across contexts. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *58*, 208-214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.09.021>