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Abstract

An Empirically Derived Typology of Families of Adolescent Male Sex Offenders

Nancy Anne Falls

Doctor of Education, Department of Adult Education,
Community Development and Counselling Psychology

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
of the University of Toronto, 2001

The purpose of this study was to develop a typology of family environments of adolescent male sex offenders. Closed clinical records of 80 adolescents male sex offenders, aged 12 - 19, and their families admitted for assessment and or treatment at a community based program were reviewed for this investigation. Data were collected related to five identified family variables: family structure, family dynamics, sexual environment, family violence and antisociality. Families were rated on each of these variables using a 5 point Likert scale, from highly stable or problem free to highly unstable or problematic. A trained second rater reviewed 25% of the files and good inter rater reliability was established, Cohen's $K > .60$ for all family variables (Cicchetti & Sparrow, 1981).

A cluster analysis revealed five distinct family groups: Extremely Problematic, Structurally Unstable, Multi Problem, Healthy, and Problematic Parenting. Extremely
Problematic families were characterized by a severe disruption on all family variables; particularly, sexual environment, family violence, and antisociality. Structurally Unstable families were distinguishable by problematic family structures, with offenders experiencing many residential moves, major separations from parents, or involvement by child protection services. Multi Problem families noted disruptions on all family variables but not as severe as Extremely Problematic families. Families in the Healthy group did not indicate problems related to any of the family variables under investigation. Problematic Parenting families were characterized by poor parenting skills including inconsistency in parenting, lack of supervision, parentification, and negative communication styles within the family. Variables not used in the formation of the family groups were used to validate and add support to the cluster solution. Specific offense and offender characteristics varied across the family groups.

The distinctive family groups in this current investigation confirm the heterogeneity of families of adolescent male sex offenders. Not all adolescent male sex offenders come from dysfunctional family systems and the nature of the dysfunction varies across the family groups. Understanding the specific dysfunction within the family may provide a targeted direction for the family component of an overall treatment program for adolescent male sex offenders.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

In the past decade, there has been a tremendous growth in the amount of literature and research regarding adolescent sex offenders. Emphasis has been placed on understanding this group through clinical observation and descriptive studies primarily focused on offender and offense characteristics. Evidence confirms the heterogeneity of adolescent sex offenders: as no one set of characteristics describes this population, and motives for engaging in deviant sexual behaviour have been found to be multiply determined (Becker, Harris, & Sales, 1993; Knight & Prentky, 1993; Marshall, Laws, & Barbaree, 1990; Nagayama-Hall, Hirschman, Graham, & Zaragoza, 1993; Weinrott, 1996).

Despite the heterogeneity, family dysfunction has been identified as an important contributor to the development and maintenance of adolescent sex offending behaviour (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Blaske, Borduin, Henggeler, & Mann, 1989; Fehrenbach, Smith, Monastersky, & Deisher, 1986). The lack of an operational definition of family dysfunction has created difficulties in understanding the specific nature of the family problems. Based on the literature, significant family variables proposed in the etiology of adolescent sexual offenses have included: changes in family structure (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Becker, Cunningham-Rather, Kaplan, & Kavoussi, 1986; Kaplan, Becker, & Martinez, 1990; Vizard, Monck, & Misch 1995), dysfunctional family dynamics (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kaplan, 1986; Becker et al., 1993; Blaske et al., 1989; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Graves, Openshaw, Ascione, & Ericksen, 1996; Hsu & Starzynski, 1990), experiences of physical and or sexual abuse within the family (Awad & Saunders, 1991;
Becker et al., 1993; O'Brien, 1991; Weinrott, 1996), addictions (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Graves et al., 1996; Lightfoot & Barbaree, 1993; Oliver, Nagayama-Hall, & Neuhaus, 1993), and criminal history (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Miccio-Fonseca, 1996). The major limitations to date in assessing family environments have been small sample sizes, limited number of sources in obtaining information, and inconsistent use of empirically validated measures. Many researchers have identified the need for further research to differentiate family characteristics and environments within groups of adolescent sex offenders and to develop a taxonomy of families of adolescent sex offenders (Bischoff, Stith, & Whitney, 1995; Goodrow & Lim, 1998; Monastersky & Smith, 1985; Oliver et al., 1993; Worling, 1995a).

The purpose of this research was to develop a typology of family environments of adolescent male sex offenders. This study focused solely on the families of adolescent male sex offenders because males have been identified as committing the majority of sexual offenses (Bischof & Rosen, 1997; Finkelhor, 1986; Weinrott, 1996) and over 95% of the potential participants for this study were male. An overview of the current literature identified the diversity within the families of adolescent sex offenders, especially when compared with families of nonsexual offending adolescents. To develop the typology, characteristics of family environments were examined under the following specific categories noted in the literature: family structure, family dynamics, sexual environment, family violence, and antisociality. Increasing our understanding of these families may provide opportunities for developing more effective and comprehensive treatment programs that address the specific needs of these individual families.
Family Environments of Adolescent Sex Offenders

From the earliest citations in the literature, the family has been identified as an important factor in the etiology and maintenance of deviant sexual behavior in adolescents. One of the earliest was Doshay (1943), who identified family trauma as one of the primary sources of sexual maladjustment. Throughout the literature, clinicians working with adolescent sex offenders have identified dysfunctional family systems as a significant contributing factor in an adolescent's choice to offend sexually (Becker, 1998; Bischof & Rosen, 1997; Gonsiorek, Bera, & Le Tourneau, 1994). Yet the definition of family dysfunction was often not described. The National Task Force on Juvenile Sexual Offending (1993) provided a more detailed description of family environment, stating,

The family and environment are essential influences in the development of sexuality and therefore, family trauma, physical and sexual abuse, neglect, scapegoating, undefined family relations and exposure to sexually traumatic material in the environment may contribute to the development of sexual offending behavior (p.31).

The inconsistent or lack of a definition of family dysfunction adds to the confusion in understanding the diversity of family environments of adolescent sex offenders. As a result, what has been noted clinically has been difficult to substantiate empirically.

In an attempt to identify characteristics unique to adolescent sex offenders, researchers have compared family environments of adolescent sex offenders with other groups of adolescents. To date, six published studies have compared the family environments of adolescent sex offenders to other nonsexual delinquents and normative samples. While there were differences between delinquent and "normal" adolescents' perceptions on several aspects of their family environments, there were also findings in which the adolescent sex offenders' families more closely resembled the normative samples (Awad & Saunders, 1991;
Bischof, Stith, & Wilson, 1992; Bischof, Stith & Whitney, 1995; Blaske et al., 1989; Ford & Linney, 1995; Oliver et al., 1993). Perhaps it is the heterogeneity of the adolescent sex offender group that washes out more striking differences and accounts for the resemblance to both the normative and delinquent samples. Bischof et al. (1995) were unable to find a unique set of family characteristics of family environments of adolescent sex offenders when compared to other delinquent and nondelinquent groups. These authors suggested that families of adolescent sex offenders may have been distinguishable from families of other delinquents on dimensions of family life other than those that they assessed such as sexual tension in the home. To understand the heterogeneity that exists within the family environments of adolescent sex offenders there is a need to examine, in greater detail, specific aspects of these environments. What follows is an exploration of the literature on family environments captured under five specific variables: family structure, family dynamics, sexual environment, family violence and antisociality.

Family Structure

Family structure refers to the composition of family members and the nature of their relationships. For example, in terms of composition, some families include a father, a mother, and their two biological children, while others may include a single mother with three children, or a divorced woman with a child who married a divorced man with a child and together they had two additional children. Changes in the family structure may also include the physical relocation of the family to new homes or new communities.

Changes in family structure have been found to have an impact on child development and heighten the risk of problem behaviours (Fergusson, Horwood, & Lynskey, 1992; Loeber,
Researchers examining the structure of families of adolescent sex offenders' report that few adolescent sex offenders come from intact families, and that most offenders have experienced divorce or separation (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Becker et al., 1986; DeJong, 1989; Kaplan et al., 1990; Vizard et al., 1995). However, Graves et al. (1996) found differences in family structure based on offense type. For example, those who assaulted peers were more likely to come from single parent families and those who assaulted children more frequently lived in foster families or blended families. It is important to note that although most adolescent sex offenders may have experienced changes in family structure, some have not, thus indicating the need to examine this variable further as potentially differentiating subgroups of adolescent sex offenders.

The nature of the relationship of the offender to his/her victim is also related to the composition of the family. This may be especially important when sexual abuse occurs within the family context. Worling (1995a) found the presence of younger siblings within the family to be a distinguishing factor between sibling incest offenders and nonsibling offenders. Studies of adolescent sex offenders often delineate sexual abuse as occurring either inside or outside the family, without distinguishing between incest with a biological sibling or step sibling (Graves et al., 1996; O'Brien, 1991). Blending families has been found to place significant stress on the parental relationship and the overall family functioning (Bischof & Rosen, 1997). The presence of a nonbiologically related father has been identified as a risk factor for the potential sexual abuse of children in these blended homes (Finkelhor, 1986). Yet no evidence exists to support a similar statement regarding the potential risk for the presence of a stepsibling. The nature of the relationship may be an important feature in contributing to differences in family structure and, therefore, worthy of further investigation.
The intent here is not to make a causal statement between adolescent sex offending and family structure. The research to date has explored the relationship on a general level pointing to the need to examine these factors more comprehensively in understanding how the composition of the family members and the instability of a home environment, contribute to sexual offending behaviour in adolescents. Authors have tended to identify family structure at the time of the offense and have not distinguished between intact families with both natural parents and those with adoptive or stepparents (Vizard et al., 1995). Furthermore, no one has examined family structure with respect to the number of changes in parenting figures, the number of residential moves, or major separations from parental figures. Perhaps it is these more specific changes in the family environment over the lifetime of the adolescent that would differentiate groups of adolescent sex offenders' families.

**Family Dynamics**

In a broad sense, "dynamics" has referred to both the interpersonal relationships among family members and the parenting skills employed in facilitating these relationships. Researchers have reported that most adolescent sex offenders have come from disturbed family backgrounds with poor relationships among family members (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Becker et al., 1986; Becker et al., 1993; Blaske et al., 1989; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Graves et al., 1996; Hsu & Starzynski, 1990; Vizard et al., 1995). However, using broad sweeping statements has created difficulties in interpretation and empirical validation of the specific dynamics occurring in family environments of adolescent sex offenders.

Based on clinical observations, dysfunctional family dynamics of adolescent sex offenders have been identified as an important influence in the development of sexual
offending behaviour (Hoge & Andrews, 1996; Monastersky & Smith, 1985; Perry & Orchard, 1992). Yet empirical evidence supporting the notion of disturbed family dynamics has been inconclusive, with one major limitation being the lack of a consistent measure for assessing this variable (Bischof & Rosen, 1997; Weinrott, 1996). Although researchers have used a number of standardized measures for assessing different aspects of family functioning, they have been unable to discriminate families of adolescent sex offenders from either other delinquent groups or nonoffending adolescents based on these measures (Weinrott, 1996). In one study, Bischof et al. (1992) found no significant differences between adolescent sex offenders and nonsexual offending delinquents on family adaptability. Adolescent sex offenders did, however, view their families as more cohesive than other delinquents, but more emotionally disengaged than the normative sample.

In another study, Blaske et al. (1989) examined groups of father-absent adolescents and their mothers and found that family relations of sexual offenders were different from nonsexual offenders and more closely resembled the nondelinquent families. The mother-son dyads did, however, report lower rates of positive communication and high rates of ruminating-internalizing. It may be that the dynamics occurring within the samples of adolescent sex offenders are diverse and, therefore, are similar to both delinquent and normal samples. Another explanation may be that the variables assessed by using these standardized measures are not able to account for the differences.

What has proven more fruitful has been to examine specific subgroups of adolescent sex offenders in identifying clearer descriptions of family dynamics. In their meta-analysis, Graves et al. (1996) examined family interaction patterns of adolescent sex offenders, based on four dichotomous variables: flexible-structured, chaotic-rigid, separated-connected, and
disengaged-enmeshed. These variables were then analyzed according to three categories of offenders: those who assaulted children, those who assaulted peers, and those who assaulted both children and peers. Based on the overall findings, the authors reported that the majority of adolescent sex offenders came from homes described as having a pathological interaction style: however, there was also a group of families coded as "healthy". Even though there were many methodological issues in using data from a meta-analysis, the results also suggest that differences in the family dynamics of adolescent sex offenders may vary based on the type of offenses. For example, the family interaction pattern of those adolescents who offended against children were described as pathological and were more extreme on the chaotic-rigid and disengaged-enmeshed variables than those in the other two groups.

In another study, Worling (1995a) used a number of standardized measures to compare family and individual functioning of sibling incest offenders to nonsibling offenders. Sibling incest offenders were less satisfied with their family relationships and reported more negative family environments with higher levels of marital discord in their parents' relationship, parental rejection, and physical punishment. Examining the family dynamics within subgroups of adolescent sex offenders has identified differences: therefore, this variable may be a distinguishing feature of groups of families.

Because no single pattern of family dynamics has been identified by the standardized measures currently available, identifying specific features of the interpersonal relationships and parenting skills within the families of adolescent sex offenders may distinguish particular family types. In addition to assessing the interpersonal relationship between the offender and each of his/her parents, no one has yet examined the relationship between the adolescent sex offender and various other parental figures such as a stepparent or foster parent. Relationships
between the offender and his/her siblings may also be an important feature. Another area that may assist in distinguishing family groups is specific parenting skills such as the level of supervision provided by the parents, the nature of the household responsibility given to the children, or the parent's ability to discipline.

**Sexual Environment**

A sexualized family environment has been identified as a potentially significant variable in the development of deviant sexual behaviour (Alexander & Schaeffer, 1994; Hall, Mathews, Pearce, McGarvey & Gavin, 1996; Hall, Mathews & Pearce, 1998). However, one of the difficulties in investigating the sexual environment in the home has been the lack of a consistent or comprehensive definition. Hall et al., (1996) provided an inclusive description of the specific problematic aspects of the sexual environment, that included, “exposure to explicit sexual material, open sexual behaviour between family members, sexualization of non-sexual behaviours and issues, and early eroticization or sexualization of the child by the family or primary caregiver” (p. 5). In the current investigation, key aspects examined regarding the sexual environment in the home included: sexual behaviours, cognitive distortions and sexual attitudes, availability of pornography, and sexual victimization history of the offender and family members.

**Sexual behaviours.** Exposure to explicit sexual behaviours within the home may place an adolescent at risk for committing sexual offenses (Awad & Saunders, 1991). Family nudity and witnessing intercourse by adults has been linked to an increase in sexual behaviour in a normative sample of children (Friedrich, Grambsch, Broughton, Kuiper, & Beilke, 1991). In one study of adult sex offenders, all participants reported exposure to sexual activities as
children (Romano & DeLuca, 1997). In their descriptive study of sibling incest families, Smith and Israel (1987) found that almost half of the adolescent perpetrators had observed sexual activity between their parents or caregivers. Among their findings they also identified that many mothers were overinvolved in their children’s physical and sexual development, and that many interactions between family members were openly flirtatious. While not all sex offenders live in home environments described as sexualized, this may be a distinguishing feature for some families.

*Cognitive distortions and sexual attitudes.* Adolescent sex offenders often use cognitive distortions and stereotypical thinking regarding the acceptability of sexual aggression and sexual contact with young children (Becker, 1998; Segal & Stermac, 1990; Vizard et. al, 1995). Parental attitudes may contribute to the development of these cognitive distortions by condoning inappropriate sexual behaviours, engaging in open discussions about sex that is beyond the developmental level of the child, or by expressing inappropriate reactions to the child’s sexualized behaviours (Hall et al, 1998; Smith & Israel, 1987).

The other extreme, repressed sexual information and attitudes within the family, may also be problematic. The denial of sexual tension and the excessive repression through rigid or puritanical morals may act as a catalyst in heightening a child’s interest in sex and the development of sexually deviant behaviour (Bischof & Rosen, 1997; Monastersky & Smith, 1985; Smith & Israel, 1987). Other repressed sexual information may include family secrets, such as the presence of extramarital affairs, or the sexual victimization history of a parental figure. In one descriptive study of 25 sibling incest families, family secrets were predominant, in that 76% of the cases included the presence of extramarital affairs (Smith & Israel, 1987).
No one has extensively examined the sexual attitudes within the homes of adolescent sex offenders: thus, this is an area in need of further research.

*Availability of pornography.* Pornography has often been related to a sexualized home environment. Authors suggest that the availability of sexually explicit materials and the parental reactions to pornography differentiate sex offenders from nonoffenders (Marshall, 1989; Marshall & Eccles, 1993; Murrin & Laws, 1990). Ford and Linney (1995) found adolescent sex offenders reported more exposure to hardcore pornography and exposure at an earlier age than other adolescents who committed nonsexual crimes. In a retrospective study of adult offenders, sex offenders were more likely to have purchased pornographic materials during adolescence in comparison to nonsex offenders (Marshall, 1988). Nonoffenders tended to outgrow pornography during adolescence while it increased in importance to many sex offenders as they entered adulthood. It was also possible to differentiate between adult sex offender groups based on the role of pornography. Child molesters reported using pornography as a stimulus during the commission of an offense more frequently than did rapists (Murrin & Laws, 1990; Marshall, 1988). Compared to rapists, pedophiles were found to have more exposure to pornography and reported that pornography had a greater influence on their lives (Murrin & Laws, 1990).

The availability of pornography per se is not a necessary or sufficient condition for developing sexual aggression. However, a further exploration is warranted with respect to the extent to which the availability of pornography contributes to the creation of a sexualized home environment for adolescent sex offenders. No researcher has explored parental attitudes towards pornography or parental awareness of the use of pornography in the home by an adolescent. These factors may be important in understanding the contribution of pornography
in creating a sexualized climate in the home and/or if these features distinguish groups of adolescent sex offenders.

**Sexual victimization history of the offender and family members.** A commonly held myth is that all adolescent sex offenders were themselves victims of sexual abuse. While it is true that some adolescents have a sexual abuse history, it is important to note that most have not experienced sexual abuse and most victims do not become perpetrators (Becker, 1998; Weinrott, 1996). Given the major methodological issues in determining prevalence rates, findings vary significantly depending upon the source of the data and the offending group being studied. For example, Worling (1995b) identified eight studies examining disclosures of sexual victimization histories and found the rates were much higher when posttreatment file reviews were used in comparison to pretreatment interviews. Estimates from previous studies of sexual victimization histories within adolescent sex offender groups varied from 20 to 55 percent (Weinrott, 1996). It is estimated that one in four boys in the general population have been the recipient of sexually inappropriate behaviours prior to the age of eighteen (Gartner, 1999). Therefore, it is worthwhile to determine if sexual victimization histories of adolescent sex offenders vary across family groups.

Another interesting finding was the relationship between an adolescent's own sexual victimization history and the age and gender of his victim. In comparative studies, adolescents who offended against children were more likely to have been abused than those who offended against peers or those who committed nonsexual offenses (Awad & Sanders, 1991; Ford & Linney, 1995). There also seems to be a strong relationship between the gender of the offenders' own childhood perpetrator and the gender of their child victim; for example, if adolescent male sex offenders were abused by a male they tended to choose males as victims.
Worling (1995b) found that if a male adolescent sex offender ever selected a male child as a victim, they were much more likely to have been sexually victimized themselves in childhood. Therefore, it may be valuable to examine the nature of the relationship between the offender and his/her victims as a potential distinguishing feature in grouping families of adolescent sex offenders.

The sexual victimization histories of parents of adolescent sex offenders has also received attention in the literature. Mothers of sibling incest offenders were more likely than those mothers of nonsibling offenders to have a childhood history of sexual abuse (Kaplan et al., 1990). This may be related to the finding that in a group of mother-son dyads, the dissolution of parental boundaries, as seen in the mother's "seductive" interaction, was predictive in assessing a maternal history of incest (Sroufe, Jacobvitz, Mangelsdorf, De Angelo, & Ward, 1985). This is not to imply that a maternal history of sexual abuse results directly in a sexualized home environment or in an adolescent's sexual offense; rather it is an issue worthy of future investigation to clarify the nature of the link. The lack of information on fathers' sexual victimization history may be attributed to a variety of reasons such as a lower incidence rate, a lower disclosure rate, or a lack of involvement of fathers in the assessment and/or treatment of their sons. Regardless, an examination of both parental figures sexual victimization histories is important in determining how this may contribute to the creation of the sexual environment within the home.

Family Violence

Family violence refers to both witnessing and or experiencing physically aggressive behaviour by one family member towards another. A relationship between family violence
and adolescent sexual offending has been suggested (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Becker et al., 1993; O'Brien, 1991). One study used structural equation modeling to delineate the path between being physically abused by a father and an increase in sexual aggression by adolescent males (Kobayashi, Sales, Becker, Figueroa, & Kaplan, 1995). Although numerous methodological concerns were identified by Weinrott (1996), the authors of this study identified a potentially important connection between physical abuse and sexual offending by adolescent males. In another study, Knight and Prentky (1993) found physical abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect were associated with the early onset of sexual aggression. The literature is consistent in suggesting that heightened family violence may place an adolescent at risk of committing a sexual offense. However, the process or link between witnessing or being victimized to becoming an abuser has yet to be clarified.

More so than sexual victimization, being a victim of physical abuse may be a significant and influential factor in the development of sexual offending behaviour in adolescents. Some authors have reported a higher prevalence of physical abuse than sexual abuse in adolescent sex offenders (Becker et al., 1993; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Graves et al., 1996). In comparison to other juvenile delinquents, adolescent sex offenders have witnessed and/or experienced more family violence (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Bischof & Rosen, 1997). However, differences have also been noted within the adolescent sex offender population. For example, sibling incest offenders reported higher rates of physical abuse than nonsibling offenders (O'Brien, 1991; Worling, 1995a). Ford and Linney (1995) found that adolescents who offended against children reported significantly more family violence and experienced more physical abuse than other offending groups. Physical victimization may be a common experience for adolescent sex offenders; however it is not a universal characteristic.
Examining the level of violence within the family environment may highlight differences in families of adolescent sex offenders.

*Antisociality*

Antisociality in the family, in this study, refers to: excessive use of alcohol and nonprescription drugs, criminal and delinquent behaviours by family members and attitudes towards criminal activities expressed by parental figures. Authors have suggested a connection between antisociality within the family and deviant sexual behavior; however, the findings are inconclusive and inconsistent as highlighted below in a discussion of these three main features.

*Substance abuse.* Excessive use of alcohol and nonprescription drugs by both the adolescent offender and his/her parents has been examined as a factor contributing to the development of sexually abusive behaviour. Mixed results have been reported in the literature. In comparison studies with nonsexual offenders, adolescent sex offenders tended to have a lower rate of alcohol and drug use (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Oliver et al., 1993). However, within the adolescent sex offender population, a wide range of substance abuse has been reported. For example, Lightfoot and Barber (1993) identified thirteen studies examining the relationship between substance use and adolescent sexual offending and found discrepancies in the prevalence rates. Parental substance use may also be an important contributing factor to family antisociality. In one meta-analysis, the majority of fathers and a significant percentage of mothers of adolescent sex offenders reported excessive use of alcohol and drugs (Graves et al., 1996). Differences also noted were based on offense type. For example, parents of adolescents who offended against children abused alcohol more often
than those parents of adolescents who offended against peers. Over 50% of mothers of adolescents who offended against children and peers acknowledged abusing drugs. However, few studies used standardized screening measures, thus contributing to the unreliable estimates of the prevalence of substance use by adolescents and other family members (Becker, 1998; Weinrott, 1996). Data for fathers is also often lacking and this has affected the overall prevalence rates.

*Criminal and delinquent behaviours.* The delinquent and criminal behaviours by the adolescent sex offender and other family members, is another feature contributing to the antisocial behaviours exhibited in the home. These behaviours may be either sexual or nonsexual. In terms of delinquent sexual behaviours, researchers have found that some adolescent sex offenders had previously engaged in other sexually deviant behaviour such as peeping, stealing underwear, or making obscene phone calls (Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Ford & Linney, 1995; Longo, 1990; Veneziano, Veneziano, & LeGrand, 2000). There has not been a great emphasis placed on identifying prior sexual deviance in the literature, perhaps because it has only recently been seen as an important factor in the etiology of offending behavior, or possibly because the shame associated with these behaviours has contributed to lower reporting rates. Regardless, engaging in deviant sexual behaviours may contribute to the development of a sexualized home environment and thus should be examined further.

Mixed results have been found related to adolescent sex offenders' previous involvement in criminal activities and family criminality. Many adolescent sex offenders have had previous contact with the criminal justice system (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Miccio-Fonseca, 1996). However, it is important to stress that not all offenders have a criminal history. In comparison to other juvenile delinquents, Oliver et al. (1993)
found that adolescent sex offenders had less exposure to family criminality. However, in another study, families in one treatment facility differed significantly on involvement with the law, with the majority of offenders from one family group having had extensive previous contact with the legal system (Miccio-Fonseca, 1996). Empirical findings have been sparse concerning parental antisocial behaviours. When compared with other delinquent groups, adolescent sex offenders had fewer socially deviant parental role models (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Oliver et al., 1993). Few clinicians have noted parental criminal history as a potential precursor to adolescents sexually abusive behaviour (Hoghughi, 1997). The intent is not to blame the parents; however, identifying the previous criminal involvement of parental figures may provide valuable insight and understanding into antisocial behaviours exhibited in the home.

*Parental attitudes towards criminal activities.* Parental figures play a significant role in establishing the family values and attitudes towards criminal activities. In a subset of homes of adolescent sex offenders, there appeared to be little teaching of prosocial values and, in fact, antisocial behaviours may have been encouraged (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Kobayashi et al., 1995). Therefore, identifying evidence of the teaching of prosocial values, or the lack thereof, may be a distinguishing feature of families of adolescent sex offenders.

**Typologies**

Some authors have recognized the heterogeneity that exists within the adolescent sex offender population and have attempted to address these differences through the development of typologies (Butz & Spaccarelli, 1999; Knight & Prentky, 1993; Worling, in press). One widely accepted typology developed by O'Brien and Bera (1986), identified seven types of
offenders based on a variety of personal and family characteristics: Naive Experimenters, Undersocialized Child Exploiter, Pseudo-Socialized Child Exploiter, Sexual Aggressive, Sexual Compulsive, Disturbed Impulsive and Group-Influenced. A major limitation of this typology is that it has not been empirically validated.

In a more recent study, Langstrom, Grann, and Lindblad (in press) used fifteen offense related variables to identify five clusters. One group in particular did differ with respect to family background: experiencing parental divorce or separation. This group also displayed less criminal involvement and the lack of alcohol or drug use during the offense. This typology was distinctive in not using victim characteristics as a means of differentiating groups. However, the small sample size and the highly selective sample of offenders, that is, being court ordered for psychiatric assessments may have accounted for the lack of differences in background variables across the groups.

One additional study worth noting was the development of a typology of incestuous families based on a cluster analysis. Alexander and Schaefler (1994) identified three types of incestuous families based on the severity of the abuse and familial characteristics. While the study was predominately based on incestuous father-daughter relationships, only one family cluster resembled the typical father-dominated profile described by Herman (1981). The authors proposed that different family groups would be evident in sibling incest cases and a further examination of family variables such as family dynamics and parental deviance was suggested.

To date, no researchers have extensively examined the family environment of adolescent sex offenders. The purpose of this current study was to address this gap by
developing an empirically derived typology of family environments of adolescent sex offenders.

**Hypotheses: Developing a family typology of adolescent sex offenders.**

The goal of a cluster analysis is to classify the data according to its natural relationships and it is primarily used as an exploratory technique (Hair & Black, 2000). The emphasis is on finding the natural structure or groupings in the data rather than proving or disproving predetermined hypotheses. By classifying the data using a cluster analysis, it was expected that family environments of adolescent sex offenders would naturally form groups around the identified variables: family structure, family dynamics, sexual environment, family violence and antisociality. With the lack of empirical evidence, it was difficult to predict the exact number of family groups/clusters or how the variables would align within each cluster. However, based on the literature it was possible to suggest at least three potential family groups:

1. *It was predicted that there would be a group of adolescent sex offenders' families that exhibit similar characteristics to those seen in violent nonsexual adolescent offenders.* In comparison studies some adolescent sex offenders have been shown to have family characteristics that are similar to those of nonsexual offending adolescents (Bischof et al., 1995; Blaske et al., 1989; Oliver et al., 1993). Families of nonsexual adolescent offenders have been described as having previous contact with social service agencies, negative relationships between family members, unininvolved parents who provide little supervision and who demonstrate a lack of parenting skills, and a high prevalence of substance abuse, parental criminality, and aggressiveness (Hagell & Newburn, 1996; Loeber, 1990). As there are
adolescent sex offenders who also have committed nonsexual offenses, it is expected one family group of adolescent sex offenders will resemble the characteristics previously described in the families of nonsexual offending adolescents.

2. It was predicted that a group of families would resemble characteristics found in families in which sexual abuse occurred. Investigations of characteristics of families in which sexual abuse has occurred have been inconclusive and the resulting descriptions ranged from "chaotic" to "normal" (Kempe & Kempe, 1984). Despite the overall heterogeneity commonly reported, characteristics of incestuous families have included: a high degree of conflict, low level of cohesion, marital conflict, patriarchal family structure, and substance abuse (Alexander & Schaeffer, 1994; Dadds, Smith, Webber & Robinson, 1991; Herman, 1981).

Related specifically to adolescent sex offender families, characteristics of sibling incest offenders have been commonly reported. The sexualized climate in sibling incest families has been described as viewing sexual interactions between parental figures, extramarital affairs, inappropriate sleeping arrangements, and the sexualization of nonsexual behaviours (Hall et al., 1996; Sgroi & Bunk, 1982; Smith & Israel, 1987). Family dynamics in sibling incest homes have included inaccessible parents, parental rejection, poor supervision and, marital discord (Sgroi & Bunk, 1982, Smith & Israel, 1987; Worling, 1995a). Related to parenting, mothers of sibling incest offenders have reported a history of childhood sexual and physical abuse, a poor choice in surrogate caretakers, and an under reporting of their son's physical and sexual abuse (Kaplan et al., 1990; Worling, 1995a). It is therefore expected that a group of adolescent sex offender families will resemble characteristics commonly found in families in which sexual abuse has occurred.
3. It is predicted that a group of families of adolescent sex offenders in the current study would be coded as "healthy". In comparative studies, some adolescent sex offenders were described as having family characteristics that more closely resemble a normative sample (Bischof et al., 1992; Bischof et al., 1995; Blaske et al., 1989; Oliver, et al., 1993). Therefore, it is expected that a subset of adolescent sex offender families would appear normal with respect to the family characteristics being investigated.

Hypotheses: Validating the Family Typology of Adolescent Sex Offenders

Variables not used to form the family groups were subsequently used to validate the final cluster solution. To validate this typology, two groups of variables were chosen that would be expected to differentiate these distinct family clusters: offense-related characteristics and offender-related characteristics. Because of the unknown composition of family groups, and the lack of empirical data, the following predictions related more to specific family descriptors as opposed to overall family clusters and for some of the variables there are no specific predictions.

Offense Characteristics. A total of five offense related characteristics were used to validate the cluster solution; three victim characteristics (age, gender, and relationship to the perpetrator) and two offense specific characteristics (diversity of sexual acts and use of force). The offense-related predictions include:

1. It was predicted that adolescents who sexually offended against children would come from dysfunctional family systems in which the home environments could be described as highly sexualized and the adolescent offender may often not have lived at home at the time of the offense. Victim age was often examined in terms of the selection of a child versus a
peer aged or adult victim. Adolescents who offend against children have been found to be sexualized at an early age (Weinrott, 1996), experience a higher incidence of sexual abuse (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Elliott, 1994; Ford & Linney, 1995), and were reported as often living in foster families (Graves et al., 1996). Therefore, adolescents who offend against children may come from more dysfunctional homes than those adolescents who offend against peer or adults.

2. The prediction related to gender was that if a male adolescent targeted a male child it was likely he would have had sexual victimization history. The majority of victims of adolescent sex offenders are female and they are predominately younger children (Barbaree, Hudson & Seto, 1993; Veneziano et al., 2000; Weinrott, 1996). However, adolescent male sex offenders who have themselves been sexually victims, more often have chosen to offend against male children (O'Brien, 1991; Worling, 1995a).

3. It was predicted that if an adolescent male sex offender chose a sibling as a victim he would likely have come from a family environment similar to the previously described incest family. The relationship to the perpetrator has been examined primarily in terms of either offending within the home versus outside of the home or whether the offender knew the victim versus unknown. As previously described, there are common characteristics of family environments of adolescents who sexually offend within the family. No specific family characteristics have been identified related to those who offend outside of the family or solely against strangers. Therefore there is only one prediction related to relationship of the victim to the offender.

4. It was predicted that adolescents who committed sexual offenses characterized as diverse, involving noncontact, molestation, and acts of penetration were likely to come from
families in which sexual abuse has occurred. The diversity of sexual offenses has been described as a range of behaviours from exhibitionism to intercourse (Herman, 1992; Sgroi & Bunk, 1988). More recently, Burton (2000) has identified three categories depicting the diversity of sexual acts: noncontact acts (such as exposure, or forced to pose nude), contact acts (involving any acts of sexual touching), and acts of penetration (including oral, digital, and/or penile penetration, and/or being penetrated with objects). O'Brien (1991) found that adolescent offenders living in disturbed families in which sexual abuse had occurred committed more acts over an extended period and were more likely to have engaged in intercourse.

5. It was predicted that adolescents who used excessive force would commit more sexual offenses and come from violent family backgrounds. Family violence and, in particular, physical abuse, has been found to be related to an increase in sexual aggression (Knight & Prentky, 1993; Kobayashi et al., 1995). Excessive force is more likely to have occurred in sexual offenses against peer aged victims. These sexually aggressive youth have been found to come from abusive family backgrounds with a history of antisocial behaviours (O'Brien, 1991; Weinrott, 1996).

Offender Characteristics. Family groups were examined to determine if membership in a particular family group could predict specific characteristics of the offenders. Five offender characteristics were selected as they were expected to differ across the family groups: age of onset of conduct problems, age of first sexual aggression, prior sexual deviance, offender's own sexual victimization history, and style of emotional expression. The remaining hypotheses related to the offender include:
6. It was predicted that adolescent sex offenders identified at an early age as having conduct or behavioural problems by the educational or legal system would come from a family environment with multiple problems. An early age of onset of behavioural problems has been linked to later delinquency (Loeber, 1990; Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986; Lynam, 1996; Moffitt, 1993; Patterson & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984). Many adolescent sex offenders also have a history of nonsexual offenses (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Barbaree et al., 1993; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Ford & Linney, 1995; Hsu & Starzynski, 1990). These adolescents have been found to come from multiproblem families with a high incidence of marital discord and family violence (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Graves et al., 1996; Fehrenbach et al., 1986).

7. It was predicted that adolescents who previously engaged in deviant sexual acts were likely to have come from homes characterized as highly sexualized.

8. It was also predicted that those adolescents who reported to have been children with sexual behaviour problems were likely to have come from homes characterized as highly sexualized. Research is sparse related to when adolescent sex offenders first begin to commit sexual acts or engage in deviant sexual behaviour. In one study, Burton (2000) examined three groups of adolescent sex offenders in terms of levels of victimization and perpetration. Adolescents who began to offend sexually prior to age 12 and continued into their teens (continuous offenders) reported the highest levels of trauma and they engaged in more severe and complex patterns of sexual offending behavior than the other two groups. Some family environments of children with sexual behaviour problems have been described as highly sexualized (Burton, Nesmith, & Badten, 1997; Friedrich et al., 1990; Hall et al., 1998).
9. It was predicted that adolescent sex offenders who had been sexually victimized were more likely to have come from the most dysfunctional family environment. Sexual victimization histories of adolescent sex offenders have been examined extensively with mixed results depending upon the sample population and source of data. Although sexual victimization is a common experience for some adolescent sex offenders, not all offenders have experienced abuse. However, when sexual victimization histories have been reported, adolescent sex offenders have described their family environments as dysfunctional (Graves et al., 1996; Worling, 1995a).

10. It was predicted that adolescent sex offenders whose emotional expression could be characterized as extreme; for example, extremely overcontrolled or extremely impulsive, were more likely to have come from the most dysfunctional homes. Affective expression has been a characteristic examined in adolescent sex offender populations. Some adolescents have been described as emotionally overcontrolled, whereas others tend to be more impulsive and emotionally expressive (Becker, 1998, Becker & Hunter, 1997; Worling, in press). An adolescent's style of emotional expression was, therefore, predicted to differ with respect to family type.
Chapter 2

Method

Participants

The data for this study were obtained from the Sexual Abuse: Family Education and Treatment (SAFE-T) program at Thistletown Regional Centre in Toronto, Ontario. SAFE-T is a community-based program providing specialized assessment and treatment services to three groups of clients: children and families in which incest has occurred, children with sexual behaviour problems, and adolescent sex offenders and their families. In conjunction with Probation and Community Services, a joint project was undertaken beginning in 1987 to provide assessment and treatment of adolescent sex offenders. Currently, approximately one half of the cases serviced in the program are adolescent sex offenders and their families (Worting, 1998). As previously discussed, this study was based solely on adolescent male sex offenders.

The closed clinical records of 80 adolescent male sex offenders, aged 12 - 19 years, and their families admitted for assessment and or treatment to the SAFE-T program were used for this investigation. In order to ensure sufficient power for measuring the five family variables and to account for potential cases being excluded from the clustering process, 80 files were reviewed. In line with the admission requirements, clients were not admitted to the program if they were psychotic or below Borderline intellectual functioning. Files were randomly selected from a larger group of case files for offenders assessed between 1987 and 1999. These case files included adolescents and their families who had completed treatment,
those who participated in the assessment only, adolescents who dropped out of or refused treatment, and those adolescents who participated without family members. No identifying information was collected to ensure that confidentiality and anonymity was maintained. No file was selected in which the researcher had been directly involved in the assessment or treatment of the adolescent offender or his family. The clinical file contained information from a variety of sources including court reports, school reports, documents from other agencies, psychological assessments, intake and assessment reports, and clinical progress notes written by the therapists.

**Measures**

Based on the literature, a file-coding instrument was developed to collect data regarding the general background of the offender, specific details of the sexual offense and, information related to the five main family variables: family structure, family dynamics, sexual environment, family violence, and antisociality. A copy of the file-coding instrument is included in Appendix A. The file-coding instrument was piloted on two files not included in the data for this study. This assisted in finalizing the list of descriptors and anchor points on the rating scales for each of the variables.

For each of the five main family variables being examined, a list of descriptor variables was identified from the literature. The purpose was to identify a number of specific variables that would capture the breadth of behaviours and attitudes contained in the clinical file. In doing so, some of the variables encompassed similar features or were variations of a similar construct. For example, in assessing family dynamics the presence of negative relationships between family members was identified as well as a negative communication
style within the family. The information related to each of these descriptor variables was then
noted on the file-coding instrument in one of the four following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) no evidence</td>
<td>information in the file confirmed the lack of evidence to support the descriptor; for example, a report indicated the offender did not use alcohol or drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) some evidence</td>
<td>only a single reference or source for the descriptor was found; for example, only the offender admitted to engaging in prior deviant sexual behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) definite evidence</td>
<td>support for the descriptor was provided through more than one source; for example, the Pre Disposition court report, a report from the child protection agency, and the clinical interviews confirmed the physical abuse history of the offender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) missing</td>
<td>no information was cited in the file</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the files contained information that was collected over a period of time, several months to several years, it was possible that conflicting information existed. In cases where conflicting reports were contained in the file, the source and context of the reported information was considered and if the bulk of the evidence supported the descriptor variable it was noted as such.

Once all of the information in the clinical file was reviewed and recorded (see the Procedure section for details), it was possible to determine an overall rating for each of the family variables on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Based on the literature, a description was provided for three of the five anchor points on the likert type scale which captured the range of behaviours from 1 (extremely unproblematic) to 5 (extremely problematic). These descriptions then operationalized the family variable and contributed to ensuring the
reliability of the ranking. What follows is a description of each of the sections of the file coding instrument with the 5-point Likert scales highlighted.

**Background information.** Data were collected pertaining to the adolescent sex offender, the family members, the victim, and the offense. General information regarding the offender included year of birth, language, country of birth, education, conduct problems, age of first sexual aggression, and age at the identified offense. For each offense, the following information was collected: victim age, gender, relationship to the offender, use of force, duration, frequency, type of offense, time known to the victim, and the level of denial by the offender and parental figures. Also coded were locations and situations in which the offenses occurred as well as the total number of offenses, any prior sexual deviance, and bestiality. Where possible, previously developed scales were used for coding or specific categories were identified. A copy of the coding descriptions is also listed in Appendix A.

To validate the cluster solution, one standardized measure was used to assess the adolescent's affective expression. The Youth Self-Report (Achenbach, 1991) is a popular measure designed to identify adolescents' perceptions of their social competencies and behaviour problems. Two compilation scales were used to assess adolescents' emotional and behavioural problems. Internalizing scores included three scales: Withdrawn, Somatic Complaints, and Anxious / Depressed while externalizing referred to the Delinquent and Aggressive Behavior scales. The author reports reliability and validity within acceptable limits.
Family structure descriptor variables. There were thirteen specific descriptors related to family structure. The stability of the family structure was examined over time in addition to where the offender was living at the time of the offense. Variables included the number of children in the home, and their ages, gender, and relationship to the offender. Background information regarding age and occupation was collected, where possible, for all parental figures. A parental figure was considered as any adult living in the household who held power in decision-making and through his or her actions, words, or deeds, influenced the adolescent offender's view of himself or the world.

Changes in the family structure were examined by the number of parental figures, changes in parenting situations, number of residential moves, and changes in schools. Any temporary or permanent removals from the home were recorded if they involved a child protection service agency. A major separation from both parental figures was coded in cases where a child experienced a prolonged separation from both parents as a result of the death of a parent, adopted, or being cared for by extended family members. An overall rating of family stability was determined using a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (extremely stable) to 5 (extremely unstable), as shown in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extremely Stable</td>
<td>Somewhat Stable</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extremely Stable</td>
<td>Somewhat Stable</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Extremely Unstable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extremely Unstable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Overall rating of family structure.
Family dynamics descriptor variables. The interpersonal relationships occurring within the family were coded using 16 descriptor variables having either a relationship or a parenting dimension. The presence of negative relationships was identified based on how the offender or other family members described their relationships. An enmeshed relationship was coded if the parental figure depended upon the offender for emotional support, or where children consoled their parents, or a "special" relationship was described. Other variables involving a relationship dimension included parents relating to the offender as a peer, lack of extended family support, and blaming external sources for family difficulties. An overall negative communication style within the family overlapped and encompassed some other family dynamic descriptors, yet for some families, it was the only description provided.

Problematic parenting skills include: inconsistent discipline, lack of supervision, and an inability to control the offender's behaviour. Parentification was described as the offender taking on parental duties such as ongoing supervision and discipline of siblings in the parents' absence, bathing a younger sibling, or major household chores such as banking, grocery shopping, and doing the family laundry. Family loyalty was broadly defined as the family appearing guarded, attempting to be perceived in an overly positive light, or the presence of family secrets.

An overall rating of family dynamics was determined using a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (extremely stable) to 5 (extremely unstable), as shown in Figure 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Extremely Stable
   positive relationship with parental figures, no or minimal marital conflict,
   appropriate role definitions and boundaries, parents aware of and involved
   in child's life

3 Somewhat Stable
   some marital conflict, poor relationship with one parent, negative
   relationships between siblings, some inconsistency in parenting, some
   blurring of parental boundaries, some lack of supervision

5 Extremely Unstable
   negative relationship with one or both parental figures, enmeshed
   relationship between offender and mother, marital discord, inappropriate
   role definitions, inconsistent parenting and disciplining, lack of supervision

Figure 2. Overall rating of the family dynamics within the home.

Sexual environment descriptor variables. Two variables contributed to the sexual
environment in the home: sexual behaviours and sexual attitudes. In total there were 14
specific descriptor variables related to the sexual environment in the home. Although sexual
victimization history of the parental figures was noted, it was not considered in the overall
rating as it pertained to the parents' childhood experiences and not directly to the adolescent
sex offender's family. Ten descriptor variables related to the sexual behaviors in the home.
The adolescents' access to pornography or sexually explicit materials was coded as being
within the home versus outside the home as well as with and without parental awareness.
Exposure to sexual behaviours in the home included nudity, witnessing parents involved in
sexual activities, hearing parents engaged in sexual talk, sexualized interactions between
adults and children, and age inappropriate or provocative dress. The presence of extramarital
affairs was also assessed both at the time of and prior to the offence. Atypical sleeping
arrangements may well be confounded with socioeconomic status or cultural norms; however, the intent was to identify arrangements that may be deemed inappropriate in our society. Examples of atypical sleeping arrangements included adolescent sex offenders sleeping in the same room with much younger sisters, sleeping with their mothers, or always sleeping on the couch fully clothed, even though they had a bedroom.

An overall rating of sexual behaviours was determined using a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (extremely not sexualized) to 5 (extremely sexualized), as shown in Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Not Sexualized</td>
<td>Somewhat Sexualized</td>
<td>Extremely Sexualized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not Sexualized maintenance of age, gender and sexual boundaries, no aggressive sexuality or inappropriate expression of sexuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Somewhat Sexualized some lack of sexual boundaries, age-inappropriate dress/behaviours, offender access to pornography without parental awareness but within the home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Extremely Sexualized sexualized interaction style, permissive philosophy regarding exposure to sexual matters, eg. parent allows access to pornography, communication and behaviours appear through a 'sexual filter'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Overall rating of sexual behaviours within the home.

Four descriptors were identified as contributing to the overall rating of sexual attitudes. These involved restrictive discussions about sex, parental discomfort in discussing sexual topics, and punitive or negative attitudes regarding sexuality or the acceptance of homophobic comments. An overall rating of sexual behaviours was determined using a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (extremely not rigid) to 5 (extremely rigid), as shown in Figure 4.
1 Not Rigid
   openness or no silencing dialogue regarding sex and sexuality,
   no myths, accurate information,
3 Somewhat Rigid
   parental discomfort re sex, sexual issues not talked about, must
   be fully clothed at all times
5 Extremely Rigid
   talk about sex is forbidden, myths and misinformation,
   punishment for sexual talk, rigid attitudes and beliefs tied to religion

Figure 4. Overall rating of sexual attitudes within the home.

*Family violence descriptor variables.* There were 13 specific descriptor variables related to family violence. Dimensions of family violence were examined throughout the file. The presence of physical and emotional abuse both within the family and from an intergenerational perspective was examined. Again, the childhood victimization histories of parental figures were not considered when the overall rating was determined. Physical and verbal fighting between parents, harsh discipline, and physical fighting between siblings were noted as violent behaviours between family members. The offender's own violent behaviour both in and out of the family was also recorded. Even though neglect is not necessarily a descriptor of a violent behaviour, its presence in the family was noted. Involvement of a child protection agency for suspected abuse or removal for physical abuse provided an indication of the severity or visibility of the violence in the home. Finally, the availability or use of weapons for illegal purposes or intimidation in the home or by any family member was identified. An overall rating of family violence was then established using a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*extremely nonviolent*) to 5 (*extremely violent*), as shown in Figure 5.
Figure 5. Overall rating of nonsexual family violence in the home.

Antisociality descriptor variables. There were 15 specific descriptor variables related to antisociality within the family. Parental, sibling, and offender history of drug and alcohol use were examined based on information reported in the file. Previous involvement with the criminal justice system by any member of the family was also examined. Engaging in criminal activities where no charges occurred was identified separately. Families in which there was no teaching of prosocial values or behaviours may have included parental lack of concern over the offender’s assault charges, involvement in prostitution, or drug trafficking by a family member within the home. An encouragement of an antisocial lifestyle was indicated when a parental figure encouraged theft, alcohol or drug use, or other antisocial activities. An overall rating of the antisocial attitudes and behaviours in the family environment was identified using a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (extremely not antisocial) to 5 (extremely antisocial) as shown in Figure 6.
The procedures for this study involved the following: piloting the file coding sheet, collecting the data, rating the family variables, and recruiting and training the second rater.

**Piloting the file coding sheet.** During the initial stage of the study, two randomly selected clinical files were examined to pilot the coding instrument. In doing so, the anchor points on the overall rating scales of each of the family variables were operationalized and the list of descriptor variables finalized.

**Collecting the data.** Randomly, clinical files were requested from the Clinical Records Department at Thistletown Regional Centre. The primary investigator reviewed all information in the clinical file. The file contained information from a number of sources including intake information, psychometric measures, assessment reports, clinical notes, and collateral information from the courts, schools, and other social service agencies. Obtaining
information from a number of sources over an extended period was done to increase the accuracy and amount of disclosed information and decrease the reliance on single-time measures susceptible to socially desirable responding (Perry & Orchard, 1992; Weinrott, 1996).

*Rating the family variables.* The cumulative effect of reading all of the information contained in the file could result in extraneous material influencing the overall ratings of the five family factors. In addition, the content of the material contained in the file was, at times, disturbing to the reader. Specific to trauma work was the potential for vicarious traumatization, which has been described as the cumulative transformative effect upon the therapist as a result of the exposure to traumatic material (Pearlman & Saakvitne, 1995). In order to avoid being unduly influenced by extraneous material, the principal investigator tagged and photocopied only those pages with references to the five family variables contained in the clinical file and placed them in a separate case file. At a later date, once all files had been reviewed, the principal investigator re-read all eighty abbreviated case files, identifying the presence of the descriptor variables and determining an overall rating for each family variable.

*Recruiting and training the second rater.* The second rater was the psychometrist at the SAFE-T program. Two case files were used for training purposes and not included as part of the interrater reliability. Both raters read the abbreviated case files during the same time period. As the case file did not include detailed information on the offense or other extraneous information, the emotional impact was minimized. Interrater reliability was established on 25% of the sample, (ie. 20 of the 80 files).
Chapter 3

Results

More so than any other multivariate technique, cluster analysis is both an art and a science. The researcher's critical decisions in determining the cluster variate, selecting the similarity or distance measure, and the method used in forming the clusters all contribute significantly to the final cluster solution. This chapter reviews the interrater reliability results and follows the process used in identifying, interpreting, and validating the cluster analysis of families of adolescent sex offenders.

Interrater Reliability

To establish interrater reliability for the five family variables, a trained rater independently reviewed twenty randomly selected files. A review of the ratings every five or six files ensured consistency in the operational definitions of the descriptor variables and the criteria for the anchor points on the 5-point Likert scale. Because both raters were rating on the same scale, Cohen's Kappa was used as the measurement of agreement (Norusis, 1994). To be retained for the cluster analysis, family variables with Cohen's $K > .60$, were considered as having good reliability (Cicchetti & Sparrow, 1981; Langstrom, et al., in press). All family variables exceeded the cut off for reliability as shown in Table 1. Insufficient information was available in the file to provide a rating for sexual attitudes within the family for 7 of the 20 cases. Although sexual attitudes was included in Table 1, it was later dropped from the analysis.
Table 1

Interrater Reliability for Family Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Cohen's $K$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Dynamics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Behaviours</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Attitudes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Violence</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisociality</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cluster Analysis

As previously noted, cluster analysis is a multivariate technique used to derive natural groupings within a set of data. To provide information on specific subgroups within a population, a cluster analysis allows for a large amount of data to be objectively reduced. A staged approach, adopted from Hair and Black (2000), was used to analyse the data. At each stage, the caveats were addressed and the rationale for decisions were illuminated. The staged process addressed the following issues, critical assumptions, selection of the distance or similarity measure, selection of the clustering algorithm, interpretation of the cluster solution, descriptions of each cluster, differences in the family variables across the clusters, and validation of the cluster solution.

Critical assumptions: In cluster analysis, common requirements for other multivariate techniques such as homogeneity of variance, linearity, and normal distribution are not relevant. Rather, two important assumptions need to be addressed: scaling and
multicolinearity. Distance measures in cluster analysis can be influenced by the scale or magnitude of the variable and, as such, variables with larger units may dominate the analysis by having a greater effect than other variables with smaller units (Hair & Black, 2000; Rapkin & Luke, 1993). The desire in this study was to consider all five variables as equally weighted within the clusters. Standardization of the data was accomplished by having all variables rated on a 5-point Likert scale.

Highly correlated variables can implicitly outweigh one set of variables in the clustering procedures (Hair & Black, 2000). The variables in the cluster analysis were examined for multicolinearity as shown in Table 2. To compensate for correlations between the variables, two possible options are to either reduce the number of variables or use a distance measure that attenuates these compounding effects. The two suggested distance measures to select when multicolinearity exists are the Mahalanobis Distance or, if unavailable, the Squared Euclidean Distance (Hair & Black, 2000). The Squared Euclidean Distance measure was chosen because the Mahalanobis Distance measure was unavailable on the current version of SPSS.

In order for the case file to be used in the cluster analysis, data on all family variables were required. Of the 80 case files rated, seven did not have sufficient information to rate all five family variables and thus these files were excluded from the analysis. The sexual environment in the home contained two variables: sexual behaviour and sexual attitudes. Information related to sexual attitudes in the home was available for only 53 of the 80 cases. Therefore, maintaining the sexual attitude variable in the cluster analysis would have substantially reduced the overall number of cases and thus was subsequently excluded from
further analyses. There were 73 cases used in the cluster analysis to determine the family
typology of adolescent sex offenders.

Table 2

Multicolinearity of Family Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Family Structure</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family Dynamics</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sexual Behaviours</td>
<td>-.57*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sexual Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Family Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Antisociality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Kendall's Tau-b: correlation is significant at the .01 level

Selection of the distance or similarity measure. There are many methods for
calculating the distance between or the similarity among cases. Important in this study was the
similarity or proximity of observations to one another within the cluster groupings and the
magnitude of the value between the clusters. Common distance measures for interval data
were considered and the Squared Euclidean Distance measure was selected because of its
ability to compensate for correlations between the variables (Hair & Black, 2000; Rapkin &
Luke, 1993). The Squared Euclidean Distance measure was used in all subsequent analyses.
Selection of the clustering algorithm. There are two broad types of clustering methods: hierarchical and iterative. Hierarchical methods form clusters by either starting with all cases as separate and combining them in sequence (agglomerated) until all cases are one cluster or the opposite, by beginning with one undifferentiated group and locating natural breakpoints to separate (divide) the clusters until all are individual cases. The iterative method is used when the number of clusters and the initial center point of each cluster are known (Rapkin & Luke, 1993). Because the number of family clusters was unknown, the divisive method was deemed inappropriate. The agglomerative method was chosen to form the clusters because of the moderate sample size. The agglomerative hierarchical clustering method begins with each case as a separate cluster. Individual cases are grouped into clusters until all cases are members of a single cluster. Once a case is included, it cannot be split, but can only be combined with other clusters. The agglomerative schedule identifies which cases or clusters were combined at each stage and the coefficient listed on the schedule indicates the distance between the two most dissimilar points of the clusters being combined (Norusis, 1994).

The next step in the cluster analysis was to select the clustering algorithm or set of rules for deciding which cases or clusters are combined at each step. Among the various clustering algorithms, discrepant results may occur as they define clusters in different ways. For example, some are biased towards producing clusters with similar numbers of observations and some are affected by outliers (Hair & Black, 2000; Rapkin & Luke, 1993). Given the exploratory nature of clustering families of adolescent sex offenders, six common agglomerative algorithms were examined: Complete Linkage, Within-Group Linkage, Between-Group Linkage, Centroid method, Median method, and Ward's method. These methods were then subjected to the following procedures to determine the most appropriate
clustering algorithm for use in this study, including: (a) visual inspection of the inverse scree plot, (b) discriminant analysis, (c) number of cases within the clusters, (d) comparison of means, and (e) clinical appraisal. Because clusters are designed to maximize group differences, significant one-way ANOVA effects should exist on all profile variables (Rapkin & Luke, 1993).

An inverse scree plot, used in a similar fashion as in a factor analysis, can provide a visual inspection of the data in determining the number of clusters. Plotted on the graphs are the number of clusters against the linkage coefficient from the agglomeration schedule (Rapkin & Luke, 1993). The number of clusters is determined when the value between two successive steps makes a sudden jump (Hair & Black, 2000). For example, a large increase in the value of the distance measure from the agglomeration schedule between cluster numbers 5 and 6 would indicate a preference for a five cluster solution. The scree plots for the six different algorithms using the Squared Euclidean Distance measure are displayed in Appendix B. Two methods, Centroid and Median, were eliminated from the selection process based on a visual examination of the scree plots, as there were irregular increases and decreases in the plots. From the remaining four methods, the inflection of the plotted coefficients suggests either a four or five cluster solution.

Discriminant analyses were then performed on the four clustering techniques to assess optimal group membership based on both a four and five cluster solution. Both the Complete Linkage and Ward's method - using a five cluster solution - provided superior solutions, correctly classifying 97.2% and 98.6%, respectively.

These two potential five cluster solutions were then compared based on the number of cases in each group as well as the means and standard deviations for each of the five family
variables. The only difference between these two five cluster solutions was in how each of the methods clustered cases in family groups 1 and 3. Ward's method had 8 cases in group 1 and 22 cases in group 3 while the Complete Linkage method placed 13 in group 1 and 17 in group 3. Examining the means and standard deviations, all family variables in both groups 1 and 3 were either moderate or high indicating family problems. Family group 1 appeared to be a more extreme subset of group 3.

A clinical appraisal of the specific cases classified in groups 1 and 3 by both clustering methods found Ward's method more accurately classified the extreme cases (a rating of 4 or 5 on each family variable) into group 1. The Ward's method - using a five-cluster solution - was deemed the most appropriate clustering algorithm and thus used in all subsequent analyses.

As a final procedure in validating the Ward's method as the most appropriate cluster algorithm, one-way ANOVAs were computed for each of the five family variables. Significant differences between the five family clusters existed for all variables, all F's (4,N = 73) > 18.95, all p's < .001. The five distinct family groups were: Extremely Problematic, Structurally Unstable, Multi Problem, Healthy, and Problematic Parenting.

Interpretation of the family clusters. Tukey's honestly significant difference tests were performed on the five family clusters to determine how the groups differed with respect to the five specific family variables. The family group means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 3. A high rating was indicative of an unstable or problematic family variable and a low rating was considered stable or problem free. Significant differences were found between the groups on all five family variables.
Table 3

Family Variables Means, and Overall Rating by Family Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Structure</th>
<th>Group 1 Extremely Problematic (n=8)</th>
<th>Group 2 Structurally Unstable (n=21)</th>
<th>Group 3 Multi Problem (n=23)</th>
<th>Group 4 Healthy (n=11)</th>
<th>Group 5 Problematic Parenting (n=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.00&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.19&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.65&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.27&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.30&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Family Dynamics  | High                             | Moderate                            | High                      | Low                   | High                             |
| M                | 4.88<sub>a</sub>                 | 3.71<sub>b</sub>                     | 4.61<sub>a</sub>           | 2.27<sub>c</sub>      | 4.30<sub>a,b</sub>               |
| SD               | .35                              | 1.10                                 | .58                       | .79                   | .82                               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Behaviours</th>
<th>Extremely High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.00&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.10&lt;sub&gt;bd,e&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.52&lt;sub&gt;ce&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.55&lt;sub&gt;bd&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.80&lt;sub&gt;bd,ce&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Violence</th>
<th>Extremely High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.75&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.23&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.00&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.27&lt;sub&gt;d&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.00&lt;sub&gt;bd&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antisociality</th>
<th>Extremely High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.75&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.38&lt;sub&gt;be&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>3.09&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.45&lt;sub&gt;de&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.80&lt;sub&gt;bd,ce&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ratings were made on a 5-point scale from 1 (extremely not a problem) to 5 (extremely problematic). Means in the same row that do not share the same subscript differ at p < .05 in the Tukey honestly significant difference comparison.
What follows is a description of the family five family groups. The general description provides an overview of the specific problem areas related to each family variable. Detailed tables of all descriptor variables are listed under the next section, Differences in Family Variables Across the Clusters. In addition to the family group description one typical family case was provided. All names and identifying information were changed to ensure the confidentiality of the families. Colours were used as family names and offenders were given names beginning with the letter "J".

*Group 1 - Extremely Problematic*

There were eight family cases in Group 1 representing 11% of the sample. What made this group unique was the extent of the disruption experienced on all family variables, as evidenced by a high or extremely high rating. Therefore, this group was named Extremely Problematic. The following is a brief description of each of the family variables. Jason Green’s story is presented as representative of a typical Extremely Problematic family.

On family structure, Extremely Problematic families were significantly more unstable than Healthy or Problematic Parenting families. At the time of the offense, only 4 of the 8 offenders were living at home and only 1 was living with both natural parents. Half of the offenders had been temporarily removed from the home on at least one occasion by a child protection agency and 75% (6 out of 8) had experienced more than five parental figures. Again, significantly higher than the Healthy families and the Problematic Parenting families, the majority of Extremely Problematic families experienced negative family relationships. In 75% of these families (6 out of 8), parents were unable to control their son’s behaviour.
Offenders commonly experienced inconsistent parenting (8 out of 8), lack of parental supervision (7 out of 8), and were often placed in parentified roles (7 out of 8). All Extremely Problematic families reported a negative communication style within the family. Also interesting to note, 5 of 8 offenders indicated a negative relationship with their biological father and/or another parental figure.

Extremely Problematic families were found to exhibit severely sexualized behaviours within the home, making them significantly different from all other groups. Inappropriate sexual boundaries by the parents were evidenced in Extremely Problematic families as the offenders witnessed parents involved in sexual activities (7 out of 8), heard parents engaged in sexual talk or activities (7 out of 8), and were involved in a sexualized interaction with a parental figure (6 out of 8). Nudity in the home was prevalent in half of their families. Evidence was found to support the availability of pornography in the home and half of these offenders indicated it was with parental awareness.

Violence in the family environment was found to be extreme, again discriminating Extremely Problematic families from all other family groups. Physical fighting was prevalent between the parents and between the children in the home. Children were often harshly disciplined by both mother and father parental figures. Child protection agencies had been involved in suspected child abuse in the majority of families and 4 of 8 offenders were removed from the home due to physical abuse at some point in their lives. The offenders themselves exhibited violent behaviours and weapons were noted in half of the families.

Extremely Problematic families exhibited the most severe antisocial behaviours and again this feature differentiated them from all other groups. The main distinguishing features included mother's alcohol abuse (5 out of 8), father's drug abuse (4 out of 8) and alcohol abuse
(7 out of 8), no teaching of prosocial values and behaviours (8 out of 8), and an encouragement of an antisocial life style (5 out of 8). The majority of offenders were involved in criminal activities (7 out of 8) and had been at least charged with nonsexual offenses (6 out of 8). In half of the families, siblings also had a history of criminal charges or convictions.

Jason Green's Story

Jason Green was a twelve-year-old adolescent who sexually offended against his ten-year-old biological sister over an 18 month period. The offenses involved noncontact, molestation, and acts of penetration that occurred while he was left babysitting his younger siblings. Jason's biological parents' relationship ended when he was three. He had no further contact with his biological mother. Jason experienced many changes in parenting and residential moves with eight adults identified as parental figures. His father remarried and had a son, four years Jason's junior.

The interpersonal relationships were extremely unstable within the family. Although remaining loyal to his father, Jason described negative relationships with his stepmother and siblings. As Jason's stepmother was overwhelmed by the responsibility for caring for the three children, Jason was often left with many parental responsibilities including discipline and supervision of his younger siblings. His parents did not recognize Jason as a child. On one occasion while Jason was in care, his parents forgot his birthday and responded to Jason's distress by stating, "Well you forgot ours."

The lack of parental boundaries was also exhibited by the sexual behaviours experienced in the home. At age ten, Jason heard his step mother scream loudly and when he entered his parents room he found them engaged in sexual intercourse. Pornographic
magazines were available in the bathroom and his parents were aware he was watching their pornographic videos in his bedroom. Jason's sexual deviance began at an early age, admitting to making obscene phone calls. There was some indication that Jason and his sister had experienced inappropriate sexual touching when they were ages six and four, respectively.

A major factor resulting in the removal of the children from the home was the level of violence in the family environment. Both of Jason's parents were abusive, slapping each other, the children, and punching holes in the walls. Jason's father was charged and convicted for the physical abuse he committed against Jason's sister. Jason was also violent towards his siblings, especially his sister, and also in the community.

While Jason's antisocial behaviours did not include drugs and alcohol, he was charged with several nonsexual criminal offenses. Unlike Jason, his parents both had a history of alcohol abuse and his dad had a history of drug abuse and criminal charges. Jason's father had no respect for authority. There was no teaching of prosocial behaviours as evidenced in part by the nonreaction of his parents to Jason's criminal activities.

Group 2 - Structurally Unstable

Group 2 included 21 family cases, which represented 29% of the sample. It was distinguished from the other groups in that family structure was conspicuously problematic, while other variables were rated low to moderate. For this reason, Group 2 was named Structurally Unstable. The following is a brief description of each of the family variables. Jackson White's story was selected as representing Structurally Unstable families.

The unstable family structure is evidenced by the offenders having three or more parental figures (20 out of 21), experiencing a major separation from both biological parents
(11 out of 21), and being temporarily removed from the home by a child protection agency (11 out of 21). This family type experienced the highest number of permanent removals from the home by child protection services, 5 out of 21. However, most were living at home at the time of the offense.

Family dynamics were characterized as moderately unstable yet significantly less problematic than the Multi Problem families and significantly more than the families coded as Healthy. Over half of the families reported inconsistent parenting, lack of parental supervision, negative relationships between the offender and his siblings, and the parents' inability to control the offender's behaviour. Also noteworthy was that 48% of the families (10 out of 21), reported negative relationships between the offender and either their biological father or another parental figure.

Unlike the families with multiple problems, Structurally Unstable families would not be described as sexualized. Fewer than 30% of the families indicated evidence on any of the nine variables assessed.

A moderate degree of family violence was reported. In 65% of the families, 13 out of 21, evidence was found to support the use of harsh discipline by a father figure and 48% of the offenders were considered to have violent behaviour.

There was little evidence of antisocial behaviours within this family group, with the exception of the offenders themselves. Three-quarters of the offenders reported to have been previously involved in criminal activities yet less than half received charges or convictions for these non-sexual crimes. Fewer than half (9 out of 21) were found to be using alcohol.
Jackson White's Story

The White family typifies the experience of offenders living in families described as Structurally Unstable. Jackson White is a thirteen-year-old who sexually offended against his seven-year-old stepbrother. The offense involved anal penetration over 60 times during a three month period. Jackson experienced an extremely unstable family structure as evidenced by the following chronology of events. After Jackson's parents met, his mother became pregnant and she moved into her partner's parents' home. From the ages of one to three, the couple left Jackson with his grandparents while they moved out on their own. When the grandparents could no longer cope, Jackson was returned to the care of his parents experiencing many different babysitters and numerous temporary separations in the marital relationship. For seven years following his parents' final separation, Jackson went back and forth living with both parents until finally he remained with his mother. Jackson's mother then remarried and had a son in this new relationship. When difficulties arose between Jackson and his stepfather, he was sent to live with his biological father. Mr. White had since married a woman who had a son from a previous relationship. It is this young boy whom Jackson offended against sexually.

Jackson maintained a positive relationship with both his biological parents and formed a negative relationship with his stepparents. Jackson's desire and acting out behaviour in attempting to re-unite his parents may have been in part fueled by the friendship and dependency that was maintained between his parents. The common parental perception of the problem was Jackson's poor attitude and lack of respect. This was probably a reflection in the later years of Jackson's noncompliant behaviour and participation in a delinquent peer group, known to be skinheads.
There was no evidence to suggest any inappropriate sexual behaviours in the home environment. While sexual victimization was suspected, Jackson became infuriated at the allegation of abuse by his peer group, even though anal intercourse was known as a common skinhead initiation activity. There was also no evidence of any other violent or antisocial behaviours in the family.

**Group 3 - Multi Problem**

Representing 31% of the study sample, Group 3 contained the largest number of family cases, 23 out of a total of 73. Similar to, but not as severe as Extremely Problematic families, Group 3 families experienced many disruptions on all five family variables, receiving a moderate or high rating. Therefore the name, Multi Problem was fitting for Group 3 families. The following is a brief description of each of the family variables. John Brown's story represented a typical Multi Problem family.

Similar to Extremely Problematic and Structurally Unstable families, the Multi Problem group of families rated significantly higher on family structure than the other two family groups. Over 80% (18 out of 23) of these offenders had three or more parental figures. Temporary removal from the home was a common experience for offenders from Multi Problem families (15 out of 23). Over 70% of the offenders lived at home at the time of the offense.

The most common disruption in family dynamics was inconsistency in parenting experienced in 20 of the 23 families. Offenders from Multi Problem families often experienced negative relationships with all family members. Similar to Extremely Problematic, but again not as severe, evidence suggested the existence of many other
troublesome family dynamics in Multi Problem families. Unique to Multi Problem families was that a substantial number indicated parents related to the offender as a peer (14 out of 23).

Evidence suggested a moderate level of sexual behaviours in Multi Problem families. Access to pornographic materials was primarily within the home (5 out of 23) but without parental awareness (7 out of 23). In 10 families, evidence was found suggesting the presence of extramarital affairs. While not as severe as Extremely Problematic families, there was evidence that offenders in Multi Problem families also witnessed parents involved in sexual activities (9 out of 23), heard parents engaged in sexual discussions (5 out of 23), and experienced a sexualized interaction with an adult or parental figure (9 out of 23).

The level of family violence experienced in Multi Problem homes was high. Offenders experienced physical abuse in 91% of Multi Problem families (21 out of 23). Physical fighting between parents was also a common feature as seen in 16 of the 23 families. In over half of the Multi Problem families, a child protection agency was involved at some point due to suspected abuse. Sixty five percent of the offender's general behaviour (15 out of 23) was characterized as violent.

Alcohol abuse by a father figure and the offender's involvement in nonsexual criminal activities were the only striking features of violent and antisocial behaviours in Multi Problem families. Also interesting to note was the evidence to support the presence of a father's criminal history and the lack of teaching of prosocial values (8 out of 23 and 7 out of 23, respectively).
John Brown's Story

John Brown is an offender whose family is typical of those included in Multi Problem families. John, a 16 year-old, sexually offended against nineteen victims who were either peer aged females or children of both genders. The offenses spanned a six year period involving a diversity of sexual acts from noncontact to penetration.

At the time of the offense for which he was apprehended, John was living at home with his single mother and one other biological sister. He experienced many changes in parenting after his parents' separation at age seven and also experienced four major family moves to that point. Following that period, Mrs. Brown's common law partner moved in and out of the home and on two occasions she requested a temporary placement for John.

There was no evidence of the offender having a positive relationship with anyone in his family and he refused to consider his mother's common law partner as a parental figure. Little productive communication occurred within the family along with blurred boundaries. John described having to aggravate his mother to the point of physical contact in order to get her attention. Mrs. Brown described her "symbiotic relationship" with her son while also stating she could no longer control his behaviour.

There was evidence of a sexualized family environment in the Brown's home. Both John and his sister were sexually abused by their father. John's father was also caught having an affair with a neighbor. By age 10, John was engaging in deviant sexual behaviour making obscene phone calls and watching X-rated movies.

John grew up in a violent family environment. Mrs. Brown's excessive use of physical discipline and the resulting altercations between John and his mother caused the child
protection agency to become involved on numerous occasions. John and his sister witnessed both physical and verbal fights between Mr. and Mrs. Brown.

All parental figures in John's life had a history of drug and alcohol abuse. Mrs. Brown was hospitalized for a drug overdose when John was seven and her common law partner was trafficking drugs in their home. There was little in the way of teaching pro-social behaviours. John has a history of delinquent behaviours beginning with fire-setting at age three.

*Group 4 - Healthy*

There were 11 family cases in Group 4 representing 15% of the sample. Families in Group 4 are unique in many regards. They rated low or relatively problem free on all family variables and thus were named Healthy in comparison to other family groups. The following is a brief description of each of the family variables. Joshua Black's story was presented as representative of a typical Healthy family.

The family structure appeared stable with 91% of the offenders (10 out of 11) living at home at the time of the offense. In only one family had the offender experienced any of the following: more than five parental figures, a major separation from both parents, or a permanent removal from the home by a child protection agency. None of the Healthy families experienced a temporary removal from the home.

Healthy families experienced significantly fewer problems related to family dynamics than all other family groups. There was some evidence for inconsistent parenting (4 out of 11), parentification of the offender (3 out of 11), and a negative communication style within the home (5 out of 11).
There was no evidence of a sexualized family environment. These families may have adopted more rigid sexual attitudes than other family groups with half of the Healthy families (6 out of 11) identifying parental discomfort and restrictive discussions of sexual topics.

There was little evidence of any violence in Healthy families. Fewer than one third of the families experienced any physical fighting or harsh discipline. None of the offenders were considered to have general violent behaviours.

Likewise, there was no evidence of any antisocial behaviours in Healthy families. Only 3 of 11 offenders were involved in any nonsexual criminal activities and only two had a history of nonsexual charges or convictions.

Joshua Black's Story

The Black family was representative of families in the Healthy family cluster. Joshua Black was a 14 year old who sexually assaulted a peer aged female on his way home from school. It was a one-time occurrence.

Joshua lived with both biological parents and was the middle child in a sibline of three, with an older brother and a younger sister. The family moved on one occasion and there had never been any involvement with a child protection agency. Joshua had a positive relationship with both parents although he had difficulty with their high academic expectations. Joshua perceived an inconsistency in his parents' disciplining practices, stating they were more lenient towards his sister and his mother was much more lenient than his father.

All negative sexual behaviours and experiences were denied. While no one openly discussed sexual topics, Joshua stated that spontaneous discussions sometimes occurred when an issue arose.
Mr. Black's use of harsh discipline and one incident of expressing anger in public were the only evidence of any violence in the family. There was no suggestion of any antisocial behaviours in the family and teaching of prosocial attitudes were provided through an active involvement in the church community.

Group 5 - Problematic Parenting.

Representing 14% of the study sample, Group 5 contained 10 family cases. Similar to the Healthy families, Group 5 families received low ratings on most family variables with the exception of family dynamics. Following an examination of the specific descriptors for family dynamics the most notable area of dysfunction was related to parenting skills. Therefore Problematic Parenting was deemed an appropriate name for Group 5 families. The following is a brief description of each of the family variables. Jose Rouge's story represented a typical Problematic Parenting family.

Problematic Parenting families had the most stable family structure with the vast majority having two parental figures and all offenders lived at home at the time of the offense. There were no major separations or involvement by a child protection agency.

The main disruptions in family dynamics were inconsistency in parenting (9 out of 10), lack of parental supervision (8 out of 10), parentification or role reversals (9 out of 10), and a negative communication style within the family (9 out of 10). Approximately half of the offenders experienced negative relationships with their fathers, mothers and siblings.

Sexual behaviours were not problematic within the home. Only 4 of 10 offenders reported access to pornographic materials inside and/or outside the home but only one with parental awareness. Nudity in the home was found in 4 out of 10 families. Evidence was
found to support negative attitudes, fear or misinformation regarding sexual topics in half of
the Problematic Parenting families.

Significantly different from families with multiple problems, Problematic Parenting
families reported low levels of violence and antisocial behaviours in the home. Harsh
discipline by the father (6 out of 10) and a current or history of paternal alcohol abuse (5 out
of 10) were the main disruptions. Also interesting to note that the offenders themselves
acknowledged being involved in criminal activities, but did not receive charges or
convictions.

*Jose Rouge's Story*

The experience of Jose Rouge represents the profile of families of group 5. Jose was a
16 year old who stalked and violently raped, at knifepoint, an unknown adult woman. The
offense was a one-time occurrence.

The Rouge family reported few structure related problems. Jose lived with his mother
and two older siblings. Jose's father, while still part of the family, was living in another
country and continuing to support his family. There were four residential moves experienced
by Jose and no child protection agency had previously been involved with the Rouge family.

There was definite evidence of disturbances in the interpersonal relationships and
family dynamics within the Rouge home. While Jose reported no negative relationships
between any family members, his sister provided a much different perspective. Mrs. Rouge
constantly provided conflictual opinions to her children in an attempt to portray herself in an
overly positive light. The inconsistency in parenting was evidenced by Mrs. Rouge, at times
would grant Jose the privileges of the head of the household and at other times she would treat
him as a child.
In terms of sexual attitudes, the family was described as extremely rigid, reporting discomfort with the topic using punitive behaviours, as sex was considered shameful. Mrs. Rouge saw sex as her duty as a wife. As a result, all family members became closed and denied any sexual behaviours in the home. Mrs. Rouge reported that, occasionally, Jose would sleep with her if he needed comfort but that it was appropriate behaviour given their cultural background.

The only violent behaviour indicated from the family was the occasional use of harsh discipline by Mrs. Rouge. There was no evidence of any antisocial behaviours and Jose described his family as very strict.

*Differences in Family Variables Across the Clusters*

Given the nature of cluster analysis it would be expected to find significant differences between groups on the variables contributing to the cluster analysis (Hair & Black, 2000). A more thorough examination of the family variable descriptors revealed the specific differences among the groups. Frequencies, percentages, and significance levels were calculated for each of the descriptor variables contributing to the five main family variables. This was done strictly for descriptive purposes and for determining an appropriate label for each group. As there were a number of descriptor variables contributing to the overall rating on each family variable, it was worth noting those descriptors that differed significantly across the groups. Because of the number of chi square analyses and the increased likelihood of Type 1 errors, a significance level of .01 was established. To identify the relationship between the variables, the Cramer's V statistic (a generalization of phi) was used to compensate for low cell counts.
and because of the size of the table (Iverson & Gergen, 1997). For all tables, the raw data were recoded into dichotomous variables referring to the presence or absence of the descriptor from information obtained in the file. What follows is a summary of the differences in descriptor variables for each of the five family variables: family structure, family dynamics, sexual environment, family violence and anti-sociality.

*Family Structure.* Of the seven descriptors for family structure, only two did not differ significantly across the groups: location of the offender at the time of the offense and the offender being permanently removed from the home by a child protection agency. The five variables that did differ significantly across the groups were number of biological parents in the offender’s family at the time of the offense, number of parental figures throughout the offender’s lifetime, number of residential moves, major separations from both biological parents, and any temporary removals of the offender from the home by a child protection agency. The results of the family structure descriptor variables across the family clusters are listed in Table 4.

*Family Dynamics.* Seventeen descriptors were coded to determine the overall rating for family dynamics. Four variables achieved the required significance level: inconsistent parenting, lack of parental supervision, parentification of the offender, and a negative relationship between the offender and a nonbiological parental figure. It should be noted that a confounding issue for the latter is the presence of a nonbiological parental figure ie. Problematic Parenting families had no nonbiological parental figures. Also worth noting was the common occurrence and lack of variability across the groups with respect to marital conflict, enmeshed relationship between the offender and his mother and family loyalty, as all
were common experiences. The results of the family dynamics descriptor variables are listed in Table 5.

Table 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Structure Descriptor Variables Across Family Groups</th>
<th>n/ (%)</th>
<th>Cramer's V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extremely Problematic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Structurally Unstable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Multi Problem</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=8)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
<td>(n=23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Offender at home at time of the offense</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>16 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of Parental figures at time of Offense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both biological</td>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td>3 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one biological</td>
<td>3 (37)</td>
<td>11 (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no biological</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>7 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Parental figures during offender's lifetime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>1 (12)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4</td>
<td>1 (12)</td>
<td>12 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>8 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of Residential moves during offender's lifetime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>2 (33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>1 (17)</td>
<td>10 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>3 (50)</td>
<td>8 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Major separation from both biological parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (38)</td>
<td>11 (52)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Temporary removal from the home by a child protection agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>11 (52)</td>
<td>15 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Permanent removal from the home by a child protection agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td>5 (24)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 5:

*Family Dynamics Descriptor Variables Across Family Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Extremely Problematic (n=8)</th>
<th>Structurally Unstable (n=21)</th>
<th>Multi Problem (n=23)</th>
<th>Healthy (n=11)</th>
<th>Problematic Parenting (n=10)</th>
<th>Cramer's V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Negative relationship with biological mother</td>
<td>3 (38)</td>
<td>7 (33)</td>
<td>11 (48)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative relationship with biological father</td>
<td>5 (63)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
<td>16 (70)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>6 (60)</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Negative relationship with other parental figure</td>
<td>5 (63)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
<td>15 (65)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Marital conflict</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
<td>17 (80)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
<td>7 (64)</td>
<td>9 (90)</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Negative relationships between offender and siblings</td>
<td>3 (38)</td>
<td>11 (52)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enmeshed relationship with mother figure</td>
<td>5 (63)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
<td>16 (70)</td>
<td>5 (46)</td>
<td>6 (60)</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Enmeshed relationship with father figure</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Inconsistent parenting or disciplining practices</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
<td>16 (76)</td>
<td>20 (87)</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td>9 (90)</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of parental supervision</td>
<td>7 (88)</td>
<td>12 (57)</td>
<td>17 (74)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>8 (80)</td>
<td>.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parentification or role reversals</td>
<td>7 (88)</td>
<td>9 (43)</td>
<td>17 (74)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
<td>9 (90)</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Child acts as confidant to parental figure</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>3 (14)</td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Family Loyalty</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>14 (68)</td>
<td>16 (70)</td>
<td>7 (64)</td>
<td>9 (90)</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Lack of extended family support</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>2 (9)</td>
<td>5 (21)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Blaming external sources for family difficulties</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>4 (19)</td>
<td>10 (44)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Negative communication style in family</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
<td>16 (76)</td>
<td>19 (83)</td>
<td>5 (46)</td>
<td>9 (90)</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Parents unable to control offender's behaviour</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>13 (62)</td>
<td>14 (61)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Parents relate to the offender as a peer</td>
<td>3 (38)</td>
<td>6 (29)</td>
<td>14 (61)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01, ***p < .001
Sexual Environment. Four of the nine descriptors considered in the sexual environment of the family achieved significance: access to pornography without parental awareness, access to pornography with parental awareness, witnessing parents involved in sexual activities, and hearing parents engaged in sexual talk or activities. When rating the sexual environment in the home, the childhood sexual victimization histories of parental figures were not considered. The five variables that determined the overall rating of sexual attitudes within the family environment were also not included in these results because of insufficient data. The results of the sexual environment descriptor variables across the family clusters are listed in Table 6.

Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Behaviour Descriptor Variables Across Family Groups</th>
<th>Extremely Problematic (n=8)</th>
<th>Structurally Unstable (n=21)</th>
<th>Multi Problem (n=23)</th>
<th>Healthy Parenting (n=11)</th>
<th>Problematic Parenting (n=10)</th>
<th>Cramer's V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Access to pornography in the home, without parental awareness</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>4 (19)</td>
<td>15 (65)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Access to pornography in the home, with parental awareness</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>7 (30)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Access to pornography outside the home</td>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td>4 (19)</td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nudity in the home</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Witnessing parents involved in sexual activities</td>
<td>7 (88)</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
<td>9 (39)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hearing parents engaged in sex or having sexual discussions</td>
<td>7 (88)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5 (22)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>.66***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sexual interaction between parent and child</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>4 (19)</td>
<td>9 (39)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Parent involved in extramarital affair</td>
<td>3 (38)</td>
<td>6 (29)</td>
<td>10 (44)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Atypical sleeping arrangements</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>6 (29)</td>
<td>7 (30)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01, ***p < .001
Family Violence. Of the 13 descriptor variables contributing to the rating of violence in the family, all but four differed significantly across the groups. Parental victimization histories were not included in the overall ranking as this variable referred to any mother or father parental figures experience of physical violence in their family of origin. The results of the family violence descriptor variables across the family clusters are listed in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Violence Descriptor Variables Across Family Groups</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>Cramer's V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Problematic</td>
<td>(n=8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structurally Unstable</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Problem</td>
<td>(n=23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Parenting</td>
<td>(n=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic Parenting</td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Physical fighting between parents</td>
<td>7 (78)</td>
<td>5 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (70)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Verbal fighting between parents</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>6 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 (96)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (70)</td>
<td>.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical fighting between siblings</td>
<td>5 (63)</td>
<td>8 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Harsh physical discipline by mother figure</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>3 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (39)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Harsh physical discipline by father figure</td>
<td>7 (88)</td>
<td>13 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 (87)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (60)</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Offender caught fighting at school</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>5 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (39)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attitude condoning aggressive behaviour</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Emotional abuse by parents</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>5 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (61)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Child protection agency involved for suspected child abuse</td>
<td>5 (63)</td>
<td>5 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (61)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Child protection agency removal from home for physical abuse</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>3 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Offender's violent behaviour</td>
<td>5 (63)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 (65)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Neglect</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>9 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (30)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Weapons available in home</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01, ***p < .001
Antisociality. Contrary to family violence, only three descriptors contributing to the antisociality rating within the family achieved significance across the groups: offender’s criminal nonsexual activities, no teaching of prosocial values, and encouragement of an antisocial lifestyle. The results of the antisocial descriptor variables are listed in Table 8.

Table 8: Antisocial Descriptor Variables Across Family Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Extremely Problematic (n=8)</th>
<th>Structurally Unstable (n=21)</th>
<th>Multi Problem (n=23)</th>
<th>Healthy (n=11)</th>
<th>Problematic Parenting (n=10)</th>
<th>Cramer’s V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mother’s history of drug use</td>
<td>3 (38)</td>
<td>5 (24)</td>
<td>4 (17)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mother’s history of alcohol use</td>
<td>5 (63)</td>
<td>7 (33)</td>
<td>5 (22)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mother’s criminal charges or convictions</td>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Father’s history of drug use</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Father’s history of alcohol use</td>
<td>7 (86)</td>
<td>7 (33)</td>
<td>13 (57)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Father’s criminal charges or convictions</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>3 (14)</td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sibling’s drug use</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sibling’s alcohol use</td>
<td>3 (38)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sibling’s criminal charges or convictions</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>3 (14)</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Offender’s drug use</td>
<td>3 (38)</td>
<td>8 (38)</td>
<td>6 (26)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Offender’s alcohol use</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td>9 (43)</td>
<td>10 (44)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Offender’s involvement in criminal activities</td>
<td>7 (86)</td>
<td>16 (76)</td>
<td>18 (70)</td>
<td>3 (64)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Offender’s nonsexual charges or convictions</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
<td>12 (52)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Offender’s substance use at the time of the offense</td>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. No teaching of prosocial behaviours</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
<td>5 (24)</td>
<td>7 (30)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Antisocial lifestyle encouraged</td>
<td>5 (63)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (13)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **p < .01, ***p < .001
Validation of the Cluster Solution

After forming and describing the clusters, the final step was to validate the cluster solution. To validate the five cluster solution, characteristics not used to form the family groups were used to support and explain the established differences found between the family clusters. The emphasis was to identify characteristics that may differ significantly across the clusters, which may in turn predict cluster membership (Hair & Black, 2000). Offender and offense characteristics previously described were chosen from the literature because it was expected that these characteristics would vary across the family groups.

A number of statistical issues needed to be addressed to validate the cluster solution. Given the exploratory nature of using a cluster analysis to establish a family typology, a significance level of .05 was selected for characteristics to be considered as differing across the groups. Characteristics achieving this level of significance were then subjected to further follow-up analysis in an attempt to determine, more specifically, the nature of the differences. It was recognized that, with the number of chi square analysis, the probability of Type I error was high. However, the importance of identifying relevant variables for future investigations outweighed the inclusion of an erroneous variable. To address the issue of low cell count frequencies, characteristics were recoded into binary categories, for example, if ever chose a child victim versus never choosing a child victim. In addition, Cramer's V (a generalization of phi) was the statistic used to identify significant relationships, as it measures nominal by nominal variables in larger tables.

Offense characteristics. Five specific offense variables were used to validate the cluster solution: victim age, victim gender, relationship to perpetrator, level of violence, and diversity of sexual acts. All characteristics were recoded into the following binary variables:
victim age was recoded into "if ever a child victim versus only peers and adult victims", victim gender was recoded into "if ever a male victim versus only female victims", victim relationship was recoded into "if ever a sibling victim versus nonsibling victim", level of violence was recoded into "no violence versus the presence of at least some violence", and sexual diversity was recoded into "use of any one or two sexual acts versus involvement in all three acts: noncontact, molestation and penetration". With respect to victim relationship, groups were controlled for the presence of younger siblings in the home. Siblings included: biological, step, half, adoptive, foster and children in common law relationships. A summary of the results of the offense characteristics used to validate the cluster solution is presented in Table 9.

There was no significant relationship between family group membership and victim age, victim gender, and level of violence. Victim relationship and sexual diversity were then subjected to follow-up analyses. Controlling for the availability of younger siblings, there was a significant relationship between family group and victim relationship. Of those offenders who had siblings, over 70% of the offenders in Extremely Problematic, Multi Problem, and Problematic Parenting families, offended against a sibling. These groups, all with problematic dynamics, differed significantly in comparison to Structurally Unstable and Healthy families, which had stable family dynamics, $\chi^2(1, N = 49) = .38, p < .008$. There was a significant difference between family group and sexual diversity. Extremely Problematic and Multi Problem families, were significantly different and more often included all three sexual acts than the other three family groups, $\chi^2(1, N = 73) = .31, p < .008$. 
Table 9

Offense Characteristics by Family Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Extremely Problematic (n=8)</th>
<th>Structurally Unstable (n=21)</th>
<th>Multi Problem (n=23)</th>
<th>Healthy (n=11)</th>
<th>Problematic Parenting (n=10)</th>
<th>Cramer's V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim Age</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if ever a child)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Gender</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if ever a male)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Relationship</td>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>12/16</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if ever a sibling)</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Violence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(some violence)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(71)</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Diversity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all three acts)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05.

Offender characteristics. Five variables were selected to determine if offender characteristics would relate to family groupings: age of first sexual aggression, child onset of conduct problems, prior sexual deviance, offender's sexual victimization history and internalizing versus externalizing scores on the Youth Self-Report. The three dichotomous variables were subjected to a chi-square analysis and one-way ANOVA's were conducted for the two characteristics with continuous variables. A summary of the offender characteristics to validate the cluster solution was included in Table 10.
Table 10

Offender Characteristics by Family Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Extremely Problematic (n=8)</th>
<th>Structurally Unstable (n=21)</th>
<th>Multi Problem (n=23)</th>
<th>Healthy Parenting (n=11)</th>
<th>Problematic Parenting (n=10)</th>
<th>Cramer's V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Onset Conduct Problem</td>
<td>5 (63)</td>
<td>10 (48)</td>
<td>20 (87)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Sexual Deviance</td>
<td>7 (88)</td>
<td>11 (48)</td>
<td>15 (65)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>8 (80)</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders Sex Abuse History</td>
<td>8 (100)</td>
<td>14 (67)</td>
<td>19 (83)</td>
<td>2 (18)</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .01, **p < .001.

As highlighted in Table 10, significant relationships were found between family group and all three offender characteristics: child onset conduct problems, prior sexual deviance, and the offenders own sexual victimization history. Follow up analysis on child conduct problems before age 12 found groups with problematic dynamics (Extremely Problematic, Multi Problem and Problematic parenting) differed significantly from those with stable dynamics, (Structurally Unstable and Healthy), \(V(1, N = 72)= .32, p < .007\). With respect to prior sexual deviance, again families with problematic dynamics were significantly different from those with stable dynamics, \(V(1, N = 73)= .36, p < .002\). Further investigation of the offenders' sexual victimization history found groups with disruptions in family structure, (Extremely Problematic, Structurally Unstable, and Multi Problem) differed significantly from groups with stable family structures, (Healthy and Problematic Parenting) \(V(1, N = 73)= .48, p < .000\).
Results of the ANOVA revealed a significant relationship existing between family group membership and age of first sexual aggression $F(4,72) = 2.82, p < .03$. Adolescents from Extremely Problematic families first committed an aggressive sexual act at a much earlier age ($M = 11.38; SD = 3.29$) than adolescents in Healthy families ($M = 14.64; SD = 1.75$).

For the final offender characteristic, the groups were compared using the internalizing and externalizing scores on the Youth Self-Report. The results of the ANOVA confirmed a significant relationship existed between family group membership and Internalizing and Externalizing coping methods. On the Internalizing scores, adolescents from Extremely Problematic families scored significantly higher than adolescents from Healthy and Problematic Parenting families $F(1,68) = 4.4, p < .003$. With regards to Externalizing adolescents from families with multiple problems (Extremely Problematic and Multi Problem), scored significantly higher than adolescents from Healthy and Problematic Parenting families $F(4,68) = 8.0, p < .001$.

**Parental Characteristics.** A decision was made not to use the physical and sexual victimization histories of the parental figures in determining the overall family violence and sexual environment ratings in the cluster solution, as they occurred long before the formation of the offenders' family environment. Therefore, these variables could be used to validate the cluster solution. Evidence in the literature supports these variables as potentially discriminating factors (Kaplan et al., 1990; Kobayashi et al., 1995; Smith & Israel, 1987). A summary of the results was included in Table 11.
### Table 11

**Parental Childhood Victimization History by Family Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Extemely Problematic (n=8)</th>
<th>Structurally Unstable (n=21)</th>
<th>Multi Problem (n=23)</th>
<th>Healthy Parenting (n=10)</th>
<th>Cramer's V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Victimization History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother figure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Victimization History</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother figure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Figure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.***p < .001*

There was no significant relationship between family group and a father figure's sexual or physical victimization history. It is important to note that only four fathers reported a sexual victimization history, and this may be low due to the lack of involvement of fathers or the low level of reporting. The sexual and physical childhood victimization histories of mothers of adolescent sex offenders were significantly related to membership in a family group. Follow-up analysis suggested that mothers of adolescents in families with multiple problems (Extremely Problematic and Multi Problem), were significantly more likely to have been sexually and or physically abused as children than mothers of adolescents in the other three family groups $V(1, N=73)= .52 p < .001$ and $V(1, N=73)= .43 p < .001$, respectively.
Chapter 4

Discussion

The families of adolescent sex offenders were grouped into five distinct family clusters: Extremely Problematic, Structurally Unstable, Multi Problem, Healthy, and Problematic Parenting. These family clusters were then validated by examining characteristics not used to form the family groups. The distinctive family groups found in this investigation confirm the heterogeneity of families of adolescent sex offenders. Not all offenders come from dysfunctional families and the nature of the dysfunction varies across the family groups. This chapter addresses the confirmation of the hypotheses in two sections: the development of the typology and the validation of the family groups. In the first section, a theoretical understanding of each family group is discussed along with treatment implications. The final section addresses the strengths and limitations of the current study and directions for further research.

Typology of Families of Adolescent Sex Offenders

In general, three family types were predicted based on the literature: one similar to violent nonsexual adolescent offenders, one similar to families in which incest had occurred, and one more closely resembling a normative sample. The hypotheses were, in part, supported by the findings in this current study. The multiple problem dimension found in families of violent nonsexual offenders was evident but not specific to one family group. Similarly, the
sexualized environment described by families in which sexual abuse had occurred was also a finding but again not specific to a particular family type. The results did support the later hypothesis of a family group coded as "healthy", relative to other adolescent sex offenders' families. What follows in a discussion of each family group.

**Group 1 - Extremely Problematic**

Extremely Problematic families were characterized by the severe disruptions on all five family variables as indicated by a high or extremely high rating. It is possible to view Extremely Problematic families as an extreme subset of families with multiple problems; however, there were distinct features making them worthwhile to be considered as a separate family type. Similar findings were reported by Alexander and Schaeffer (1994) in which the most conflicted family environments characterized a smaller subset of incestuous families. Children in Extremely Problematic families experienced the most severe physical punishment by both parents. They also experienced significantly more traumatic sexual abuse, involving more perpetrators, earlier onset, greater duration, and more intrusive acts.

No single theory has been empirically tested to explain the etiology of sexual offending behaviours (Becker, 1998; Burton et al., 1997; Hoghughi, 1997). Bandura's social-learning model has been used by some researchers to understand the pervasive influence of the family that contributed to adolescent problem behaviour (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1996; Moffit, 1993; Patterson, 1982). When sexual offending is regarded as a variant of deviant behaviour, the social learning model may explain, in part, how family interactions and behaviours contribute to sexually abusive behaviours by adolescents (Burton, 2000; Burton et al., 1997; Lewis, Shankok, & Pincus, 1979, Marshall, Hudson & Hodkinson, 1993). For example, inadequate parenting may provide models for inappropriate sexual or violent
behaviours, which then may be learned and acted out by adolescents, explaining, in part, their offending behaviours.

Children growing up in witnessing or experiencing violence and abuse learn that this behaviour can be used towards others (Hoghughi, 1997). The relationship is not a causal one as many individuals who grow up in abusive environments do not go on to abuse others. In a similar vein, Gelles (1997) proposed an exchange/social-control theory of intimate family violence stating family members hit and abuse other members because they can. In such families, there is an absence of social controls; for example, values, attitudes, and behaviours that would discourage members from these violent acts. While the exchange theory may be useful for explaining why some men who assume positions of power as the head of a family choose to abuse women and children, it can also be applied to adolescents who are forced to assume parental responsibilities. Some authors have noted that the incidence of sexual offending behaviour was high when adolescents were given parental responsibilities in babysitting and other child care duties (Becker, 1997; Bischof & Rosen, 1997). Three of the family groups (Extremely Problematic, Multi Problem and Problematic Parenting) had a significant number of offenders who assumed parenting responsibilities for their siblings and lacked supervision from their parents. Perhaps, for some families, placing an unwilling teen in a supervisory role with younger siblings increased the risk for the abuse of power and the potential for sexual abuse to occur.

In addition, evidence in the current investigation suggested the lack of teaching of prosocial values, the encouragement of an antisocial lifestyle, and the highly sexualized family environment were features contributing to the uniqueness of Extremely Problematic families. Awad & Saunders (1991) reported a similar subset of adolescent sex offenders who came
from families previously involved with the criminal justice system and who had parents or stepparents who condoned or encouraged antisocial behaviours.

Early exposure to sexual activities and inappropriate sexual learning experiences within the family have been noted as influencing the psychosexual development of adolescent sex offenders (Longo, 1990). A highly sexualized home environment was characteristic of all Extremely Problematic families. Specifically contributing to the sexualized environment were: witnessing or hearing sexual activity, family nudity, and the use of pornography with parental awareness. In addition, all offenders from Extremely Problematic families reported a sexual victimization history and 7 out of the 8 offenders identified themselves as being previously involved in deviant sexual behaviours. While victimization histories and prior sexual deviance were not unique to Extremely Problematic families, it was pervasive. All offenders from Extremely Problematic families sexually abused a child with the majority involving a male sibling, and their offenses included the greatest diversity of sexual acts. Therefore, Extremely Problematic families may require specialized treatment relating to the sexualized aspect of family functioning.

With the severity and magnitude of family problems, offenders from Extremely Problematic families may require a specialized long term treatment program. Multisystemic Treatment (MST) has been identified as an effective treatment modality for adolescent sex offenders (Borduin, Henggeler, Blaske & Stein, 1990; Henggeler, Melton & Smith, 1992; Huey, Henggeler, Brondino, & Pickrel, 2000). Based on Bronfenbrenner's (1986) social-ecological model of development, MST, is contextual and it addresses the dysfunctional systems and processes related to the specific offending behaviour of a particular adolescent (Huey et al., 2000). For example, if the family system is ineffective, the treatment would
focus on the particular dysfunction within the family, such as increasing family cohesion, encouraging parents to take a more active role in parenting, or developing conflict-resolution skills. A potential barrier is that MST is an individualized home based treatment program that would require considerable resources, not to mention the assumption that the adolescent sex offender is at home. If family members from Extremely Problematic families were to commit to treatment, there would be a number of specific areas that would require a specialized treatment focus; for example, the sexualized environment, the high level of violence, and the antisocial attitudes and behaviours. Although for some adolescents, a safe and structured environment may be more appropriate to address damage caused by the multitude of family problems.

**Group 2 - Structurally Unstable**

As the family name suggest, Structurally Unstable families are distinctive in the specific disfunction related to family structure. In children, family structure has been identified as one of the factors contributing to sexual offending behaviour (Hall et al., 1998; Pithers, Gray, Buscone, & Houchens, 1998). Changes in the physical structure of the family have been noted as contributing to dysfunctional family systems found in families of adolescent sex offenders (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Becker et al., 1993; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Vizard et al., 1995). One possible explanation for the sexual offending behaviour of adolescents from Structurally Unstable families could be that these physical disruptions contributed to the development of poor attachments of adolescents to their parents, thus placing them at a higher risk to sexually offend (Goodrow & Lim, 1998; Marshall, et al., 1993).
According to Bowlby (1980), the attachment bond developed between the child and the caregiver acts as a template for the child that forms future relationships. James (1994) referred to attachment as a reciprocal, enduring emotional and physical affiliation between a child and a caregiver. From this perspective, disturbances in attachment can be viewed as either a disruption in the physical relationship or an ongoing lack of an emotional relationship between the child and caregiver. The current investigation supports these findings, which are most evident in families with multiple problems and the distinct feature of Structurally Unstable families. Offenders in Structurally Unstable families experienced more permanent removals and major separations from their parents than any other family group.

Poor attachments can lead to difficulties with intimacy, producing painful feelings of loneliness and possibly aggressive behaviour. To attempt to satisfy their desire for intimacy and love, these adolescents may choose compliant females who are not likely to reject their sexual advances and may be easily overpowered (Marshall et al., 1993). In this current study, 70% of adolescents from Structurally Unstable families chose female child victims and used at least some level of violence. Perhaps, these physical changes in family structure, over the lifetime of the offenders, may have caused difficulties forming intimate relationships, and the resultant disruptions in attachment may have contributed to the sexual offending behaviour of adolescents from Structurally Unstable families.

Treatment implications for offenders in Structurally Unstable families may require a specific family focus particular to this group. The primary therapeutic emphasis in work with these families would be to address the disruption in the structure. For example, it may mean finding a consistent placement with consistent caregivers, or encouraging the parents to provide one stable home environment for the duration of treatment. Difficult issues may need
to be addressed to resolve the impact of multiple caregivers and extra support for all family members may be helpful. Other family areas such as sexual or antisocial behaviours may not need to be addressed at all in treatment as these may not be problem areas for Structurally Unstable families.

.Groups 3 - Multi Problem

Multi Problem families share similar characteristics to those described in families of adolescents involved in nonsexual delinquent behaviour. Specifically, the common multiproblem dimensions included lack of supervision and inconsistent parenting, family instability related to changes in family structure, harsh physical discipline, and alcohol abuse. Combining the two family groups with multiple problems, Extremely Problematic and Multi Problem, these two groups represent approximately 40% of this study sample, and this supports previous findings that many adolescents come from chaotic family background similar to delinquent samples (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Becker, 1998; Bischof et al., 1995; Blaske, et al., 1989; Oliver et al., 1993; Ryan & Lane, 1997). A significant number of offenders in Multi Problem families have also participated in other criminal activities and have received charges or convictions for nonsexual offenses, another finding which makes them similar to violent, nonsexual offenders (Awad & Sauder, 1991; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Miccio-Fonseca, 1996).

As with Extremely Problematic families, Bandura's social-learning theory may be used to explain, in part, the sexually offending behaviour of adolescents in Multi Problem families. The modeling of inappropriate, violent, sexual, and antisocial behaviours within the
family may have created an environment that placed an adolescent at risk to learn and engage in sexually abusive behaviours.

The treatment implications for Multi Problem families may also be similar to those suggested for Extremely Problematic families. As there may be many disruptions in the family functioning, a comprehensive assessment and treatment plan would assist to initially identify and address the most problematic areas.

*Group 4 - Healthy*

The group most difficult to explain was the family group labeled Healthy. These families did not indicate any significant problematic behaviours within the family on any of the five identified family variables. Bischof & Rosen (1997) proposed an ecological perspective for understanding adolescent sexual offending that considers a number of variables and the interaction between the adolescent and his/her environment. Family was but one of the critical influences identified in the etiology of sexual offending behaviour. Perhaps it was the interrelationship among peers, school, community and societal contexts that were more influential in the offending behaviour of adolescents from Healthy families.

Alternatively, there may be other family factors not adequately addressed in the current study that also contributed to sexually offending behaviour, such as sexual repression or punitive attitudes towards sexuality. Researchers have noted the lack of sex education, the denial of sexual tensions, punitive attitudes, and unclear or mixed messages regarding sexuality that may influence an adolescent's sexual identity and may contribute to offending behaviour (Bischof & Rosen, 1997; Kaplan et al., 1990; Monastersky & Smith, 1985; Sefarbi, 1990; Stith & Bischof, 1996).
Somewhat related may be the level of repression or denial within the family when disclosing information or acknowledging the sexual offending behaviour. Self-disclosure may be lower in families with closed communication patterns (Stith & Bischof, 1996). The repression or denial of information related to the family may reflect a need to protect members by maintaining the homeostasis of the family dynamics or preserving the social image (Stevenson, Castillo, & Seefari, 1990). Perhaps in some families the need to be perceived positively to preserve their social image may have contributed to the repression of information related to any family dysfunction. However, it is unlikely such a family system could be maintained throughout a rigorous assessment and treatment process.

Healthy families may not require an extensive family component in the treatment of the adolescent sex offender. Of course, involving the family to support the adolescent in treatment would be beneficial. However, attempting to have them address family issues that are not problematic may lead to frustration and possibly discontinued involvement in the treatment program. Therapists may have difficulty working with Healthy families as many authors have identified a dysfunctional family as characteristic of all adolescent sex offenders. Changing this frame of reference and not continuing to suspect the family is in denial may not be an easy transition for some clinicians.

**Group 5 - Problematic Parenting**

In the current investigation, Problematic Parenting families were identifiable by their disruptions in interpersonal relationships, receiving a high rating on family dynamics in comparison to other family variables. Similar to Structurally Unstable families, understanding the family environment of Problematic Parenting families may be most meaningful from an attachment perspective.
Some parent-child rearing practices have been found to contribute to avoidant and anxious-ambivalent attachment styles (Loeber & Stouthammer-Loeber, 1986). These authors have identified specific predictors of juvenile delinquency as including parental conflict, poor supervision and lack of affection by mothers, all of which were particularly common in Problematic Parenting families. Also similar to juvenile delinquents many adolescent sex offenders have a history of nonsexual crimes (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Miccio-Fonseca, 1996). In this current study, 90% (9 out of 10) adolescents from Problematic Parenting families revealed involvement in criminal activities yet only one had received charges or convictions and the family environments were not characterized as violent. Perhaps, similar to juvenile delinquents, inadequate parenting may have contributed to disruptions in attachments thus, contributing to sexual and nonsexual delinquent activities.

A connection has also been suggested between insecure attachments and deviant sexual behaviour (Goodrow & Lim, 1998; Marshall et al., 1993; Pithers et al., 1998; Stith & Bischof, 1996). The lack of positive communication in the family, particularly between fathers and adolescent sex offenders, has been related to sexually aggressive behaviours (Kobayashi et al., 1995; O'Brien, 1991; Ryan & Lane, 1997; Stith & Bischof, 1996). Marshall et al (1993) suggest insecurely attached adolescent sex offenders may have had poor templates upon which to model intimate relationships, resulting in low self-esteem, social isolation and limited skills to establish close relationships. With the onset of puberty and increased sex drive, these adolescents may have difficulty meeting their social and sexual needs through relationships with peer aged females. They may instead turn to self-stimulation using masturbatory fantasies that are affectionless with compliant females or they may engage in sexual activities by forcing women or choosing young female victims. Interestingly,
adolescent sex offenders from Problematic Parenting families admitted to engaging in sexually deviant behaviours prior to their offences (8 out of 10), and using pornography both inside and outside the home (4 out of 10). The majority of these adolescents offended against children (7 out of 10), did not choose a male (6 out of 10), and used some level of violence (6 out of 10). Perhaps this unique feature of Problematic Parenting families, the disruptions in interpersonal relationships and family dynamics, may have resulted in disruption in attachments and as such, provides one explanation contributing to the sexual offending behaviour of adolescents from these families.

The implications for treatment would relate to the disruption in this particular aspect of family functioning. Family therapy may be beneficial to address problematic interpersonal relationships among family members. Social learning principles may be useful to design treatment strategies helping parents more effectively monitor, discipline, and communicate to their children (Huey, et al., 2000). Couple therapy may also be helpful in ensuring consistency in care taking responsibilities and parenting decisions. Problematic Parenting families were found to be stable in terms of structure and had few problems with violent or antisocial behaviours. These issues would therefore not be the focus of therapy.

Validation of the Family Clusters

Offense characteristics. It was proposed that membership in a family cluster would differentiate groups of adolescent sex offenders based on the following five offense related characteristics: victim age, victim gender, relationship to the perpetrator, level of family violence, and diversity of sexual acts. Generally, the predictions related to offense characteristics were not supported by the findings in the present investigation. The current
emphasis of understanding adolescent sexual offending behaviour based solely on victim characteristics has fallen short of explaining the heterogeneity that exists within this population and some researchers have begun to question this practice (Hsu & Starzynski, 1990; Worling, in press). Victim characteristics of age and gender were not indicative of membership in a particular family group as predicted. For example, a sexualized home environment was not a consistent finding for adolescents who sexually abused children or only males.

The relationship between the adolescent offender and the victim was supported as a distinguishing feature of family groups but not in the way it was predicted. Rather than a sexualized family environment being the dominant feature of sibling incest cases, a disruption in family dynamics was the common characteristic. It is possible that inappropriate role definitions, lack of supervision, inconsistent parenting, and ineffectual communication may help to create a climate in which the adolescent behaviour goes unchecked and abuses of power occur, not only because they can, but also because there may be no clear boundaries or appropriate models from which to model behaviour.

An examination of the two variables related to the offense led to mixed results. Contrary to the prediction, offenders from Healthy families (which reported the least amount of family violence) used more violence in the commission of their offenses. Level of violence was not, however, significantly different among all family types.

Offenders in families who had multiple problems (Extremely Problematic and Multi Problem) were more likely to engage in the greatest range of sexually abusive behaviours involving noncontact, molestation, and acts of penetration. As predicted, these are some of the same families in which there was the greatest incidence of sibling incest. However, a high
incidence of sibling incest was found in Problematic Parenting families, and offenders from these families did not engage in all three acts. Perhaps it was the multiplicity of problems that created a chaotic environment in which the opportunity existed to engage in sexually abusive behaviour and, over time, the progression to more intrusive acts.

**Offender characteristics.** Many of the hypotheses related to characteristics of the offender were generally supported and these characteristics were found to differ across family groups. What was most interesting was the combination of family groups that was predictive of a particular offender characteristic. For example, although a highly sexualized environment was predicted to differentiate groups of offenders, other variables such as family dynamics or family structure were the common features that differentiated families of adolescent sex offenders. Predictions were related to the following five offender characteristics: child onset conduct problems, age of first sexual aggression, prior deviant sexual behaviour, sexual victimization history and expression of affect.

Similar to the findings of Awad & Saunders (1991), the child onset conduct problems was evident in adolescent sex offenders who came from chaotic environments with inappropriate role models. As predicted, early onset of behaviour problems was noted in families with multiple problems; however, the common feature was problematic family dynamics. Three of the five family groups, Extremely Problematic, Multi Problem and Problematic Parenting had adolescent offenders who reported early onset of conduct problems. Perhaps in these families, boundaries were unclear, and roles defining appropriate behaviour in relationships were not adequately modeled; thus allowing for inappropriate or aggressive behaviour to go unchecked. However caution needs to be exercised as many
children with behaviour problems do not engage in this type of behaviour and other etiologies for conduct problems have been identified. In addition, the definition of conduct problems included evidence of a range of behaviours as opposed to a clinical diagnosis. However, child conduct problems may be a reflection of parenting difficulties, and early intervention may possibly correct this behaviour.

The age of the offender's first sexual aggression was found to be a distinguishing feature. Adolescents from Extremely Problematic families were much younger than adolescents from Healthy families when they first committed a sexually aggressive act. Adolescents from Extremely Problematic families also experienced a highly sexualized family environment, which may explain in part the early exhibition of problematic sexual behaviours. Only recently have researchers extensively examined children with sexual behaviour problems and based on one retrospective study, there may have been adolescents who acted out sexually and were not identified (Burton, 2000). What we know about adolescent sex offenders has directed what therapists ask and work with in assessment and treatment. Some therapists, particularly in older case files, may not have asked about inappropriate childhood sexual behaviours to ascertain when the offending behaviours began or only identified these behaviours when they were obvious, as in highly sexualized homes.

As anticipated, adolescent sex offenders who had engaged in deviant sexual behaviours prior to being identified as a sex offender were from families with more problematic sexual behaviours evident within the home. However, the main distinguishing feature of these families was problematic family dynamics as found in Extremely Problematic, Multi Problem and Problematic Parenting families. Similar to Longo's (1990) findings, early involvement in deviant sexual activities or inappropriate sexual relations with
older partners negatively impacts the psychosexual development of some adolescent sex offenders. Exposure to pornography and inappropriate sexual behaviours of parental figures may account for some of the prior sexual deviance of offenders in these families. However, it may have also been the lack of supervision and inappropriate modeling of interpersonal relationships that provided the opportunity and acceptance for adolescents to engage in deviant sexual behaviour prior to being identified as an adolescent sex offender.

Researchers have examined the sexual victimization histories of adolescent sex offenders, and some have attempted to view the sexual offending behaviour as a re-enactment of the offenders' own sexual victimization (Longo, 1990; Veneziano et al., 2000). Many offenders were not victims of sexual abuse so other explanations are needed. In the current study, offenders' sexual victimization history was more prevalent in 3 of the 5 family groups, Extremely Problematic, Structurally Unstable and Multi Problem. These three family groups all shared changes in family structure and a high level of violence in the home. From an attachment perspective, adolescents who experienced many moves or changes in parenting may have had difficulty forming relationships. Possibly this lack of emotional and physical connection may have resulted in these adolescents being more vulnerable to seek and receive attention, sexualized or not, and from older individuals, related or not.

And finally, as predicted, those adolescents who came from the most dysfunctional homes experienced extremes in affect regulation. Those with high scores on either the Internalizing or Externalizing scales of the Youth Self-Report tend to report high scores on the other scale as well. Adolescent sex offenders in Extremely Problematic families had the highest scores on both scales, with their internalizing scores significantly higher than the scores in all other groups. These findings illustrate that offenders from multi-problem families
experience significantly more emotional problems (Somatic Complaints, Withdrawal, Depression and Anxiety) and significantly more behavioural problems (Delinquent and Aggressive Behaviours) than adolescents in other family groups.

Although not a hypothesis, the present investigation as in the literature suggest a maternal sexual or physical abuse victimization history may be a distinguishing feature of groups of adolescent sex offenders (Becker et al., 1986; O'Brien, 1991; Worling, 1995a). Families with multiple problems (Extremely Problematic and Multi Problem) had the highest incidence of maternal physical and sexual victimization histories. However, the other three family groups reported victimization histories less than what is accepted as prevalence rates in the general population i.e. one in three women have experienced unwanted or inappropriate sexual behaviour by the age of 18 (Finkelhor, 1986; Herman, 1992). In the Healthy families, none of the mothers reported a childhood sexual victimization history and only one mother reported a childhood physical victimization history. In Structurally Unstable and Problematic Parenting families, two mothers in each family group reported sexual and physical victimization histories. These findings suggest the need for specific treatment that differs across family groups. Mothers of adolescent male sex offenders from families with multiple problems had a higher incidence of maternal childhood victimization, and may require additional assistance in resolving issues related to their own childhood trauma.

Strengths and Limitations of the Current Study

Relative to the existing literature, there were a number of strengths in this current investigation. The number of sources of data, the corroboration of historical information, and the review of information over an extended period of time, addresses the limitations
previously noted by researchers (Becker, 1998; Bischof et al., 1995; Weinrott, 1996; Worling, 1995a). In addition, identifying information in the files related to the family variables and then rating these abbreviated case files at a later date, assisted both the researcher and the second rater to rate the same family information and minimized the impact of traumatic material. This ultimately resulted in good interrater reliability. Another strength was the operationalization of specific family variables, such as a sexualized family environment. The established reliability for each of the five family variable rating scales adds clarity to our understanding of the family environments of adolescent sex offenders.

There are three main limitations of this study. First, a cluster analysis is a heuristic device and is useful only to the degree that the results can be replicated in future studies. Developing a typology using a relatively small sample requires replication before these results can be accepted as having clinical relevance. Second, in retrospective studies, the results are contingent upon the availability of the data in the file. Our knowledge about adolescent sex offenders and their families has developed substantially over the years. Because information reviewed in this study was collected up to ten years ago, it may be biased based on the information collected. The lack of evidence for some variables may have resulted from either not asking about or not recording certain information. For example, exploring the issue of pornography with parental awareness, family nudity, witnessing sexual activities, bestiality, and sexual attitudes within the family are but a few of the descriptors that have only recently received more attention in the field. The third limitation pertains to the number of chi-square tests performed and the likelihood of Type I error. However, given the exploratory nature of developing a family typology, the inclusion of an extraneous variable is acceptable given the need to replicate the differences between the family environments of adolescent sex offenders.
Conclusion

Empirical research on family environments of adolescent sex offenders has been lacking. In this study, a typology of family environments of adolescent sex offenders was identified, consisting of the following five distinct family groups: Extremely Problematic, Structurally Unstable, Multi Problem, Healthy and Problematic Parenting. These five family groups support the heterogeneity of families of adolescent sex offenders, as not all adolescent sex offenders come from chaotic, dysfunctional families. Understanding the specific dysfunction within the family may provide a specific direction for the family component of an overall treatment program for adolescent sex offenders. Not all families of adolescent sex offenders are the same, and treatment programs may be more effective if they are designed to address the specific family dysfunction.
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## Appendix A: File Coding Sheet

### Discriminating Groups of Adolescent Sex Offenders

**Through an Examination of Specific Family Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File:</th>
<th>SAFE-T ID #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date coded:</th>
<th>Coded By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Offender Demographic Information

**Year of Birth:**

**Parents first language:**

1. English
2. French
3. Spanish
4. Italian/Portuguese
5. Russian
6. Chinese
7. Punjab (East Indian)
8. Twi (African)
9. Native Indian

**Parents country of birth:**

1. Canada
2. United States
3. Caribbean
4. South American
5. Africa
6. Europe
7. Eastern Europe
8. India/Middle East
9. Pacific Rim

#### Education:

**Grade (at time of index offense):**

**Code:**

- Identified for special education: yes __ no __ not officially ___ uncertain __
- If yes, age identified ___ grade ___
- Conduct / school problems: before age 12 ___ after age 12 ___ no ___
- Number of Schools attended 1 2 3 4 5 other ___

#### Offense Information

**Offenders Age:**

**at time of first sexual aggression/offense:**

**year:**

**at identified offense:**

**year:**

**at last identified perpetration:**

**year:**

#### Victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age(s)</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>offender age(s)</th>
<th>level of violence (code)</th>
<th>duration (code)</th>
<th>frequency (code)</th>
<th>Relationship to victim</th>
<th>Time known to victim</th>
<th>Type of offense</th>
<th>Total number of victims</th>
<th>Prior sexual deviance (code)</th>
<th>Bestiality (1=yes, 2=no)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Denial

(code: denial of any interaction, that interaction was sexual or interaction was an offense)

- by offender __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
- by mother __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
- by father __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __
- by other parent __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __

#### Location(s):

1. victim's home, 2. offenders home, 3. residential placement, 4. outside home, 5. school, 6. multiple locations

#### Situation(s):

1. babysitting, 2. family friends-visiting, 3. playing in neighborhood, 4. playing at school, 5. with friends, 6. on own in community, 7. multiple situations
### Structure Within the Family

**Overall Rating of Family Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Stable</td>
<td>Somewhat Stable</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Extremely Unstable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Extremely Stable**
   - Somewhat related problems, living with both biological parents, no separations or changes in parenting, few or no family moves

2. **Somewhat Stable**
   - occasional instability and disruption, large family, some changes in parenting, blended families, single parent with frequent partners

3. **Extremely Unstable**
   - instability, many relocations, single parent with many transient mates, many changes in parenting, permanent removal of child from home

**Descriptors:**

Offenders' family structure at time of offense:

- both natural parents
- single mom
- single dad
- mom & step dad
- mom & CLP
- dad & step mom
- dad & CLP
- relative
- guardian
- Other (explain)

Parents demographic information:

- bio-mother
- bio-father

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Birth Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of parental figures for the offender up to the identified offense:  
Changes in parenting: 1 2 3 4 5 6 other

Number of residential moves up to the time of the index offense:

Temporary removal of the offender from the home: yes (##)  no

Permanent removal of the offender from the home: yes  no

Major separation from parents: offenders age  length of separation

### Siblings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Relationship to Offender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Step Half Foster Adopted Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continue on back if necessary)

Place in sibline: of

Number of siblings at home at time of offense: (list #’s)
Interpersonal Relationships and Family Dynamics

Overall Rating of the Family Dynamics within the home

1, 2, 3, 4, 5
extremely stable
somewhat stable
extremely unstable

1 Extremely Stable
positive relationship with parental figures, no or minimal marital conflict,
appropriate role definitions and boundaries, parents aware of and involved in child's
life

3 Somewhat Stable
some marital conflict, poor relationship with one parent, negative relationships
between siblings, some inconsistency in parenting, some blurring of parental
boundaries, some lack of supervision

5 Extremely Unstable
negative relationship with one or both parental figures, enmeshed relationship
between offender and mother, marital discord, inappropriate role definitions,
inconsistent parenting and disciplining, lack of supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>No Evidence</th>
<th>Some Evidence</th>
<th>Definite Evidence</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negative relationship with bi-mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative relationship with bio-father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative relationship with other parental figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marital conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative relationship between offender and siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enmeshed relationship between offender and mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enmeshed relationship between offender and father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inconsistent parenting / disciplining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of parental supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parentification of the child / role reversals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child acts as a confidante to parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total lack of extended family support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blaming external sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative communication style within family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unable to control offenders behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents relate to offender as peer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

File: ___________________________
ID: ___________________________
Coded by: _______________________
Date: _________________________
Input on: _______________________
The Sexual Environment in the Home

Overall Rating of Sexual Behaviors within the family environment

1 2 3 4 5
1 Not Sexualized
   - maintenance of age, gender and sexual boundaries, no aggressive sexuality or inappropriate expression of sexuality
3 Somewhat Sexualized
   - some lack of sexual boundaries, age-inappropriate dress/behaviors, offender access to pornography without parental awareness but within the home
5 Extremely Sexualized
   - Sexualized interaction style, permissive philosophy regarding exposure to sexual matters, eg. parent allows access to pornography, communication and behaviors appear through a 'sexual filter'

Overall Rating of Sexual Attitudes within the family environment

1 2 3 4 5
1 Not Rigid
   - openness or no silencing dialogue regarding sex and sexuality, no myths, accurate information
3 Somewhat Rigid
   - parental discomfort re sex, sexual issues not talked about, must be fully clothed at all times
5 Extremely Rigid
   - talk about sex is forbidden, myths and misinformation, punishment for sexual talk, rigid attitudes and beliefs tied to religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>No Evidence</th>
<th>Some Evidence</th>
<th>Definite Evidence</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sexual victimization history of any mother figure</td>
<td>se1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual perpetration history of any mother figure</td>
<td>se2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual victimization history of any father figure</td>
<td>se3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual perpetration history of any father figure</td>
<td>se4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual victimization history of offender</td>
<td>se5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual victimization history of sibling(s)</td>
<td>se6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual perpetration history of sibling(s)</td>
<td>se7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to pornography in home without parental awareness</td>
<td>se8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to pornography with parental awareness</td>
<td>se9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to porn outside the home, without awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nudity in the home</td>
<td>se10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>witnessing parents involved in sexual activities</td>
<td>se11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hearing parents engaged in sexual talk or activities</td>
<td>se12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexualized interaction between adults and child</td>
<td>se13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extramarital affairs</td>
<td>se14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age inappropriate or provocative dress</td>
<td>se15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atypical sleeping arrangements</td>
<td>se16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restrictive discussion, parental discomfort re sex</td>
<td>se17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative attitudes, fear, misinformation re sex</td>
<td>se18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punitive attitude towards sex discussion or behaviors</td>
<td>se19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homophobic attitudes</td>
<td>se20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Violence in the Family Environment

Overall Rating of Non Sexual Family Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Extremely Non-Violent</td>
<td>Somewhat Violent</td>
<td>Extremely Violent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>no evidence or history of violence in family, attitude condoning anti violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Somewhat Violent</td>
<td>harsh physical discipline, verbal fights between parents, physical fighting between siblings, emotional abuse, CAS suspected child abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Extremely Violent</td>
<td>violent interaction style, use of weapons, physical perpetration history of parents, physically abusive to children, CAS involvement, spousal abuse, attitude condoning violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>No Evidence</th>
<th>Some Evidence</th>
<th>Definite Evidence</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>physical victimization history of mother in family</td>
<td>fV1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical victimization history of father in family</td>
<td>fV2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical victimization history of offender in family</td>
<td>fV3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical victimization history of siblings in family</td>
<td>fV4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical fighting between parents</td>
<td>fV5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal fighting between parents</td>
<td>fV6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical fighting between siblings</td>
<td>fV7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harsh physical discipline by mother</td>
<td>fV8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harsh physical discipline by father</td>
<td>fV9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offender caught fighting at school</td>
<td>fV10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude of condoning aggressive behavior</td>
<td>fV11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional abuse by parents</td>
<td>fV12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS involvement for suspected child abuse</td>
<td>fV13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS removal of child from home for physical abuse</td>
<td>fV14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offenders violent behavior</td>
<td>fV15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neglect</td>
<td>fV16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>availability or use of weapons in the home</td>
<td>fV17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

File: ___________________________  ID: ___________________________
Coded by: ___________________________  Date: ___________________________
Input on: ___________________________
Antisocial Attitudes and Behaviors in the Family

Overall Rating of the Antisocial Activity within the family environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Not Antisocial</td>
<td>Somewhat Antisocial</td>
<td>Extremely Antisocial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Extremely Not Antisocial
   No current or previous problems with alcohol or drug use, no criminal convictions, no alcohol or drug problems in family history

3. Somewhat Antisocial
   One parent has a problem with drugs or alcohol, parents have no criminal charges, offender only has history of non sexual offenses, may have family history of drug or alcohol problems

5. Extremely Antisocial
   Current drug and alcohol problems in the family, criminal history of parents, negative attitudes towards police, encouraging an antisocial lifestyle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>No Evidence</th>
<th>Some Evidence</th>
<th>Definite Evidence</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mothers current or history of drug abuse</td>
<td>af1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mothers current or history of alcohol abuse</td>
<td>af2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mothers criminal history (charges or convictions)</td>
<td>af3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fathers current or history of drug abuse</td>
<td>af4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fathers current or history of alcohol abuse</td>
<td>af5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fathers criminal history (charges / convictions)</td>
<td>af6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sibling's drug use</td>
<td>af7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sibling's alcohol use</td>
<td>af8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sibling's criminal history (charges / convictions)</td>
<td>af9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offender's drug use</td>
<td>af10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offender's alcohol use</td>
<td>af11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offenders criminal activities</td>
<td>af11a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offender's criminal non sexual charges or convictions</td>
<td>af12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offender's use of substances at the time of the offense</td>
<td>af13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no teaching of pro-social attitudes/behaviors</td>
<td>af14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouragement of antisocial lifestyle</td>
<td>af15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

File: ____________________________   ID: ____________________________
Coded by: ____________________________   Date: ____________________________
Input on: ____________________________
An Empirically Derived Typology of Families of Adolescent Male Sex Offenders

**Codes**

**Level of Violence (Safe-T)**
1 = coaxing, convincing  
2 = pushing, slight grabbing, swearing  
3 = slapping, grabbing, holding, threats of violence  
4 = punching, kicking, beating, death threats  
5 = weapon, extreme beating, tying up

**Relationship to victim**
1 = sibling, biological  
2 = sibling, step  
3 = sibling, half  
4 = sibling, adoptive  
5 = sibling, foster  
6 = relative  
7 = friend of family  
8 = friend/peer  
9 = acquaintance  
10 = stranger  
11 = CLP's children  
12 = animal (family pet)

**Duration**
1 = 1 day  
2 = 1 - 3 weeks  
3 = 1 - 11 months  
4 = 1 - 2 years  
5 = more than 2 years

**Frequency**
1 = 1 time only  
2 = 2 - 4 times  
3 = 5 - 14 times  
4 = 15 - 30 times  
5 = more than 30 times

**Time known to victim**
1 = at offense  
2 = 1 - 6 months  
3 = 6 - 12 months  
4 = 1 - 2 years  
5 = 2 - 5 years  
6 = 6 - 10 years  
7 = all victims life

**Type of offense (Burton, 2000)**
1 = non contact (peeping, voyeurism, exhibitionism, stealing underwear)  
2 = molestation (over or under clothes, above or below waist)  
3 = non contact and molestation  
4 = penetration (oral, anal, vaginal, insertion of objects)  
5 = non contact and penetration  
6 = molestation and penetration  
7 = all three acts (non contact, molestation and penetration)

**Prior sexual deviance**
1 = yes (any non contact offense, obscene phone calls, masturbating with women's underwear, or other inappropriate sexual interactions)  
2 = no

**Denial by offender (denial of any interaction, denial interaction was sexual, denial interaction was an offense) (Barbaree, 1993)**
1 = no denial  
2 = initially when offense identified  
3 = pre / post trial (intake, prior to SAFE-T)  
4 = assessment at SAFE-T  
5 = treatment  
6 = termination

**Denial by mother, father or non-biological parent (denial of any interaction, denial interaction was sexual, denial interaction was an offense)**
1 = no denial  
2 = denial changed over time  
3 = continual denial
Appendix B: Scree Plots of Clustering Algorithms

Figure B-1. Wards Method using Squared Euclidean Distance measure

Figure B-2. Between Groups method using Squared Euclidean Distance measure
Figure B-3. Complete Linkage method (furthest neighbor) using Squared Euclidean Distance measure

Figure B-4. Within Group method using Squared Euclidean Distance measure
Figure B-5. Median method using Squared Euclidean Distance measure

Figure B-6. Centroid method using Squared Euclidean Distance measure