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Abstract

Adolescent Sex Offender: A Comparison Study of Adolescents Who Commit Only Sexual Offenses and Adolescents Who Commit Both Sexual and Nonsexual Offenses.

by

Norma Sockett-DiMarco

Master Of Arts Degree 2001
Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

The purpose of this study was to determine if adolescent sex offenders who commit both sexual and nonsexual offenses are a distinct subgroup from those adolescent sex offenders who commit only sexual offenses. A sample of 60 adolescent sex offenders were identified and grouped based on prior recorded charges. The sex offender plus group \((n = 33)\) had sexual and nonsexual charges, and the sex offender only group \((n = 27)\) had been charged with sexual offenses only. The groups were compared on interpersonal, familial, and intrapersonal characteristics. The sex offender plus group was significantly more delinquent, aggressive, and antisocial than the sex offender only group. The sex offender only group was more likely to have sexually assaulted children. The results are discussed in terms of the importance of distinguishing between the two groups with respect to treatment needs.
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Introduction

Overview

Society views sexual offenses committed by adolescents more seriously now than in the past. Previously, adolescent sexual offending behaviour was perceived as normal teenage experimentation motivated by curiosity rather than abnormal criminal conduct (Bischof, Stith, & Whitney, 1995; Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Mathews, 1987), and consequently, the problem was either minimized or denied (Bischof et al., 1995). This, perhaps, was reflected in the perception that few adolescents were responsible for serious sexual offenses (Becker & Abel, 1982). Fortunately, in the last ten years, research on adolescent sexual offending has brought about a more accurate depiction of the incidence and severity of this problem.

Although the incidence of adolescent sexual assault varies by the type and source of data collected, various crime reports indicate that adolescents are responsible for a considerable percentage of sex crimes (Fagan & Wexler, 1988). In Canada, the number of juveniles charged with sexual offenses increased by 66% between 1988 and 1993, and by 1997, 18% of accused sex offenders were between the ages of 12 and 17 (Statistics Canada, March, 1999). In 1998, 8% of adolescent males charged with a violent crime committed a sexual assault (Statistics Canada, December, 1999). American crime statistics report that adolescent males committed more than one fifth of all forcible rapes (Barnard, Robbins, Newman, & Hutchinson, 1985), one fourth of other sex crimes (Boyd, Hagan & Cho, 2000) and 30% to 50% of all child molestations (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987). Groth, Longo and McFadden
(1982) found that as many as 60% to 80% of adult sex offenders committed sexual offenses during adolescence. These alarming numbers underscore the need for increased research in the area of juvenile sexual offending in an effort to learn more about these offenders.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this investigation is to examine if adolescent sex offenders who commit sexual offenses exclusively present differently than those sex offenders who commit a variety of other offenses as well. It is hypothesized that by dividing juvenile sex offenders into delinquent and nondelinquent subgroups, interpersonal, intrapersonal, prior victimization, and familial characteristics unique to these groups may be identified. The outcome of this study could contribute important information about sexual offending to the field of adolescent sex offenders and the results may have implications for treatment.
Literature Review

Various characteristics that describe the adolescent sex offender have been cited in the literature. Becker and Kaplan (1988) proposed a model where the first sexual offense committed by juveniles can be predicted from a combination of individual characteristics, family relationship problems, and social-environmental stressors (Becker & Kaplan, 1988). A fourth characteristic mentioned as a motivating factor is prior sexual victimization (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Spaccarelli, Bowden, Coatsworth & Kim, 1997; Weinrott, 1996). Although the development of this model was not empirically based, these clinical observations have some support from several research studies and reflect commonly held beliefs of why adolescents commit sexual offenses (Becker, Sales & Kaplan, 1993; Boyd et al., 2000; Davis & Leitenberg, 1987). The interpersonal, intrapersonal, and familial traits of the sexual offender based on the Becker-Kaplan model, as well as prior victimization, identify the attributes that appear to be common to this population of adolescents. However, a profile unique to adolescents committing sexual offenses, based on the clinical observation of these factors, has not been identified (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987) as some of these same characteristics also describe delinquent offenders who may or may not commit sexual offenses.

Characteristics of Sexual Offenders

Individual characteristics reported in the literature to be common among adolescent sex offenders are low academic performance (Awad & Saunders, 1989; 1991; Fagan & Wexler, 1986) and low impulse control (Smith, Monastersky, &
Deisher, 1987). Unstable family characteristics such as witnessing or experiencing violence in the home (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Lewis, Shanok, Pincus, & Glaser, 1979; Pynoos & Nader, 1988; Smith, 1988; Worling, 1995c), unsatisfactory home environments characterized by distant relationships with parents and siblings (Becker et al., 1993; Worling, 1995c), prior sexual victimization of sex offenders (Barnard et al., 1985; Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Groth, 1979; Langevin, Wright, & Handy, 1989; Mathews, 1987), and poor social skills causing relationship difficulties (Becker et al., 1993), have all been suggested as possible risk factors which may lead to adolescent sexual offending. Accordingly, adolescent sex offenders are typically perceived as impulsive, poor students, socially awkward, have been sexually abused, and live in families characterized by violence and distant relationships.

Delinquency Characteristics: Similarities to Juvenile Sex Offenders

Although such identifying characteristics are used to describe juvenile sex offenders, they are not unique to the adolescent sex offender. Adolescent delinquents have been described as lacking impulse control (Loeber, 1990), and living in broken homes (Elliot, Huzinga & Morse, 1987). As well, adolescents' level of academic performance, their quality of family life, and their social skills have been reported as predictors of delinquent behaviour (Sankey & Huon, 1999). As variables characterizing sex offenders have typically been similar to those describing adolescent delinquent offenders, who may or may not also be sexual offenders, it has been difficult to establish conclusive risk factors to sexual offending. To
empirically validate these common characteristics, researchers have compared adolescent sex offenders to delinquent nonsex offenders (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Worling 1995b).

Comparison Studies:

Interpersonal Characteristics of Sexual and Nonsexual Offenders

Results of comparative studies of the interpersonal characteristics of the juvenile sex offender can be classified as mixed, as investigators have not found any features exclusive to the sexual offender. Using a sample of 242 violent offenders, Fagan and Wexler (1988) identified 34 sexual offenders and compared them to the nonsexual delinquent offenders of the sample. They demonstrated that sexual offenders, aside from their sexual deviancy, often resembled nondelinquent youth. The authors indicated that adolescent sex offenders resembled "normal" youth in terms of family composition, self-reported and official criminality, beliefs towards the law, and reliance on external behaviour controls. Compared to the sexual offenders, the delinquent offenders exhibited antisocial behaviours characterized by hostility, elevated aggression, an earlier onset of aggressive behaviours, and demonstrated hostility towards social norms (Fagan & Wexler, 1988). The authors illustrated that sexual offenders engaged in deviant sexual behaviour exclusively and did not demonstrate characteristics similar to delinquent offenders. In contrast, Awad and Saunders (1991) found that the majority (63%) of adolescent sex offenders in their study had a prior history of antisocial behaviour. Most had a delinquent record, including theft and cautions by the police for antisocial acts committed at home and
at school, and a greater involvement in delinquent behaviours such as alcohol and
drug use (Awad & Saunders, 1991). The difficulty in finding distinguishing
interpersonal features of the sexual offender who, at times, engages in behaviours
similar to a delinquent offender and at other times, appears solely sexually deviant,
is seen in the inconsistent findings of these two studies.

Familial Characteristics of Sexual and Nonsexual Offenders

When adolescent sex offenders are grouped and compared to delinquent
offenders, researchers have been unable to differentiate family characteristics of
these offenders (Weinrott, 1996). In their review, Davis and Leitenberg (1987)
stated that adolescent sex offenders had a higher reported history of physical abuse
than other groups of adolescent offenders, but this has not been a consistent finding.
In one study, the family environments of adolescent sex offenders, violent offenders,
and nonviolent delinquents were compared to the family environments of nonsexual
nondelinquent adolescents using the subscales of the Family Environment Scale.
Although there was a difference between offenders and nonoffenders, no significant
differences between the three different groups of juvenile offenders were found
(Bischof et al., 1995). In another study, sexual offenders ($n=50$) were compared to
nonsexual violent offenders ($n=106$) and a low violence group ($n=54$) using two
modified versions of the Conflict Tactics Scale to measure exposure to physical
abuse and household conflict. In both studies, no significant differences between
sexual and nonsexual offenders were found in the total family environment or in the
specific area of physical punishment (Bischof et al., 1995; Spaccarelli et al., 1997).
Prior Sexual Victimization Characteristics of Sexual and Nonsexual Offenders

Prior sexual victimization of sex offenders has been linked in both adult and adolescent sex offender studies as a factor which may lead to adolescent sexual offending (Barnard et al., 1985; Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Groth, 1979; Langevin et al., 1989; Mathews, 1987). Social learning theory has been used to explain that deviant behaviors, specifically learned through repeated exposure and reinforcement, may cause adolescent sex offenders to act out their own personal experience of having been victimized as children (Fagan & Wexler, 1988). This point, however, does not suggest that all children who have been sexually abused will become perpetrators of abuse themselves, only that one potential outcome could be the perpetration of illegal sexual behavior (Becker et al., 1993; Worling 1995c).

In one controlled study, the rate of victimization for the juvenile child molester was 50%, compared to 17% for the juvenile rapist, and 17% for nonsexual violent offenders (Ford & Linney, 1995). In comparison, Spaccarelli et al. (1997) found the rate of victimization of sexual offenders and a group of low violence delinquents was roughly the same at 8%.

Intrapersonal Characteristics of Sexual and Nonsexual Offenders

With respect to intrapersonal characteristics, several researchers found that adolescent sex offenders lacked social and assertiveness skills compared to nonsexual offenders (Awad & Saunders, 1989; Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Katz, 1990; Shoor, Speed, & Bartlett, 1986). Researchers have reported evidence to support the notion that sexual offenders feel alienated with respect to their peers (Blaske et
al., 1989) and lack social and assertive skills (Becker et al., 1993), resulting in low self-esteem. Adolescent sex offenders have also been described as typically associating with peers younger than themselves, and desiring to control and initiate interpersonal relationships with these younger peers (Awad & Saunders, 1989; Ford & Linney, 1995). However, contradictory or inconclusive results have been found in this area. Spaccarelli et al. (1997) could not find any significant differences between sexual and delinquent offenders in terms of social isolation and the offenders’ perceived competence in peer relationships. In another study, results counter to the widely held belief regarding the social deficits of the adolescent sex offender were observed as the nonsexual offenders were the least likely to initiate close relationships and affectional contact (Ford & Linney, 1995).

Limitations of Comparison Studies

Inconsistent and contrary findings typify comparison studies of adolescent sexual and nonsexual offenders with respect to interpersonal, intrapersonal, prior victimization, and familial factors. The results of comparison studies have been mixed. Sexual offenders do not appear to have distinctive traits when compared to the delinquent offender. Based on these findings, some researchers have concluded that sexual offenses committed by juveniles are a serious type of delinquency and have no distinct etiological differences from nonsexual offending adolescents (Bischof et al., 1995; Blaske et al., 1989; Jacobs, Kennedy & Meyer, 1997; McCraw & Pegg-McNab, 1989). The mixed findings may be a result of combining all adolescent sex offenders in one group and comparing them to nonsex
offenders. Other researchers have argued that there are different types or subgroups of sexual offenders who present differently than the common profile of an adolescent sex offender (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Ford & Linney, 1995; Worling, 1995b).

*Subgroup Studies: Sexual Offenders*

Identifying potential subgroups of adolescent sex offenders to better understand etiology signaled a shift in the focus of research as important etiological differences can be missed when offenders are studied as a homogeneous group (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Mathews & Stermac, 1989; Worling, 1995b). Consequently, researchers studied differences among subgroups of adolescent sex offenders (Carpenter, Peed & Eastman, 1995; Ford & Linney, 1995; Mathews & Stermac, 1989; Worling, 1995c). Worling (1995c) compared male adolescent sex offenders who assaulted younger siblings to those who offended against non-sibling children and found significantly more marital discord, parental rejection, physical discipline, negativism, and overall family dissatisfaction among adolescent sibling incest offenders. Child molesters and rapists were compared to violent nonsexual offenders in another study, and the subgroup of non-aggressive sex offenders was exposed to a greater incidence of family violence and more physical abuse than juvenile rapists and violent nonsexual offenders (Ford & Linney, 1995). Carpenter et al. (1995) compared child molesters to peer sex offenders and found child molesters to be more dependant, avoidant, and schizoid than same-age sex offenders. Subgroup studies have made significant contributions to understanding and
illustrating the existence of different types of adolescent sex offenders. However, identifying that sex offenders are not a homogeneous group has not addressed the fact that some adolescent sex offenders also commit nonsexual offenses. This distinction may lead to an understanding of etiological differences that has been lacking in the past.

Classification of Sexual Offenders

Commission of a sexual offense had been the de facto methodology for classifying nonsexual and sexual offenders. However, distinguishing the sexual offender based on the incidence of past or present nonsexual offenses is lacking in the research. Researchers who divide sexual offenders into heterogeneous groups have not attempted to differentiate sex offenders with a history of offense behaviour that is solely sexual from one in which both sexual and nonsexual offenses are committed. This is an important difference as it may explain why researchers have been inconsistent in explaining why some sexual offenders engage in other forms of delinquent behaviour and why some commit only sexual crimes.

The incidence of sexual offense has been one approach used to differentiate sexual and nonsexual offenders (Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Carpenter et al., 1995). But often, the participants were part of a larger sample of violent offenders. These offenders, for the most part, had been incarcerated in correctional facilities, and while the studies were important sources of information, the samples may have been over-representative of delinquent offenders. Sexual offenders have also been differentiated under various subgroup classifications (i.e. peer and child offenders) to
distinguish sexual offenders based on victim age, gender, and relationship to the offender, but the researchers did not differentiate sex offenders by their admitted delinquent acts (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Ford & Linney 1995). In both Awad and Saunders (1991) and Ford and Linney (1995), the offenders were differentiated on the basis of committed sexual offenses. Given that this may facilitate the forming of subgroups, it does not take into account the history of delinquent behaviour of the sexual offender. In response, some investigators focused on sex offenders with no prior history of delinquent behaviour (Blaske et al., 1989; Spaccarelli et al., 1997) and compared them to nonsexual delinquents. A limitation of these studies was that the researchers did not take into account that some adolescents committed both sexual and nonsexual offenses.

What has been lacking in the research is a comparison between offenders who commit only sexual offenses and those who commit both sexual and nonsexual offenses. This departure from existing research could lead to interesting results based on the intrapersonal, interpersonal, personal victimization, and familial characteristics of the adolescent sexual offender. Specifically, the difference in methodology could result in significant differences with respect to these four areas: the intrapersonal characteristics of aggression and hostility; the interpersonal factors of peer relationships and social deficits; the familial relationship problems encompassing physical punishment, neglect, and marital discord; and prior victimization and victim selection based on victim age, gender, and relationship to the offender. In this study, the motivation for sexual offending will be explored by
comparing sex offenders who committed only sexual offenses to those who committed a variety of criminal offenses including sexual.

The purpose of this study was to determine if adolescent sex offenders who commit both nonsexual and sexual offenses ('sex offender plus' group) are different from those adolescents who commit only sexual offenses ('sex offender only' group) with respect to identified interpersonal, intrapersonal, prior victimization and familial characteristics. It is important to examine whether any differences exist between these groups as the results may assist in determining whether the causes and correlates of sexual offenses overlap with those of other violent behaviours, and general delinquency, or whether they derive from independent etiological paths (Fagan & Wexler, 1988). These answers may have implications for the treatment of adolescent sex offenders. Specific behaviours identified as unique to each group of sexual offenders could be targeted in treatment and the specificity of a program may have a greater impact on decreasing recidivism.

**Hypotheses**

Based on the findings of previous studies, when testing for differences between the sex offender only and sex offender plus groups, the following areas were focal points: family characteristics, prior sexual victimization, interpersonal characteristics, and intrapersonal characteristics. The differences in the types of sexual offenses committed by each group were also compared (i.e. child vs. peer; inter- vs. intra-familial). As no researchers had classified subgroups in the same
manner, hypotheses were based on a combination of previous research with both violent and nonviolent sex offender subgroups, and with the violent and nonviolent delinquent (nonsex related) subgroups.

Familial and Childhood Victimization Characteristics

Within the family and prior victimization characteristics domains, the following hypotheses were made:

1. The sex offender only group will have experienced more physical punishment and violence within the family than the sex offender plus group.

2. The sex offender only group will have experienced a higher incidence of parental rejection (neglect) than the sex offender plus group.

3. The sex offender plus group will have experienced more family instability in their family of origin than the sex offender only group in terms of more marital discord between parents, greater family chaos, a higher number of moves and disruptions, as well as a higher degree of negative family atmosphere.

4. The sex offender only group will have experienced a greater incidence of prior sexual abuse than the sex offender plus group.

Interpersonal Characteristics

Within the interpersonal characteristics domain, the following hypotheses were made:

5. The sex offender only group will have an earlier age of sexually acting out behaviour compared to the sex offender plus group.
6. The sex offender only group will present a history of sexual deviance compared to the sex offender plus group.

7. The sex offender plus group will be characterized by a more extensive history of antisocial behaviour compared to the sex offender only group.

8. The sex offender plus group will have an earlier age of onset of aggression, a higher level of aggression, and will present as more delinquent than the sex offender only group.

9. The sex offender plus group will demonstrate more hostility than the sex offender only group, as well as a higher level of violence (coercion) in the commission of sexual offenses.

Intrapersonal Characteristics

Within the intrapersonal characteristics domain, the following hypotheses were made:

10. The sex offender only group will have more reported social problems and exhibit a higher degree of internalizing behaviours (withdrawal and depression) consistent with sex offender research whereas the sex offender plus group will report fewer social problems.

11. The sex offender plus group will have same-aged friends and the sex offender only group will generally associate with younger children.

12. The sex offender only group will more often offend children, while the sex offender plus group will generally assault same-age peers. As well, the sex
offender groups will be compared to see if they differ with respect to the gender of, and relationship to the victim.
Methodology

Participants

Data were collected from the closed clinical files of participants at the Sexual Abuse: Family Education and Treatment (SAFE-T) program, at Thistletown Regional Centre in Toronto. Referrals to the program were obtained from various sources, including probation officers, child welfare agencies, families, lawyers, or other agencies. Sexual offenders accepted into the program completed a comprehensive psychological assessment, and satisfied the following conditions: none of the offenders were below borderline intellectual functioning or were actively psychotic (Worling, 1995b).

Only data from male participants were used for this study as previous researchers report that most identified sexual offenders are male (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Finkelhor, 1986; Weinrott, 1996). A sample of 60 male adolescent sex offenders ranging in age from 12 to 18 years, at the time of their assessment, was divided into two groups: sex offender only group ($n = 27; M = 15.52$ years; $SD = 1.45$), and sex offender plus group ($n = 32; M = 15.41$ years; $SD = 1.27$). The 60 offenders were chosen at random from a larger sample of offenders who were involved in the SAFE-T program. The data are kept in a locked cabinet at SAFE-T, and participants were identified only by a Case File Number, for later analysis, in order to protect the identity of participants.

Informed consent for clinical and research purposes was obtained from participants at the time of their admission to SAFE-T. Participants signed a consent
form giving SAFE-T staff permission to collect the information contained in their files to be used for treatment and research (See Appendix A).

Grouping offenders is often problematic (Worling, 1995a, 1995b, & 1995c). In the current study, an adolescent was classified as a sex offender plus offender if there was official documentation of nonsexual offense charges recorded in his file. To be classified as a sex offender only, the adolescent had to have been charged at least once with a sexual offense or the sexual assault had to be corroborated by a third party (i.e. parent or professional). In addition, most charges were corroborated by victim statements on file. As well, the sex offender could not have a nonsexual related charge or conviction on file.

Measures

To measure various punitive childhood experiences, and to estimate the degree of family violence, the Assessing Environments (III) Self-Report Scale (AEIII) (Berger & Knutson, 1989) was used. The AEIII has several subscales that are relevant. The four subscales used in the present study were Physical Punishment, Negative Family Atmosphere, Marital Discord, and Parental Rejection. The authors report adequate internal consistency (Kuder-Richardson-20) above 0.65 for all four scales as well as test-retest reliability (60 days) of 0.82 (KR-20) for Physical Punishment, 0.80 for Negative Family Atmosphere, 0.76 for Marital Discord, and 0.60 for Parental Rejection.

A frequently used measure of self-concept is The Tennessee Self-Concept Self-Report Scale (TSCS) (Roid & Fitts, 1988). There are 100 self-descriptive items
in the TSCS, but only two relevant scales were used in this study: the Total Score and Self-Criticism. The Total Score (90 items) measured the offenders’ overall level of self-esteem. The Self-Criticism (SC) scale (10 items) was used as an estimate of social desirability. The SC scale is used to determine whether or not the participant is presenting a favourable self-image (Worling, 1995b). According to the authors, internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha) for the Total Score was 0.91 and 0.71 for the Self-Criticism scale. The test-retest (two weeks) reliability for the Total Score was 0.92 and for the Self-Criticism scale, 0.75. The TSCS manual contains extensive information related to the demonstrated reliability and validity of this measure (Roid & Fitts, 1988).

In order to obtain adolescents’ descriptions of their social competencies and problem behaviors, the Youth Self-Report (YSR) (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1987) was used. The YSR contains 8 scales of which 5 were utilized: Delinquent Behaviour and Aggressive Behaviour for interpersonal issues and Anxious/Depressed, Withdrawn, and Social Problem for intrapersonal social difficulties. The YSR is a widely used measure and data related to its demonstrated reliability and validity have been reported in the test manual by the authors (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1987).

The Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory (BDHI) (Buss & Durkee, 1957) was used as a measure of hostility. The BDHI consists of 66 items in 7 scales. Only the Total score was used as most validation research has been conducted utilizing the Total score. This measure has an adequate test-retest (two week) reliability of .82
(Biaggio, Supplee & Curtis, 1981), and the discriminant validity of the BDHI has been demonstrated with forensic populations (Selby, 1984).

All sexual offense data relating to victim selection including age, gender, and relationship (intra- vs. extra-familial), as well as the sexual offense history of the offender including age of onset of sexual activity, and sexual deviance history (viewing pornography, peeping/voyeurism, exhibitionism, obscene phone calling), were collected from the file data. The following variables were also coded from the file data: age of onset of aggression; history of antisocial behaviour; the total number of residential moves; the number of parental figures; changes in parenting situations and family stability (Family Chaos). File information was used to collect data on the prevalence of past sexual and physical abuse (see Appendix B for SAFE-T Coding Sheets). All file data were collected from various sources (i.e. parents, probation officers, police and psychology reports) and recorded by the therapist.

**Demographic Variables**

As mentioned, the data were collected from the closed case files at SAFE-T (See Appendix C for the Case File Data Collection Form). However, there may exist some discrepancies in the case files, as the offender may either deny or add more detail with respect to his offending history as he moves from Intake through to Treatment. In some cases, the offender was only assessed at the treatment centre; in other instances, treatment may also have been provided. In order to maintain consistency across participants, data for analysis were collected using Assessment information only.
The age of onset of sexual activity was defined as any type of sexual activity from viewing pornographic magazines and videos, to peeping, to viewing adults (parents) engaging in sexual relations. If there was no defined age of sexual acting out, it was coded as the age of first sexual offense. Sexual offense activity was only coded if the following conditions were met: the subject was clearly the perpetrator, a victim was identifiable, and the assault could be corroborated either through charges or a third party report (i.e. parent or professional). In the case where the offender was not arrested but was issued a warning by police, the act was considered a sexual assault and coded. Sexual offenses that were suspected or alleged, as well as those the participant called a secret and would not disclose any more information about, were not coded. With respect to coercion, the present study coded the worst level of violence (see Appendix C for the Case File Data Collection Form) used during the sexual assault. For example, if the sexual offender committed a sexual assault with coercion as physically holding down the victim (Physical = 3) and using a weapon (Weapon = 4), the level of violence was coded a 4.

Antisocial behaviour has been defined in past research as any behavior that is serious in nature, such as deliberate theft, fire setting, vandalism, or physical aggression (Loeber, 1990). This includes acts that violate criminal laws, even if the offender was not charged with the commission of a crime. The same criteria were used in the present study with the proviso that antisocial behaviour did not include sexual offenses. 'Age of onset of aggression' was coded as the age of the first act of antisocial behaviour, and in the case of no recorded antisocial behaviour, was coded as the age of arrest for the first nonsexual delinquent crime. Prior sexual and
physical victimization were coded as either "yes", "no", or "alleged", when strongly suspected by a third party (i.e. parent or professional) but the participant did not make such an admission. All file data with respect to antisocial behaviour and prior victimization were collected from various sources and recorded by therapist.

The number of moves, parental figures, and changes in parenting situations were coded to include changes up to the time of admission to the SAFE-T program. Finally, socioeconomic status (SES) was determined using the Blishen scales (Blishen & Carroll, 1978). The Blishen scales are based on Canadian occupations, and in the case of two parent families, the higher income was coded. Specific occupational scores were assigned to one of six categories and the lower the score the higher the SES income bracket.

 Procedures

Data were collected from archival client files including psychometric test data. All questionnaires had been completed individually by the participants during an assessment. For the purpose of assessment and treatment, therapists collected sexual victimization and offending histories of young sex offending clients. These files contained the relevant data needed for the study. Self-reports of personal information were corroborated, as best as possible, by comparison to official reports within the clinical file. The use of self-report questionnaires, interview data, social desirability measures, previous psychological reports, and police records helped to corroborate information collected from these various sources. Finally, the
psychologist in charge of research developed a specific form to collect and code all relevant information from case files (See Appendix B).

Analyses

Before beginning any analysis, Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were performed with the potentially confounding variables of Age, SES, and social desirability (using the Self-Criticism scale from the TSCS), to ensure that these variables were not significantly different between groups. As there was a significant difference with respect to social desirability, multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was used to control for this on subsequent analyses. A correlational analysis followed to determine which self-report variables were significantly correlated to social desirability (SC). To reduce the probability of Type I errors with multiple hypothesis testing, the eleven variables from the self-report measures were grouped into clusters. The first cluster group contained: Aggression (YSR), Delinquency (YSR), and Hostility (BDHI). The second cluster included: Depression (YSR), Withdrawn (YSR), and Social Problems (YSR). The AEIII variables of Marital Discord, Negative Family Atmosphere, Parental Rejection, and Physical Punishment made up the third cluster. Support for clustering variables in this manner was found in Worling (1995b and 1995c).

Hypotheses 1, 2, 3:

To address the incidence of marital discord, parental rejection, and negative family atmosphere, data from the AEIII were used, and a multivariate analysis of
variance (MANOVA) was performed with these family variables. As the AEIII was not significantly correlated with social desirability, Self-Criticism was not controlled for this variable.

With respect to the total number of residential moves, the number of parental figures, and changes in parenting situations, each variable was examined using an ANOVA. In terms of family stability, the level of Family Chaos was also examined with an ANOVA. Chaos scores ranged from 1 (stable) to 4 (severe) (see Appendix B for Intake Sheet details).

The file review data with respect to history of previous physical punishment were nominal (suspected/never); therefore, a two-by-two chi-square was employed.

**Hypotheses 4, 5, 6:**

Data concerning prior sexual victimization were also nominal (suspected/never); accordingly, a two-by-two chi-square was performed. Originally, prior childhood victimization was coded as “yes”, “no” or “alleged”. However, the “alleged” cells were too small a sample size, therefore prior victimizations were classified as “suspected” or “never” and coded accordingly. In addition, the following variables were subjected to a chi-square test to test the hypotheses: known sexual deviance (yes/no) and age of onset of sexual activity (under/over 12 yrs).

**Hypotheses 7, 8, 9:**

A MANCOVA was used to examine the variables of aggressive behaviour (YSR), delinquent behaviour (YSR), and hostility (BDHI). An ANOVA was performed
to examine the following variables: level of violence (files) used during an assault; and age of onset of aggression (files), or the age that the adolescent started displaying aggression. A two-by-two chi-square test was performed with respect to history of antisocial behaviour (yes/no).

Hypotheses 10, 11:

The Social Problems raw score on the Achenbach Youth Self-Report scale and the raw scores of Depression (YSR) and Withdrawn (YSR) were clustered and subjected to a MANOVA to determine if groups differed with respect to internalizing symptomatology. An Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was done separately to examine Total Self-Concept (TSCS) as it was significantly correlated with social desirability (Self-Criticism of the TSCS). Limited information was available in the client files with respect to peer associations; therefore, no further analysis could be conducted.

Hypothesis 12:

To observe whether adolescent sex offenders differed on victim selection, the age, gender, and relationship to the offender (intra-familial or extra-familial) are the variables that were used to examine group differences. A chi-square test was performed on the following variables: Age of victim (child ever – yes/no); Relationship to victim (intrafamilial ever – yes/no); Victim gender (male ever – yes/no).
Results

The results will follow the outline demonstrated throughout the research paper, categorizing the two subgroups with respect to familial, intrapersonal, childhood victimization, and interpersonal categories. Also, one case file was not included in some of the data analysis as the offender was in treatment for victimizing an animal. As a result, victim data was missing.

The means and standard deviations for the potentially confounding variables of Age, SES, and Self-Criticism are presented in Table 1. There was a significant difference between the groups with respect to Self-Criticism, \( F(1,34) = 7.66, p<.01 \), as the sexual offender only group tended to provide more socially desirable responses. Due to this result, Self-Criticism was controlled for on subsequent analyses of identified self-report variables.

Table 1

*Mean Age, SES and Self-Criticism Based on Offender Sub-Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex Offender Only</th>
<th>Sex Offender Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( M )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS - Self-Criticism**</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *A lower SES ranking indicates a higher SES level. TSCS – Tennessee Self-Concept Self-Report Scale: A lower Self-Criticism score indicates more socially desirable responses. **\( p < .01 \)
The correlations between Self-Criticism and the other self-report variables are presented in Table 2. Given the significant correlations, Self-Criticism was controlled for when Delinquency, Aggression, Hostility, and Self-Concept were examined.

**Table 2**

Correlation Coefficients of Self-Report Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>BDTOT</th>
<th>MAR²</th>
<th>NEGA</th>
<th>PARE</th>
<th>PUNN</th>
<th>TSCTS_TOT</th>
<th>YAGGRES</th>
<th>YANX_Dep</th>
<th>YDELINQ</th>
<th>YWITHDRA</th>
<th>SOCPB</th>
<th>SOCS_SEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>3016</td>
<td>.5687</td>
<td>.4749</td>
<td>.3552</td>
<td>-.6659</td>
<td>.7171</td>
<td>.6428</td>
<td>.6331</td>
<td>.4434</td>
<td>.4199</td>
<td>.6487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.38)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.38)</td>
<td>(.38)</td>
<td>(.38)</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.070</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.003</td>
<td>P=.031</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.009</td>
<td>P=.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR²</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.3845</td>
<td>.1899</td>
<td>.3755</td>
<td>-.2955</td>
<td>.1942</td>
<td>.2469</td>
<td>.0906</td>
<td>.2115</td>
<td>.0445</td>
<td>.1772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.185</td>
<td>P=.010</td>
<td>P=.095</td>
<td>P=.201</td>
<td>P=.219</td>
<td>P=.045</td>
<td>P=.221</td>
<td>P=.202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGA</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.6023</td>
<td>.5760</td>
<td>-.483</td>
<td>.3737</td>
<td>.5200</td>
<td>.1870</td>
<td>.3002</td>
<td>.1681</td>
<td>.2279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.004</td>
<td>P=.011</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.219</td>
<td>P=.045</td>
<td>P=.221</td>
<td>P=.202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARE</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.4248</td>
<td>-.5302</td>
<td>.3456</td>
<td>.5792</td>
<td>.2294</td>
<td>.3905</td>
<td>.3038</td>
<td>.2331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.020</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.130</td>
<td>P=.008</td>
<td>P=.043</td>
<td>P=.192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNN</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-.3105</td>
<td>.3116</td>
<td>.5175</td>
<td>.1139</td>
<td>.2083</td>
<td>.2601</td>
<td>.1737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.079</td>
<td>P=.037</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.456</td>
<td>P=.174</td>
<td>P=.084</td>
<td>P=.334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCTS_TOT</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.5945</td>
<td>-.6398</td>
<td>.3908</td>
<td>.3655</td>
<td>.3748</td>
<td>.3678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.018</td>
<td>P=.026</td>
<td>P=.024</td>
<td>P=.027*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAGGRES</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.5465</td>
<td>.6066</td>
<td>.5700</td>
<td>.5037</td>
<td>.5212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.001**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YANX_Dep</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.4174</td>
<td>.5911</td>
<td>.6431</td>
<td>.2009</td>
<td>.4786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.002</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDELINQ</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.3944</td>
<td>.2600</td>
<td>.4786</td>
<td>.0339</td>
<td>.0646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.053</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWITHDRA</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.4664</td>
<td>.0731</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSOC_PB</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0731</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCTS_SEL</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** *BDTOT=Hostility; *MAR=Marital Discord; *NEGA=Negative Family Atmosphere; *PARE=Parental Rejection; *PUNN=Physical Punishment; *TSCTS_TOT=Total Self Concept; *YAGGRES=Aggression; *YANX_Dep=Depression; *YDELINQ=Delinquency; *YWITHDRA=Withdrawn; *YSOC_PB=Social Problems; *TSCTS_SEL=Self-Criticism. Results presented: Coefficient / Number of Cases / 2-tailed Significance; " . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed.

***p<.001
**p<.01
*p<.05
Familial and Childhood Victimization Characteristics: Hypotheses 1 to 4

The sex offender plus group had severe Family Chaos, $F(1,54) = 13.23$, $p<.001$, and a higher number of residential moves, $F(1,52) = 4.21$, $p<.05$, when compared to the sex offender only group. The results are presented in Table 3 and support hypothesis 3. No significant differences between the groups were found when looking at the number of parental figures, $F(1,57) = .986$, $p>.05$, or the number of parental changes, $F(1,57) = 1.74$, $p>.05$, in the family of origin (see Table 3).

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations based on Family Chaos and Instability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex Offender Only</th>
<th>Sex Offender Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Chaos***</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Residential Moves*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parental Figures</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parental Changes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***$p<.001$

*p<.05

It was predicted that the sex offender only group would have a history of more punitive childhood experiences and family violence than the sex offender plus group (hypotheses 1,2). The results of the MANOVA indicated no significant differences with respect to the four variables of the AEIII (Physical Punishment, Parental
Rejection, Marital Discord, and Negative Family Atmosphere), $F(4,41) = .798$, $p > .05$ (See Table 4).

Table 4

**Means and Standard Deviations based on the AEIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex Offender Only</th>
<th>Sex Offender Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n=20$</td>
<td>$n=26$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Punishment</td>
<td>2.65  2.48</td>
<td>2.69  2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Discord</td>
<td>2.85  2.06</td>
<td>2.69  1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Rejection</td>
<td>.90   1.33</td>
<td>1.53  1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Family Atmosphere</td>
<td>2.55  2.39</td>
<td>3.35  2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of prior abuse, it was predicted that the sex offender only group would experience a greater incidence of prior sexual abuse (hypothesis 4) and physical abuse (hypothesis 1). According to Table 5, a Chi-square test indicated that the groups were not significantly different with respect to prior physical abuse, $\chi^2 (1, N=60) = .360$, $p > .05$, or prior sexual victimization, $\chi^2 (1, N=60) = 1.56$, $p > .05$. 
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Table 5

**Chi-Square Test of Prior Physical and Sexual Abuse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex Offender Only</th>
<th>Sex Offender Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History (%)</td>
<td>None (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior physical abuse</td>
<td>11 (40.7)</td>
<td>16 (59.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior sexual abuse</td>
<td>12 (44.4)</td>
<td>15 (55.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interpersonal Characteristics: Hypotheses 5 to 9*

Although it was predicted in hypothesis 5 that the sex offender only group would have an earlier age of sexual acting out, no significant differences between the groups were found, $F(1,57) = .125, p>.05$ (see Table 8). Furthermore, the sex offender only group did not differ significantly from the sex offender plus group in deviant sexual history (hypothesis 6), $\chi^2 (1, N=60) = .604, p>.05$ (see Table 6).

A significant difference between the sex offender only and sex offender plus groups was found with respect to the history of antisocial behaviour (see Table 6). These results support hypothesis 7, that the sex offender plus group had a more extensive antisocial history, $\chi^2 (1, N=60) = 15.92, p< .001$, when compared to the sex offender only group. Ninety-four percent of the participants in the sex offender plus group ($n = 31$) had a history of antisocial behaviour compared to only 48% of the sex offender only group ($n = 13$).
Table 6

Chi-Square tests of Sexual Deviant and Antisocial History of the Offending Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex Offender Only</th>
<th>Sex Offender Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History (%)</td>
<td>None (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Deviance</td>
<td>18 (66.7)</td>
<td>9 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>13 (48.1)</td>
<td>14 (59.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.001

The sex offender plus group was significantly more delinquent, $F(1,28) = 5.55$, $p<.05$, and aggressive, $F(1,28) = 4.47$ $p<.05$, than the sex offender only group (hypothesis 8) (See Table 7). It was also predicted in hypothesis 8 that the sex offender plus group would have an earlier age of onset of aggression when compared to the sex offender only group, but no significant differences were found, $F(1,40) = 3.21$ $p>.05$. The sex offender plus group did not demonstrate more hostility (hypothesis 9) as measured by the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory, than the sex offender only group, $F(1,28) = 3.18$, $p>.05$. Coercion, as measured by the level of violence (hypothesis 9) employed during the commission of a sexual assault, was not significantly different between the groups, $F(1,58) = .859$, $p>.05$ (See Table 8).
Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations based on Hostility, Aggression, and Delinquency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex Offender Only</th>
<th>Sex Offender Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDH$^a$ – Hostility</td>
<td>26.71</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR$^b$ – Aggression*</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR$^b$ – Delinquency*</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $^a$BDHI=Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory Total Score; $^b$YSR=Youth Self Report.

*p<.05

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations based on Age of Onset of Aggression, Level of Violence, and Age of Onset of Sexual Acting Out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex Offender Only</th>
<th>Sex Offender Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Onset of Aggression$^a$</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Violence$^b$</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Onset Sexual Acting Out$^c$</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $^a$As reported in the case files.  $^b$Physical level of coercion reported during assault (case files). $^c$Age of Exposure to first Sexual Media as reported in the case files.
Intrapersonal Characteristics: Hypotheses 10, 11, 12.

It was predicted in hypothesis 10 that the sex offender only group would have more social problems than the sex offender plus group. Data for this comparison are presented in Table 9. The results of the MANOVA indicated no significant differences with respect to social problem variables (Anxious/Depressed, Withdrawn, Social Problems), $F(3,51) = .238, p > .05$. The prediction that the sex offender only group would have a lower Total Self-Concept was not supported as no significant differences between the groups were found, $F(1,34) = 3.54, p > .05$.

Table 9

*Means and Standard Deviations based on YSR and TSCS Raw Scores – Internalizing Behaviours*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex Offender Only</th>
<th>Sex Offender Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR$^a$ – Anxious/Depression</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR$^a$ - Withdrawn</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSR$^a$ - Social Problems</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSCS$^b$ - Total Self Concept</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $^a$YSR=Youth Self Report; $^b$TSCS=Tennessee Self-Concept Self-Report Scale;*

With respect to age of peers (hypothesis 11), there was insufficient information recorded in the case files to adequately examine any possible group differences.
With respect to age of victim, the sex offender only group differed significantly from the sex offender plus group. Eighty six percent of the sex offender only group had assaulted a child compared to 61% of the sex offender plus group, $\chi^2 (1, N=52) = 4.71$, $p<.05$, providing partial support for hypothesis 12 (See Table 10). No further support was found for hypothesis 12, as the groups were not significantly different with respect to victim gender (ever a male victim), $\chi^2 (1, N=59) = .683$, $p>.05$, or victim relationship (ever intrafamilial), $\chi^2 (1, N=60) = .097$, $p>.05$.

Table 10

Chi-Square test of Victim Selection by Offender Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sex Offender Only</th>
<th>Sex Offender Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$ Yes (%)</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever a male victim</td>
<td>26 10 (38.5)</td>
<td>16(61.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever a child victim*</td>
<td>24 21(87.5)</td>
<td>3(12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever intrafamilial</td>
<td>27 12(44.4)</td>
<td>15(55.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.05$
Discussion

The goal of the present study was to determine if adolescents who commit only sexual offenses were significantly different from those who commit both sexual and nonsexual offenses. It was suggested that adolescents who commit a variety of offenses, including sexual ones, would exhibit a delinquent profile, characterized by aggression, delinquency and family instability, when compared to adolescents exclusively committing sexual offenses. As past studies have not focused on delinquency as an aspect of juvenile sexual offending behaviour, two groups of adolescents were compared with respect to intrapersonal, interpersonal, and familial characteristics. The results of the analyses indicate that the groups are different. Accordingly, the motivation for committing sexual assaults by each group may differ as well, which is an important consideration when determining appropriate treatment for sexual assaulters.

The sex offender plus group was significantly more delinquent, aggressive, and antisocial than the sex offender only group. The delinquent behaviours exhibited by this group are common to nonsexual offending delinquents. Such antisocial behaviours range from committing serious overt acts of violence such as fighting and open aggression towards parents and teachers, to covert acts such as vandalism and truancy (Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1987; Loeber, 1990). In the past, some researchers have concluded that all sexual assaults should be considered a form of delinquency and not a distinct type of offense (Bischof et al., 1995; Blaske et al., 1989; Jacobs et al., 1997; McCraw et al., 1989). This is not the case here. In the present study, only a particular group of offenders was delinquent.
and demonstrated antisocial tendencies. The results seem to indicate that for the adolescent in the sex offender plus group, sexual offending appears to be another conduit for aggression vented in the form of antisocial behaviour and delinquent acts that happen to include both sexual and nonsexual crimes. Thus, the characteristics that the sex offender plus group has in common with nonsexual offending juveniles may signal that delinquency may be a more salient problem than sexual offending, or at least, an additional problem.

For adolescents who commit only sexual crimes, on the other hand, antisocial and aggressive behaviours are not common. These juveniles demonstrate less aggressive and antisocial tendencies and past researchers have also found support that some adolescent sex offenders, notwithstanding their sexual deviancy, can resemble nonviolent youth (Fagan & Wexler, 1998). It may be argued that but for their sexual crimes, these adolescents would not be considered to be typically involved in the criminal justice system. While the sex offender plus group tended to be more oppositional and was least concerned about societal perceptions, the sex offender only group provided significantly more socially desirable answers to self-report tests, and they seemed to be more concerned about social norms. Sexual offenders want to present themselves as socially adjusted (Fagan & Wexler, 1988), while the sex offender plus group is more aligned with delinquency literature in the sense that this group would rebel against social norms (Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Awad & Saunders, 1991) and would not be as concerned about appearing socially adjusted.
The significance of the Self-Criticism variable is best demonstrated with respect to victim selection between the groups, especially in terms of victim selection by the sex offender only group. Although many in the sex offender plus group sexually assaulted peers, 88% of the sex offender only group (n = 21) targeted children. The fact that the sex offender only group gave more socially desirable answers may provide one reason why this group of offenders tends to offend against children rather than same-aged peers. The sex offender only group is aware of societal rules and, therefore, may target victims where the offender can control the relationship. Children are vulnerable, impressionable, and easier targets for the sex offender only group, while the sex offender plus group is less concerned about the type of victim. Past researchers have also proposed that an offender who desires to control and initiate interpersonal relationships will target children as potential victims (Awad & Saunders, 1989; Ford & Linney, 1995).

Another more obvious reason the sex offender only group targets children may be to satisfy their own sexual arousal towards children. The profile of the sex offender only group in the present study is of a group that is deviant sexually in that members otherwise resemble non-violent youths, with the exception of their interest in children. The sex offender only group is clearly more deviant sexually than the sex offender plus group, where sexual offending seems to be part of an overall pattern of delinquency.

The argument that sexual assault may just be another form of delinquent behaviour, proposed in the literature by some researchers, does not apply to both groups in this study. While this may accurately describe the sex offender plus
group, it cannot be extended to the sex offender only group. There are no significant differences between the groups with respect to identified sexual deviance (pornography, peeping/voyeurism, exhibitionism, obscene phone calling). However, the significance of targeting children as victims does provide support that the sex offender only group is indeed more deviant sexually. It also suggests that the sex offender only group may be more likely to reoffend. Past investigators have found that sexual interest in children is a predictor of sexual recidivism, and, if left untreated, will lead to significantly higher rates of reoffending (Worling & Curwen, 2000). Another possible explanation may be that the groups do differ with respect to deviant sexual fantasies, in the frequency of masturbation, fantasy content (i.e. child versus peers), offending patterns, whether they pre-plan their sexual assaults and befriend their victims (active planning and intention), and in their degree of denial. These are areas to examine in future studies.

The families of origin of the sex offender plus group were severely chaotic, characterized by instability, many relocations, a single parent with transient mates, parental fighting, and parental or sibling abuse. Although this finding is the result of a single variable (family chaos), it is corroborated when comparing the number of moves experienced by each group. The sex offender plus group experienced a significantly greater number of moves compared to the sex offender only group. These findings are consistent with delinquency literature. Offenders who come from broken homes are most likely to become involved in criminal activity as they become older (Elliot et al., 1987), which further supports the belief that the sex offender plus group is more delinquent than deviant sexually.
With respect to family characteristics, no further significant differences between sex offender only and sex offender plus groups were found. This may suggest that the groups share similar family experiences with respect to physical punishment, marital discord, parental rejection, and negative family environment. The difference in family dynamics between the two groups may be in the expression of sexual boundaries, exposure to sexual media, and sexual attitudes set by the family. The lack of group difference in the age of onset of sexual acting out may be a result of the difficulty in pinpointing exactly when sexual acting out began. For example, a child that forcefully kisses another child at an early age may be described as aggressive or mischievous rather than sexually aggressive. In the future, it may be helpful if clinicians and parents can track at what age the child begins to act out sexually as this effort could potentially differentiate aggressive actions committed by children from those that are more sexual in nature. The difficulty in properly identifying these behaviours may explain the lack of significant difference with respect to onset of sexual acting out and the age of onset of aggression. These distinctions will help determine when a child begins to act out sexually versus aggressively. Both family dynamics and tracking of age of onset are further areas to consider in future studies.

No differences with respect to prior physical or sexual victimization were found, contrary to the belief that most sexual offenders are sexually victimized as children (Barnard et al., 1985; Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Groth, 1979; Langevin et al., 1989; Mathews, 1987).
Differences between the groups with respect to social problems, self-esteem, and withdrawal/depression were not found, and the popular perception that adolescent sex offenders are socially isolated, awkward, and withdrawn (Awad & Saunders, 1989; Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Katz, 1990; Shoor et al., 1986) was not supported. A somewhat surprising result is that the sex offender only group, who offended more often against children, did not present with greater social problems than the sex offender plus group. A possible explanation for this result is that the adolescent sex offender does not fit the common perception that they suffer in terms of social deficits and intrapersonal relationship problems (Spaccarelli et al., 1997; Ford & Linney, 1995), but that the targeting of children is less in response to social deficits and more likely as a result of a sexual interest in children. Another possibility is that the self-report measures are not the most effective means of accessing this information and third party reports may be more accurate in gauging social problems.

The results suggest a need to have different treatment courses for the sex offender only and the sex offender plus groups. Adolescents who commit only sexual offenses should be deemed sex offenders only and should receive treatment for deviant sexual behaviour. The sex offender who commits a variety of offenses should be treated for antisocial behaviour in addition to treatment addressing sexually offending behaviour. For instance, factors focusing on delinquency should be the basis of treatment for the sex offender plus group, including sexual behaviour. Some researchers have suggested that the most effective treatment for delinquent behaviour is structured and focused, styled on cognitive behavioral and social
learning approaches, rather than nondirective relationship-oriented counseling (Gendreau & Andrews, 1990; Lipsey & Wilson, 1993). In this respect, treatment could focus on replacing the skills of stealing and aggression with more prosocial alternatives, by increasing self-control, and by developing self-management and problem solving skills (Gendreau & Andrews, 1990). Dealing with sexual offending as an expression of aggression and lack of control in treatment may not be enough to prevent this behaviour from reoccurring. A multi-modal approach to treating the sex offender plus group may have a greater effect on reducing the incidence of both delinquency and sexual offending. This group of sex offenders may be more versatile, and therefore, in need of treatment for delinquent behaviour, in addition to treatment for sexual offending. Future treatment studies may address this empirical question.

Conversely, the sexual offender only group would benefit from a sex offender treatment program focusing on sexual offense patterns including sexual deviance (i.e. masturbation, fantasies, interest in children, and voyeurism). As mentioned, this group appears deviant sexually, and therefore, should be treated for this behaviour. Past investigators have demonstrated that promoting the family-relationship aspect has been effective in the reduction of sexual recidivism (Worling & Curwen, 2000). By targeting specific problematic behaviours in treatment, i.e. sexual deviance, anger management, and delinquency, the intervention method may have greater influence on reducing recidivism.
Limitations of the Study

Prior to discussing the limitations, it is important to highlight the present study as unique in the way in which sex offenders have been classified. Unlike previous studies, the methodology of separating antisocial and aggressive characteristics of the sex offender was effectively used to identify significant differences between groups. The offenders in the study were randomly selected and identified for their respective groups. Data collected for this classification were corroborated as best as possible through the use of both self-report and file data.

The results presented in the study are limited to the population of the participants, male adolescent sex offenders, and exclude other types of sex offenders such as adult males or females. Accordingly, the results can only be applied to youths who have been identified as sexual offenders.

A second limitation is that although the groups were defined from the offense history as contained in the data collected from the case files, some offenses, both sexual and nonsexual, may be unknown as participants may refuse to divulge knowledge of participation in sexual or criminal offenses for which they had not been apprehended or questioned.

A third limitation was the lack of information on peer relationships. Peer relationships are an important factor in the development of both sexual offending and antisocial behaviour according to adolescent sexual offending and delinquency literature (LeBlanc, Quimet, & Tremblay, 1988; Levine & Singer, 1988). Devising different means of collecting information to inform on peer relationships may be considered for future study.
A final limitation of the study is the relatively small sample size. To ensure valid results, especially in the light of the fact that after controlling for Self-Criticism some of the group sample sizes decreased, a greater number of participants is suggested for future studies in order to increase the overall sample size.

Conclusions

Sexual offenders are not a homogenous group of offenders, and adolescents committing both sexual and nonsexual offenses are more delinquent, aggressive, and antisocial than adolescents committing only sexual assaults. Conversely, adolescents exclusively committing sexual assaults have more family stability and target children more often than the sexual offenders involved in other criminal activity. This methodology of classifying sexual offenders has made it possible to identify important distinctions between adolescent sex offenders who commit only sexual offenses and those who commit both sexual and nonsexual offenses. Identifying that one group of offenders resembles the average adolescent except for their sexually deviant interest in children and that the other group of offenders closely resemble juvenile delinquents is important for treatment. It is the hope that this information will lead to more effective treatment programs that can reduce the chance of recidivism for both groups of offenders.
Appendix A
Psychological Assessment Consent Form

I, ____________________________________________, currently residing at

(please print full name)

(please print current address)

agree to complete the psychological assessment at the SAFE-T Program. I understand that this assessment is being supervised by Dr. James Worling, C.Psych., the psychologist at the SAFE-T Program, and that the tests will be administered by a staff under his supervision.

I will be asked to complete a variety of questionnaires, and it will take approximately 4 or 5 hours in total—over 2 or 3 appointments—depending on the tests that I am asked to complete. Some of the questionnaires will be presented on the computer, and others will be paper-and-pencil. Given the nature of my involvement at SAFE-T, I understand that the questions will be focused on general issues such as my current thoughts, feelings, and behaviours, my family life, my attitudes, and my social relationships. I also realize that there will be questions regarding my sexual thoughts, sexual feelings, sexual behaviours, and sexual attitudes in addition to specific questions regarding my sexual-assault behaviours. I realize that some of the questions may remind me of upsetting past events, and that if I find any of the questions disturbing in any way, I can discontinue the assessment at any time or choose not to complete specific questions or questionnaires.

I am aware that the test results will assist my clinical team at SAFE-T to perform a more thorough assessment of my particular strengths and weaknesses. The information from the psychological assessment will add to the information that is collected from clinical interviews that I participate in. I understand that some of the information gained from the psychological tests could be collected through additional clinical interviews; however, I also understand that the psychological tests will provide my team with important information that cannot be acquired from clinical interviews.

I understand that I am free at any time during this assessment to withdraw this consent and to stop my participation in the psychological testing. Although this will mean that certain information about me will not be collected for my assessment, I understand that this decision will not affect my access to assessment and/or treatment resources at SAFE-T.

I am aware that I should ask the person giving me the tests if there are any words or phrases that I do not understand so that the information is as accurate as possible. I also
I understand that if I experience any difficulties reading, test questions will be read aloud for me. I know that I am free to ask any questions about the psychological assessment process at any time.

I understand that my parent(s) and/or guardian(s) will also be asked to complete psychological tests regarding my thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and behaviours. I am aware that the information from these tests will be included in my overall assessment.

My responses to the tests will be summarized and will be used by my clinical team as part of my overall assessment. I understand that if any of my responses suggest that I may be at risk of harming myself or others, these results will be shared with my therapist at SAFE-T so that these issues can be discussed more fully in an interview with me. I also understand that the information that I provide will be kept confidential by the clinical team at SAFE-T with the following exceptions: (1) if I am at risk of harming myself; (2) if I am at risk of harming a specific person; (3) if I disclose (previously undisclosed) past offenses against identified individuals; (4) if I disclose previously undisclosed past abuse against me by an identified person; (5) if a court orders my records; (6) if I disclose sexual abuse by a regulated health professional. I understand that in each of these instances, SAFE-T will report the relevant information to the proper authorities.

I understand that I will be given feedback from this psychological assessment, and that I can ask Dr. Worling about any aspects of this assessment at any time. I am aware that my completed tests will be stored in a separate psychological assessment file at SAFE-T and that Dr. Worling is responsible for any access to these documents.

I am aware that SAFE-T conducts research in the area of sexual abuse, and that scores from my psychological tests may be used in studies of the causes and consequences of sexual abuse. I understand that, in this research, test scores are combined among many individuals, and that any identifying information about me will never appear in any research report. Rather, information presented will represent averages from groups of individuals, and I will remain anonymous in any report. This research will help SAFE-T and other programs in their work with offenders, victims, and family members. I also understand that, for research purposes only, my police records may be accessed in the future to determine whether treatment was successful in helping me to stop criminal activity.

I have read and understood the information presented in these 2 pages regarding psychological assessments at SAFE-T, and any questions that I had have been answered to my satisfaction. I hereby agree to proceed with the psychological assessment at SAFE-T.

______________________________    ______________________________
(signature)                        (today’s date)

______________________________
(witness)

AD 15.
INTAKE INFORMATION

Client - Offender at Intake

ID# ________________ Date of Birth ______  Age ______

Country of Birth  □ Canada  □ other ________ Yrs. in Canada ______

Residential Location
□ parental home  □ group home O/C
□ foster home  □ own home
□ jail  □ group home C/C
□ with relatives  □ with friends
□ other __________________________

Referral Source
□ Probation  □ Child Welfare
□ foster parent  □ mother
□ father  □ relative
□ self referral  □ other agency ________________
□ other __________________________

Residential moves
□ 0 □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6
□ other______________

Number of parental figures
□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6
□ other ________________

Changes in parenting situations
□ 0 □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6
□ other ________________
SCHOOL HISTORY

Present Grade ________

Number of schools attended
☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5  ☐ 6
☐ other ____________

Number of Suspensions
☐ 0  ☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5  ☐ 6
☐ other ____________

Number of grades failed
☐ 0  ☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5  ☐ 6
☐ other ____________

Peer relationships
☐ Problematic - fighting, etc.
☐ Scarce - few, picked on, etc.
☐ Younger Peers -
☐ Older Peers -
☐ Not Problematic - popular
☐ unknown
☐ other ____________

School Activities
☐ involved
☐ little involvement
☐ no involvement
☐ unknown
☐ other ____________

Learning Disabilities
☐ none
☐ reading
☐ unknown
☐ other ____________

I.Q.
☐ borderline
☐ below average
☐ average
☐ above average

Special Education
☐ no
☐ unknown
☐ yes ____________
OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

☐ Probation
☐ Child Welfare
☐ residential treatment
☐ psychiatrists
☐ psychologists
☐ medical doctors
☐ outpatient programs
☐ group homes
☐
☐ unknown
☐ other __________________

Family of Origin - Rating

☐ stable and secure - no family related problems

☐ mildly chaotic - occasional instability and disruption

☐ moderately chaotic - disruptive, large family, some relocations

☐ severely chaotic - instability, many relocations, single parent with many transient mates, parental fighting, parents and/or siblings abusive

☐ uncertain

Based on
FAMILY HISTORY
☐ intake
☐ summary

ID#________________________

Relationship to Offender ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

Date of Birth _____________ Age___

Occupation ________________________________

Victimizations

# of sexual victimizations ____ offenders:

# of physical victimizations ____ offenders:

Offenses

# of sexual offenses ______ victims:

# of physical offenses ______ victims:

Relationship History

Common Law _________ Offenders age(s) _________

Marriages ___________ Offenders age(s) _________

Separations _________ Offenders age(s) _________

Divorces _____________ Offenders age(s) _________

Children _____________

Extra Marital Affairs ______ Offenders age(s) _________

knowledge of affairs ☐ Y ☐ N ☐ Unknown

Police contact ☐ Y ☐ N ☐ Unknown

illegal activities:
BEHAVIOURAL/EMOTIONAL DIFFICULTIES

☐ depression

☐ suicidal attempts

☐ suicide thoughts

☐ threatening others

☐ posessing weapons

☐ somatic complaints

☐ over eating

☐ under eating

☐ alcohol abuse

☐ drug use abuse

☐ cruelty to animals

☐ firesetting

☐ defying authority

☐ running away

☐ other ________________________

☐ other ________________________

☐ emotionally cruel to others

☐ physically cruel to others

☐ physical fighting w/ spouse

☐ verbal fighting w/ spouse

☐ physical fighting w/ siblings

☐ verbal fighting w/ siblings

(circle if suspected or diagnosed - medical/psychological)

☐ ADD suspected/diagnosed

☐ ADHD suspected/diagnosed

☐ conduct disorder suspected/diagnosed

☐ other suspected/diagnosed ________________________

☐ other suspected/diagnosed ________________________
Antisocial Behaviours

ID# __________________________

☐ intake  ☐ offender/client
☐ assessment/therapy _______ (months)

BEHAVIOURAL/EMOTIONAL DIFFICULTIES

☐ depression
☐ suicidal attempts
☐ suicide thoughts
☐ posessing weapons
☐ somatic complaints
☐ firesetting
☐ defying authority
☐ running away
☐ over eating
☐ under eating
☐ alcohol abuse
☐ drug use abuse
☐ cruelty to animals
☐ emotional bullying/threatening to others
☐ physical fighting to others
☐ verbal fighting with others

☐ threatening parents
☐ physical fighting w/ parent(s)
☐ verbal fighting w/ parent(s)

☐ threatening siblings
☐ physical fighting w/ sibling(s)
☐ verbal fighting w/ sibling(s)

☐ other __________________________

☐ other __________________________

(circle if suspected or diagnosed-medical/psychological)

☐ ADD suspected/diagnosed
☐ ADHD suspected/diagnosed
☐ conduct disorder suspected/diagnosed
☐ parents abused alcohol suspected/confirmed
☐ other __________________________

1. Physical fighting before age 16

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
no fighting some fighting a lot of fights

who:

2. Discipline and/or attendance problems in elementary school

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
no problems some problems serious problems

explain:
NONSEXUAL OFFENSES

- **intake**
- **asmt/therapy _____ (months)**

ID# __________________________

**Offenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charges</th>
<th>Convictions</th>
<th>Self-Report</th>
<th>Alleged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Shoplifting/stealing
| ☐ Vandalism/mischief
| ☐ Break and Enter
| ☐ Assault/violence
| ☐ Armed robbery
| ☐ Trespassing/loitering
| ☐ Breach of probation/open custody
| ☐ Theft (over or under)
| ☐ Possession of stolen goods
| ☐ Forgery/fraud
| ☐ Weapons/possession
| ☐ Drug/possession
| ☐ other __________________________ |

**Disposition & duration**

(over for code sheet)

**Level of Violence**

(over for code sheet)

**Ages**

# Cooffenders

(over for code sheet)
SEXUAL DEVIANCE HISTORY

☐ intake
☐ assessment/therapy ______ (months)

☐ yrs/age
☐ Corrob/ Date in file

☐ pornography-type _____________
  ☐ alone
  ☐ peer activity
  ☐ adult intervention

☐ voyeurism/peeping
  ☐ alone
  ☐ peer activity
  ☐ adult intervention

☐ exhibitionism
  ☐ alone
  ☐ peer activity
  ☐ adult intervention

☐ obscene phone calling
  ☐ alone
  ☐ peer activity
  ☐ adult intervention

☐ bestiality
☐ other __________________________
SEX OFFENSE HISTORY

☐ intake ☐ offender-victim #  
☐ therapy ___ (months) ☐ victim-victimization #  
☐ other relative ____________________________

ID# ____________________________ Date ____________________________

Offender’s age at last offense _____ Offender’s gender ☐ M ☐ F

Date of last offense (month/year) ______________________________

Victim’s age at last offense _____ Victim’s gender ☐ M ☐ F

Accused relationship to victim

☐ Intrafamilial __ __ __ __ __
☐ Extrafamilial

Duration

☐ 1 time only

☐ ___ x(s) per ☐ month
☐ week
☐ day for___ ☐ years
☐ months
☐ days

☐ unknown
☐ unsure
☐ other ____________________________

Co-offenders

☐ yes, ____________________________
☐ no ☐ unknown
☐ other ____________________________

Location

☐ private home ☐ street/alley/path
☐ park/playground ☐ vehicle
☐ private property ☐ parking lot/garage
☐ school ☐ group home
☐ victim/offender home ☐ non-residential bldg
☐ victim’s home ☐ offender’s home ☐ unknown
☐ other ____________________________
Victim disclosed to
• mother  • father  • brother
• sister  • aunt  • unknown
• teacher  • peer  • other ________

Assault types
offender to victim _______ _______ _______
____ ______ ______ ______

victim to offender _______ _______ _______
____ ______ ______ ______

Charges pressed
• Y, what____________________________
• Unknown
• No, why? _______________________

Conviction
• Y  • all charges
• Some  Plea Bargained  □N  □Y
• Unknown
• N  Why? _______________________

Sentence
• probation
• community service order
• open custody
• secure custody
• fine
• absolute discharge
• other __________
• unknown

Length
### Substance used at time of offense

- by offender
  - N
  - Unknown
  - Y
- by victim
  - N
  - Unknown
  - Y
- forced use
  - N
  - Unknown
  - Y

### Level of Violence

1. (e.g., coaxing, convincing)
2. (e.g., swearing, pushing, slight grabbing)
3. (e.g., slapping, grabbing, holding, threats of violence)
4. (e.g., punching, kicking, beating, death threats)
5. (e.g., weapon, extreme beating)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coercion</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Corroboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attempted Silence with:</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Corroboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DENIAL AND MINIMIZATION SCALE

☐ intake  ☐ offender/client
☐ therapy/assessment ___(months)  ☐ parent/figure_______

☐ victim # ______________  Victimization # ____________

ID# ___________________________  Date ______________

Denial

☐ any interaction (never involved with)

☐ interaction was sexual (back rub)

☐ interaction was offense (liked it, provoked, no meant yes)

Minimization of:

Responsibility

☐ victim blame (eventually enjoyed, I was seduced)

☐ external attributions (alcohol, bad reputation)

☐ internal attributions (emotional problems, bad parents)

Extent

☐ frequency

☐ # of previous victims

☐ amount of force used

☐ intrusiveness—acts

Harm

☐ no long term effects

☐ victim education (they learned from me, I taught them)

No denial or minimization

☐ no denial

☐ no minimization
Overall Summary

SEX OFFENSE HISTORY

Total number of victimizations __________________________

Total number of sexual offenses __________________________
  a) male children __________________________
  b) female children __________________________
  c) male adolescents __________________________
  d) female adolescents __________________________
  e) male adults __________________________
  f) female adults __________________________

Total number of moves __________________________

Total number of schools __________________________

SEXUAL HISTORY

Age when first has consenting sexual contact _____ years
Age when first experienced consenting sexual contact _____ years
Number of consenting female sex partners since puberty # ____
Number of consenting male sex partners since puberty # ____
First sexual partner was a: (circle one) stranger
  acquaintance/friend
  steady partner

Longest dating relationship _____ weeks/months

Number of dating partners (not necessarily sexually involved) # ____
## DISCHARGE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.D.#</th>
<th>Date Discharged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intake to Discharge months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Residential Moves

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- Other

### Therapies and Duration

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Individual
- Group
- Family
- Art/Play
- Marital (for parents)
- Dyadic and
- Dyadic and
- Other

### Was client ordered to receive treatment?

- N
- Y - remain past ordered date

- N
- Y - duration

### Did client complete therapy

- Y
- N - went to other agency
- Client determined unproductive
- SAFE-T determined unproductive
- Other
- Unknown

### Rated by therapist

### Risk level at discharge

- Poor
- Guarded
- Fair
- Good
- Other
- Unknown

### Risk Level - Scale of 1-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
<th>10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Case File #

**"grp"** = Group Type  
SOO = 1  
SOP = 2  

**"expsmcd"** = Early exposure to Sexual Media:  
1 = Yes  
2 = No  

**"agexsmed"** = Age of exposure to 1st sexual media  
Age:  

**"agexsexac"** = Age of onset of Sexual Activity  
Age:  

**"tsexoffe"** = Total number of sex offences  
Number:  

**"ageoffence"** = Offender age at time of offence  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sex offence #</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"cooffder"** = 1 = Yes  
2 = No  

**"relatshp"** = Relationship to victim  
interfamilial = 1  
extral familial = 2  

**"agevctm"** = Age of victim  
66 = older  
77 = under 12  
88 = peer aged  
99 = unknown  

**"gendvctm"** = Gender of victim  
Male = 1  
Female = 2  

**"victms"** = Type of Victim  
sibling- biological = 1  
sibling- half = 2  
sibling- step = 3  
sibling- adopted = 4  
foster = 5  
neighbourhood = 6  
school = 7  
family friend = 8  
relative = 9  
friend = 10  
aquaintance = 11  
stranger = 12  
unknown = 99  

**"freqsx"** = Frequency of Sexual Assault  
99 = unknown  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (X times)</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration (months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**"sexastyp"** = Type of Sexual Assault  
inappropriate kissing = 1  
oral sex = 2  
vaginal intercourse = 3  
anal intercourse = 4  
dry/simulated intercourse = 5  
exposed = 6  
anal penetration/object = 7  
vaginal penetration/object = 8  
forced sex acts with others = 9  
bestiality = 10  
fondling above waist = 11  
fondling below waist = 12  
fondling over clothes = 13  
fondling under clothes = 14  
voyeurism/peeping = 15  
bondage = 16  
digital vaginal penetration = 17  
anal digital penetration = 18  
pornography = 19  
touching - not specified = 20  
unknown/other = 21  

**"levelvio"** = Level of Violence/Coevolution: Physical  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sex offence #</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| coercion/convincing = 1  
swearing/punishment/grabbing = 2  
slapping/grabbing/holding = 3  
punching/beatings/death threats = 4  
weapon/extreme beating = 5  
unknown = 6  

**"dyrbirth"** = Year of Birth  

| "dctry" = Offender's Country of Birth  
Canada = 1  
Other = 2  

| "lang" = Offender's first Language  
English = 1  
Other = 2  

| "moves" = Number of Moves  
No.  

| "schools" = Number of Schools  
No.  

| "fageoffender" = Number of Parental Figures  
No.  

**"chgpnm"** = Changes in Parenting situation  

**"facmchaos"** = Family Chaos  
stable & secure = 1  
mildly chaotic = 2  
moderately chaotic = 3  
severely chaotic = 4  
uncertain = 5  

**"ssdevian"** = Known Sexual Deviance  
YES = 1  
NO = 2  

**"prevsait" = Prior Sexual Victimization  
YES = 1  
NO = 2  

| Suspected/Alleged = 3  
| Suspected/Alleged = 3  

**"antibeh"** = History of Antisocial Behaviour  
YES = 1  
NO = 2  

| "ageagg" = Age of on-set of Non-sex Aggression  
Age:  
88 = unknown/unsure  
99 = none  

| "tnonsexoa" = Total number of non-sexual offences  
Number:  
88 = unknown/unsure  
99 = none  

**"nonsexty"** = Non-sex offense type: charged  
non-sex offence #  
shoplifting/stealing = 1  
vandalism/mischief = 2  
breach & enter = 3  
assault/volence = 4  
armed robbery = 5  
treason/passing = 6  
theft (over/under) = 7  
stolen goods/potency = 8  
forgeries/fraud = 9  
weapons/possession = 10  
drugs/possession = 11  
other = 12  
unknown = 99  

**"famsa1,2,3,4"** = Family SA History:  

| "famcrtm1,2,3,4" = Family Criminal History:  
charge:  

| mother = 1  
father = 2  
step-mother = 3  
step-father = 4  
sibling #1 = 5  
sibling #2 = 6  
sibling #3 = 7  
step-sibling = 8  
grandparent = 9  
extended family = 10  
unknown/unsure = 99  

**"attlivio"** = Level of Violence/Attempted Silence: Physical  

| sex offence #  
coercion/convincing = 1  
swearing/punishment/grabbing = 2  
slapping/grabbing/holding = 3  
punching/beatings/death threats = 4  
weapon/extreme beating = 5  
unknown = 6  

| Attachment/Level of Violence/Attempted Silence: Physical  

| sex offence #  
coercion/convincing = 1  
swearing/punishment/grabbing = 2  
slapping/grabbing/holding = 3  
punching/beatings/death threats = 4  
weapon/extreme beating = 5  
unknown = 6  

|
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