

A DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS OF
DISPOSITIONS OF MALE JUVENILE
SEXUAL AND NONSEXUAL
OFFENDERS

By

JANA GOBER ZIMMERMAN

Bachelor of Science in Education
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas
1979

Master Of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1984

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
May, 1989

Thesis
1989D
Z74J
COP. 2

A DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS OF
DISPOSITIONS OF MALE JUVENILE
SEXUAL AND NONSEXUAL
OFFENDERS

Thesis Approved:

James M. Dean

Thesis Adviser

J. J. S. S. S.

Joseph Pearl

Alfred Carlziz

Kay R. Murphy

Norman R. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

Variables thought to contribute to disposition decisions were compared in a discriminant function analysis which showed that legal factors of recidivism rate, number of current offenses, and type of offense and the psychological indice of the Rorschach Suicide Constellation Summary Score contributed the most variance. Accurate prediction of classification of juvenile offenders' dispositions was moderately high at 56%. However, based on the fact that mixed offense patterns and violence as a "modus operandus" tended to separate sex and person offenders from property offenders, it was suggested that the weighting of the variables be modified. As a result, the contribution of use of force and offense pattern would be increased in decisions regarding dispositions and recidivism rate, number of current offenses, and type of offense would be reduced in importance. It is hoped that policy on disposition decisions will be affected in such a way that the psychosocial needs of the juvenile offenders are better met.

The conclusion of this paper has been long in coming and I owe much gratitude to many people. First of all, my spouse, Jubal, has endured much the last few years and I will be forever grateful. Secondly, my committee members,

Dr. Seals, Dr. Bull, Dr. Carlozzi, Dr. Pearl, and Dr. Murphy, have been very understanding and supportive throughout this process. I especially thank Dr. Bull who has gone far beyond the duty of a committee member. Dr. Seals has been my faithful connection to another world as I tried to work and complete this project and I have certainly appreciated all his efforts.

Special thanks go to Dr. Saleem Ateek and Betty Collingsworth of the juvenile department in the county studied. Their thoughtful accomodation of my needs in their busy schedule was sincerely appreciated.

Finally, I want to thank Dr. John Skinner and Dr. Rick Hussian for their encouragement and comments. The "motivational" comments of Vernon Washington, C.S.W. and Dr. Luis Irurita were exceptionally beneficial in seeing this project through to the end.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of Study	10
Statement of the Problem	12
Hypotheses	15
Definition of Terms	16
Limitations	18
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	22
Impact of Labeling on Disposition	22
Juvenile Offender Studies	25
Gender	25
Race and Socioeconomic Status	27
Size	30
Studies Comparing Juvenile Sexual and Nonsexual Offenders	34
Recommended Assessment Procedures Specific to Juvenile Sexual Offenders	35
Results of Psychological Assessment: Personality Functioning	39
Results of Psychological Assessment: Intellectual Functioning	48
Nonlegal Variables	52
Gender	52
Influence of Race and Socioeconomic Status	55
Size	60

Chapter	Page
Legal Variables	60
Identification of Sexual Offenses	60
Disposition Related to Seriousness of the Offense and Use of Force	68
Recidivism in Sexual and Nonsexual Offenses	74
Summary.	80
III. METHOD.	82
Subjects	82
Instruments.	83
Use of Instruments with Juveniles.	88
Procedure.	91
Statistical Analysis	93
Description of the Sample	94
Hypotheses.	95
IV. RESULTS	97
Description of Sample.	97
Personality Variables.	98
Intellectual Functioning	99
Legal Variables.	100
V. DISCUSSION.	106
Personality Variables.	106
Intellectual Functioning	109
Seriousness of the Offense	111
Socioeconomic and Race Variables	114
Predictor Variables.	116
Theoretical Implications and Applications.	118
Recommendations for Further Research.	120
Summation.	124
REFERENCES.	127
APPENDIX.	135

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Age by Disposition	136
2. Univariate F Test - Age.	137
3. Personality Functioning by Disposition	138
4. Sample Personality Functioning	142
5. Intellectual Functioning by Disposition.	143
6. Sample Intellectual Functioning.	147
7. Description of the Sample.	148
8. Summary Description of the Sample.	149
9. Income, Housing Costs, and Race by Disposition.	150
10. Rorschach Summary Scores by Disposition.	151
11. Univariate F Tests - Rorschach Summary Scores.	152
12. Univariate F Tests - MMPI.	153
13. Univariate F Tests - Intelligence and Achievement	155
14. Offense Type and Force by Disposition.	156
15. Current Offense Number and Recidivism by Disposition.	157
16. Race by Current Offense Type	158
17. Results of Discriminant Function Analysis of Dispositions.	159
18. Univariate F Tests - Predictor Variables	160

Table

Page

19. Pooled Within-Group Correlations
among Predictors. 161

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The data on the juvenile exhibiting sexually aggressive behaviors are limited. This limitation is particularly evident when compared with the extensive research on the juvenile nonsexual offender. The relatively recent focus on juvenile sexual offenders resulted from the research of adult sexual offenders (Groth, 1977). Yet, early studies of juvenile sexual offenders noted the exclusion of juveniles from the study of adult sex offenders and proposed the connection between juvenile and adult sexually offending behaviors (Atcheson & Williams, 1954; Doshay, 1943; Waggoner & Boyd, 1941). A trend suggesting similarity or homogeneity among sexual offenders of all ages as a distinct group of offenders continues to be detected in the literature. This rather implicit assumption that juvenile sexual offenders and juvenile offenders are, thus, dissimilar is reflected in the retrospective self report studies of adult sex offenders and juvenile sex offenders, where no comparison groups of nonsexual offenders are employed. These assumptions fueled the arguments in favor of early intervention with and differential dispositions of

juvenile sexual offenders.

Empirical support for a developmental connection between the sexual offending behaviors of juveniles and adults is demonstrated in retrospective studies of the adult sex offender. Finkelhor (1981) suggested long-term effects of child sexual abuse as one possible etiological explanation of sexually offending behaviors. This argument posits that the child sexual abuse victim identifies with the aggressor in order to regain a sense of control of his or her life situation. Thus, recognition of the need for early intervention began to evolve. Further evidence, found in the retrospective self-report studies of the adult sex offender, showed that the onset of sexually aggressive behaviors, of many offenders, initially occurs in the adolescent years (Longo, 1982; Longo & Groth, 1983). Finally, Groth, Longo, and McFadin (1982) studied incarcerated adults convicted of rape and child molestation finding that the mean age for rapists on first self-reported offense was 16 years and modal age was 16 years for both.

Confirmation of pre-adult onset of deviant sexual behaviors can be found in studies of juvenile sexual offenders. Monastersky and Smith (1985) of the University of Washington Juvenile Sexual Offender Project reported 65% of 440 males seen in the program had a history of a prior sexual offense. Awad, Saunders, and Levene (1983) determined onset of first sexual offenses occurred between

the ages of thirteen and fifteen for 87% of their 24 subjects. Longo's (1982) study of seventeen adolescent sexual offenders tried as adults revealed an age range of eight through seventeen years for first sexual assault.

The determination of increasing aggressiveness of sexually offending behaviors and proximity to victims added emphasis to the call for early intervention. Evidence of escalation of sexual aggression and chronicity of sexually aggressive behaviors was supported in the study by Longo and Groth (1983). In this retrospective self-report study, 35 per cent of 231 incarcerated rapists (committed sexual crimes against adults) and child molesters (committed sexual crimes against children) reported a history, with adolescent onset, of compulsive masturbation, exhibitionism, or voyeurism. Further, a deviant sexual arousal pattern was established prior to 18 years of age in over 50 percent of the offenders in the study by Becker and Abel (1984). Freeman-Longo (1985) reported deviant sexual fantasies to begin on the average at age 15 among sex offenders.

Knight, Rosenberg, and Schneider (1985) assert that the identifying label of sexual offender implies "homogeneity" (p. 309) with others so labeled. Yet, heterogeneity or differences among sexual offenders has emerged from the various efforts at classification in terms of demographic characteristics and differences in

offending behavior. The finding apparently applies to studies of juvenile sexual offenders as well (Smith, Monastersky, and Deisher, 1987). Again, Abel, Becker, Cunningham-Rather, and Lucas (cited in Becker & Abel, 1984) isolated multiple paraphiliac behaviors among 306 juveniles evaluated including: female nonincest pedophiles (15.4%), male nonincest pedophiles (21.2%), female incest pedophiles (8.8%), male incest pedophiles (2.6%), rapists (4.9%), exhibitionists (13.1%), voyeurs (7.2%), frotteurs (5.9%), and other paraphilias (20.9%). Monastersky and Smith (1985) presented a breakdown of sexually aggressive behaviors exhibited by a sample of 305 males evaluated at the University of Washington including rape (23%), indecent liberties (57%), exhibitionism (11%), voyeurism, fetishisms, and other paraphiliac behaviors (18%). Adding further complication, multiple diagnoses may be applicable to one individual. Becker, Kaplan, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kavoussi (1986) question the validity of the previous distinction made between incest offenders and nonincest sexual offenders in their study of 22 adolescent incest sexual offenders as 41% of their sample reported other paraphilias.

Treatment of sample juvenile subjects as a homogenous group in terms of sexual offenses has been criticized as a faulty, but "common" (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987, p. 421) methodological practice. Where comparison groups of

nonsexual offenders were employed, similarities between groups have been discerned. A study by McManus, Alessi, Grapentine, and Brickman (1984) of 71 incarcerated juvenile delinquents, including 6 subjects adjudicated for sexual assault involving a weapon or felonious assault, proves illustrative in that the psychiatric principal diagnoses, based on research diagnostic criteria (RDC) and the DSM-III, of the sex offenders included Axis I diagnoses (50%) and Axis II diagnoses (50%). Of the remaining 65 nonsexual offenders evaluated, 42% received psychiatric diagnoses that included Axis I diagnoses (18%) and Axis II diagnoses (23%). The Axis I diagnosis of conduct disorder was assigned to proportionately more sexual offenders (33%) than nonsexual offenders (15%). Findings of intellectual functioning within the average range for both groups presents further support for the suggestion that groups of nonsexual and sexual offenders may share common characteristics (Awad et al., 1979).

The classification or label of juvenile offender is semantically linked to a criminally-oriented connotation that invokes related issues of adjudication and rehabilitative treatment within the juvenile justice system. Surprisingly, adjudication appears to be a relatively new phenomenon for juveniles convicted of sexually aggressive offenses according to Neilson (cited in Freeman-Longo, 1985):

In 1890 we found no record of juveniles committed to the Oregon juvenile justice system for sex crimes. In the nineteen sixties there were just a few adolescent sex offenders. In the nineteen seventies we began to see an increase in juveniles committed for sexual crimes. Here in the nineteen eighties we are shocked to find adolescents committed not only for rapes and child sexual abuse charges but rape murders as well (p. 130).

A rationale for the recent increase in numbers of incarcerated juvenile sexual offenders may be found in the historical perception held by those in power, or with some level of status, of sexually aggressive juveniles as nonoffenders. Factors including an equitable racial distribution (rather than greater minority representation), predominantly male gender, and a slight trend toward higher socioeconomic status among juvenile sexual offenders (Doshay, 1943; Awad et al., 1979) may have accounted for the favorable treatment in light of Siegel and Senna's (1981) position that status has a great influence on who determines labels and who receives labels. [It should be recognized that the incidence rates of sexually aggressive behaviors perpetrated by juveniles are distorted or basically unknown due to under-reporting, reliance on arrest rates, suspect reliability of self-report, and lack of empirical studies (Becker & Abel, 1984)]. Consequently, legal decisions regarding case findings or dispositions have varied for sexual offenses committed by juveniles. Knopp (1985) described the responses by the judicial system to the identified sexually aggressive juvenile as ranging

from ultimate disregard or dismissal of the behavior as normal adolescent sexual behavior to incarceration without treatment for punitive rather than rehabilitative reasons.

Perception of seriousness of the offense becomes a relevant consideration. Groth (1977) commented on the tendency to diminish the seriousness of juvenile sexually aggressive behavior by various institutions including the courts. This seemed to be based on the fear of stigmatization of the child or again, the "boys will be boys" perspective such that the "offense is regarded as merely sexual experimentation, situational in nature or as an expression of the normal aggressiveness of a sexually maturing male" (p. 249). In a later publication, Groth and Loredó (1981) reported that a majority of 50 juvenile sexual offenders evaluated over a period of three years had disclosed a history of normative sexual experiences. Results of a descriptive study of 67 juvenile sexual offenders evaluated and treated on an outpatient basis by Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kaplan (1986) indicated "82% had engaged in nondeviant, nongenital sexual behavior and 58% had engaged in nondeviant, genital sexual behaviors" (p. 441) prior to the onset of deviant sexual behaviors. Becker and Abel (1984) proposed the use of the DSM III in differentiating "normative sexual behavior" from the paraphilias (p.2).

Freeman-Longo (1985) observed the trend to promote

another label of juvenile sexual aggression as that of "adolescent adjustment reaction" with the outcome said to be "minimal to nonexistent intervention or supervision" (p. 132). Thus, the accused juvenile is enabled to successfully avoid the stigma of psychiatric and juvenile justice systems. Nonaggressive sexual offenses termed "nuisance offenses" such as exhibitionism and voyeurism seem particularly related to low level intervention (Longo & McFadin, 1981). Therefore, minimal to no use of force in the perpetration of a sexual offense can be treated as innocuous in the legal system and the disposition determined accordingly. Deisher, Wenet, Paperny, Clark, and Fehrenbach (1982) cautioned the practicing physician to recognize and treat seriously the paraphiliac behaviors of juveniles that do not include coercion or force such as voyeurism and exhibitionism.

Recidivism as an indice of the development of chronic sexually offending behaviors was described by Becker, Cunningham-Rathner and Kaplan (1986) in their study of juvenile sexual offenders. Based on official and self-report data, their findings indicate 72 sexual assaults were committed by 41 subjects classified as pedophiles and 49 sexual assaults were committed by 17 subjects classified as rapists. A total of 89.6% of the subjects reported prior arrests for sexual crimes although 50.7% had not been incarcerated for any length of time.

Abel et al. (1984) concluded the "average adolescent sexual offender may be expected to commit 380 sex crimes during his lifetime" (p. 1). Interestingly, the generally high rate of recidivism of juvenile sexual offenders in nonsexual offenses reported in several studies (Atcheson & Williams, 1954; Awad et al. 1979; Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus, 1979) comparing juvenile sexual offenders with juvenile offenders denotes the probability that commonalities exist between the two types of offender populations.

Thornberry (1973) distinguished between legal and nonlegal variables in evaluating the contribution of certain factors to the determination of dispositions of juvenile offenders. In doing so, he concluded legal variables of seriousness of the offense and recidivism were significantly related to disposition. However, later research efforts pointed to the influence of nonlegal variables of gender, race, and socioeconomic status in the determination of disposition. Likewise, factors of seriousness of the offense and recidivism have had minimal consistent impact on disposition decisions for juvenile sexual offenders. Therefore, disposition determinations for juvenile sexual offenders may be unduly influenced by nonlegal variables.

In summary, a developmental analogue of offending behaviors occurring between the stages of adolescence (or

earlier stages of childhood) and adulthood connoted the necessity of early identification and differential treatment of juvenile sexual offenders so that adequate intervention would reduce the risk of development of a pattern of sexually aggressive behavior that might prove resistant to change (Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kaplan, 1986; Bonner, 1986; Groth & Loreda 1981; Longo & McFadin, 1981). Studies of adult and juvenile sex offenders that were primarily descriptive and lacked comparison groups implied a perception of juvenile sexual offenders as similar to each other and different from juvenile nonsexual offenders. However, assumptions regarding homogeneity among juvenile sexual offenders as a group have not been supported. Examination and comparison of the contribution of legal and nonlegal variables to disposition decisions for both groups was indicated based on the reports of commonalities between sample groups of juvenile sexual and nonsexual offenders and the relationship between nonlegal variables and disposition outcomes.

Purpose of Study

A critical question that becomes readily apparent is whether different dispositions and/or treatment for juvenile sexual and nonsexual offenders are warranted. Medical, corrections, or mental health orientations may

comprise the global setting such that treatment of juvenile sexual offenders may occur in outpatient settings, residential and inpatient settings, and secure or closed settings (Knopp, 1985; Ryan, 1986). In real terms, resources for assessment, treatment, and post-treatment may be quite limited as noted by Knopp (1985):

Though 40 states offer some type of private or public treatment for these young clients, very few states provide comprehensive assessment, treatment, and post-treatment services. As a result, courts usually have limited treatment options available and thus young sex offenders may be placed in settings highly inappropriate to their treatment and custodial needs (p. 7).

Therefore, the lack of adequate or appropriate treatment facilities has been perceived as a major barrier to providing early intervention and reducing recidivism coupled with the fact that juveniles are assigned to diverse types of treatment settings (Thomas & Rogers, 1983). Evaluation and treatment is currently the focus of the National Adolescent Perpetrator Network National Task Force (Ryan, 1986) and clinicians involved in field research (Becker & Abel, 1984; Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kaplan, 1986). However, Bonner (1986) noted long-term studies evaluating outcome particularly comparing the treated and nontreated juvenile have not been forthcoming.

Fiscal and social responsibility are addressed by Abel et al. (1984) in reporting a success rate of 98.9% one week post treatment for 87 adult sexual offenders and

79.2% 6-12 months post treatment for 24 offenders treated at the Sexual Behavior Clinic. Prior to treatment, these 87 child molesters committed an average of 471.16 sexual assaults each totaling 40,991. A comparative cost analysis revealed that 6.6 therapist hours per offender at \$100 per hour totaling \$700 were utilized in this group treatment approach that vastly undercut the average \$15,000 to \$40,000 per offender per year cost of incarceration. Admittedly without supportive treatment outcome data, Knopp (1985) contrasts the costs of community-based treatment for low-risk juvenile sexual offenders (an estimated \$900 in New York) with incarceration (\$80,000 for a secure New York Division for Youth facility) in her recommendation for early intervention efforts. The increasing recognition of preadolescent offenders (Gil, 1985) presents a compelling argument for early intervention in itself. However, comparisons of juvenile sexual and nonsexual offenders may not be convincingly different to warrant dissimilar disposition outcomes.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate what legal and nonlegal factors, including type of offense, use of force, and recidivism (legal factors) and socioeconomic status and race (nonlegal factors) are influential in the

differentiation of types of dispositions of juveniles charged with sexual offenses and juveniles charged with person or property offenses. Additionally, the contribution of psychological functioning including personality features and cognitive abilities was assessed. Variables thought to be influential and thus controlled, included age and physical size. The study was retrospective as the data were collected from records compiled on each juvenile charged with a sexual offense and evaluated by the psychological unit of a large southwestern county juvenile department during the time span of January, 1984 through June, 1988. An equivalent number of records of juveniles charged with property and person offenses of a nonsexual nature was randomly selected for comparison.

The offense type and information regarding recidivism was gathered from the juvenile department file maintained by the assigned probation officer. Degree of force employed in the commission of the offense as described in the police report and predisposition report prepared by the probation officer was estimated through the application of the aggression rating scale developed by Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kaplan (1986). Information regarding final disposition was taken from the court order filed in the juvenile department file on each subject. Possible disposition outcomes included referral

by police to counseling and services for first time offenders, informal adjustment with referral to community services, dismissal of the charges, probation, court-ordered counseling or services within the juvenile department and the community, court-ordered institutionalization in foster homes, group homes, or residential treatment care facilities, court commitment to Youth Commission facilities, or certification as an adult. Psychological functioning was measured with instruments including the Rorschach and/or the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory dependent on the age of the subject. Intellectual functioning was assessed according to the subject's performance on the Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised and one of three intelligence tests including Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (or the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Adults-Revised), Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, or the Culture Fair Intelligence Test. These instruments are routinely administered by the juvenile department psychology staff and thus, scores were readily available. Further, these tests are commonly included in psychological test batteries in a variety of settings and used with multiple populations. A determination of socioeconomic status was based on available information including income and housing costs as documented in the subject's file.

Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that legal factors such as type of offense, use of force, and recidivism would not significantly contribute to the types of disposition. Instead, disposition would be more accurately classified by nonlegal factors including socioeconomic status and race. Psychological functioning (personality features and cognitive abilities) would not significantly impact disposition decisions. Specific hypotheses include:

1. Evidence of psychopathology would not serve to differentiate between types of dispositions.

2. Intellectual functioning would not differentiate between types of dispositions assigned to subjects.

3. Type of offense would not serve to differentiate between classifications of disposition. That is, juveniles charged with sexual, person, or property offenses will not vary significantly in assignment of dispositions.

4. Use of force would not serve to differentiate between dispositions. Subjects who employed physical or excessive physical force in the commission of the offense will not differ in disposition from those subjects who employed verbal or no coercion.

5. Evidence of recidivism would not serve to differentiate between dispositions. Subjects whose records indicate a pattern of recidivism will not differ in

disposition from those subjects charged with significantly fewer offenses.

6. Socioeconomic status would serve to differentiate between types of dispositions. Low socioeconomic subjects are more likely to be prosecuted, adjudicated, and removed from the community than middle to high socioeconomic subjects.

7. Race would serve to differentiate between dispositions. Minority subjects would be more readily prosecuted, adjudicated, and removed from the community than majority subjects.

8. Type of offense and race would interact to differentiate between types of dispositions. That is, minority subjects would be arrested more frequently than majority subjects for particular offenses.

9. In general, nonlegal variables of socioeconomic status and race would be more likely to differentiate between dispositions than legal variables of type of offense, use of force, and recidivism or psychological functioning.

Definition of Terms

Relevant definitions of delinquent conduct and conduct indicating a need for supervision as defined in the Texas Family Code (Texas Department of Human Resources, 1981), Section 51.03 will be discussed.

Offenses considered as conduct indicating a need for supervision include unexcused school absences, absences from the home, and inhalation of fumes and vapors unless committed in association with an additional offense and are not relevant to the study. Other status offenses or activities considered illegal only when juveniles are involved are not pertinent indices of juvenile criminal behavior and will not be included in the study.

Delinquent conduct is defined in Section 51.03 as a violation other than a traffic offense including:

- (1) penal law of the state of Texas
- (2) disposition as established by Section 54.04 and Section 54.05. Section 54.04 delineates hearing processes and disposition alternatives. Section 54.05 describes the allowances and processes of hearings to modify dispositions.

Conduct indicating a need for supervision is defined in Section 51.03 as a violation of:

- (1) Texas penal laws of the grade of misdemeanor or penal ordinances
- (2) laws governing driving while intoxicated or under the influence of any drug.

The target offense(s) will typically be consistent with those charges referenced in the psychological evaluation or the referral form for psychological evaluation completed by the assigned probation officer and the legal court orders. The juvenile sexual offender has been charged with a crime(s) against a person of a sexual nature and may or may not be charged with additional crimes against persons or property of a nonsexual nature.

These subjects may or may not have a history of nonsexual offenses against persons or property. The juvenile offender has been charged with a crime(s) against a person of a nonsexual nature or property and may or may not have a history of sexual offenses.

Disposition refers to the legal outcome of the charges or petition filed against the juvenile and will be categorized as : no action taken (referral by police to group and individual counseling and services for first time offenders, informal adjustment, or dismissal of charges); assignment to the community (probation and/or court-ordered counseling or services), removal from the community (court-ordered institutionalization or Texas Youth Commission commitment) or certification as an adult. Disposition may be based on more than one offense particularly in the case of certification as an adult.

Limitations

Limitations of utilizing an involuntary population are acknowledged and results are interpreted accordingly. For example, information and responses given by subjects may be inaccurate. Also, some information that may have jeopardized the subject legally was not actively sought. Generalization to other populations will be restricted due to the nature of the sample studied and the involuntary status of the subjects. The juvenile department

policy requiring the psychological evaluation of all juveniles charged with a sexual offense or certified as an adult served to limit generalization. Also, the discretion of the arresting officer and the investigating officer acted as a screening process that affects the sample. In fact, all of the professionals involved made subjective decisions which were included in their various reports. This could not be standardized and controlled within this study.

State definitions of delinquent conduct and conduct in need of supervision vary in that comparison between states is difficult. The reported history of sexually offending behaviors is probably spuriously low, reflecting only those acts which were reported to the police and resulted in an arrest (Becker & Abel, 1984; Fehrenbach, Smith, Monastersky, & Deisher, 1986). Further, the lack of a statewide reporting system resulted in the documentation of only local charges in the juvenile's record.

The use of records to obtain data on the sample selected was subject to inconsistency, inaccuracy, and omissions in the recording by the responsible staff. Availability of records was problematic due to Dallas County Juvenile Department policies on storing and destroying closed records. Finally, legal procedures and/or court docket scheduling delayed the determination of dispositions of some subjects until a date after the

termination of the study, which reduced the sample size. Psychological test batteries were not consistent as the selection of the tests is at the discretion of each psychologist within the limits described above. Due to lack of resources, inter-judge reliability of the determination of use of force was not possible.

The rare acknowledgment of female juvenile sexual offenders adds to the labeling dilemma and the question of homogeneity among types of offenders. Finkelhor's (1984) review of studies of female sexual offenders indicates the dearth of research in the area of child sexual abuse. This is despite the reported incidence of sexual abuse offenses perpetrated by females involving 5% of females and 20% of males. Wolfe's (1985) literature review of research on female sexual offenders resulted in few studies beyond single case studies predominantly found in the psychoanalytic materials. Davis and Leitenberg (1987) comment on the absence of systematic comparisons of male and female adolescent sexual offenders in the most recent review of the literature available. Gil (1985) maintains that availability of treatment resources results in identification of adolescent girls who exhibit some similar clinical issues as the boys. Information provided by Dr. Saleem Ateek, Psychology Director at the juvenile department (personal communication, February 29, 1988) indicated few female sexual offenders

were processed by the juvenile department. Thus, the study sample included males only.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Impact of Labeling on Disposition

Walsh (1984), based on his study of sentencing patterns with adult offenders, concluded that "by the standards applied to non-sex offenders, sex offenders receive disproportionately severe sentences" (p. 458). Inherent in this conclusion is the significant negative impact of the label 'sex offender'. Walsh attributed the relatively harsh punishment to society's attempt to differentiate and isolate these offenders from the remainder of the population as a defense against admitting the capability to act similarly. Labeling theory can be applied both to the explanation of this occurrence of inequity in sentencing as well as to earlier references of the impact on juveniles labeled as sexually aggressive. H. Becker (cited in Liska, 1981) defines the labeling:

Social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitute deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an 'offender'. The deviant is one to whom that label

has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label (p. 186).

Liska (1981) comments on the lack of empirical support in relationship to social policy and labeling theory. He further states that in some cases the ultimate result of the diversion of juveniles to programs less socially stigmatizing is supposedly ill advised. The example of diversion of the juvenile to treatment programs where he/she is labeled "sick" may be more harmful than the label of delinquent. Essentially, the findings of various research projects are conflicting, but the labeling theory does seem to support the assumption that those without status are more likely to be labeled by those with status (Siegel & Senna, 1981). Additionally, those with status "possess the resources to actively resist societal reaction" (Liska, 1981, p. 141). Race, socioeconomic status, and gender may be variables considered in the awarding of status and subsequent decisions regarding what constitutes deviant behavior.

Roberts, Abrams, and Finch (1973) present a discussion of the labels of delinquency and delinquent sexual behavior:

In fact, one of the most significant things about delinquency is that almost any form of youthful behavior which society does not approve of may be labeled 'delinquent'. Delinquency in and of itself has no substantive meaning. It is instead an appellation used by society and its agencies of social control to designate various forms of youthful activity as deviant. Thus, sexual behavior termed 'delinquent' is

determined primarily by two factors - the prevailing standards and whether or not the participants are detected (p. 167).

In commenting about the legal status of the adolescent precariously situated between adulthood and childhood, Reiss (1967) describes the generality of offenses included in juvenile statutes such that "any sexual act or conduct can be defined as a delinquent offense" (p. 46).

Specificity regarding offending behaviors is avoided in favor of labeling the child a delinquent for corrective and control purposes as illustrated clearly by the legal category of status offenses. Though Brown (1984) was disparaging in his account of the 1980 work of Smith, Berkman, and Fraser, who associated the effects of abuse and neglect with labeling of juvenile victims as offenders following an introduction to the Juvenile Court, citing "conceptual weaknesses of labeling theory and the limited empirical support for its propositions" (p. 265), an important observation concluded from this review of the literature was that abused and neglected juvenile offenders were more likely to be institutionalized thus implying a lack of support systems.

Variables associated with the findings in the literature of both juvenile offenders and juvenile sexual offenders are examined in the exploration of the importance of labeling theory and its impact upon disposition decisions.

Juvenile Offender Studies

Legal variables of seriousness of the offense and number of previous offenses were found to be significant in earlier research efforts refuting suspicions of discriminatory sentencing and placement practices on racial and socioeconomic grounds (Thornberry, 1973). Summarizing the literature from 1934 through 1970, Felice and Offord (1971) distinguish the female juvenile delinquent from her male counterpart particularly in terms of the offense committed, characterizing the male as a property offender and the female as a sexual (status) offender. Recent research, however, has denoted the significance of nonlegal variables such as gender, race, and socioeconomic status in the type and severity of disposition received by juvenile offenders.

Gender

Studies of juvenile offenders and juvenile sexual offenders share a commonality in that few offer a comparison of gender. Figueira-McDonough (1985) charges sex discrimination within the juvenile justice system as responsible for differential processing and treatment of male and female offenses. She contends that status offenses committed by females result in more severe dispositions as reflected by official statistics. In addition, her review of two studies reveals similar

causative factors for both sexes involved in delinquent behaviors. Contrasting data is offered by McClelland (1982) who cites studies conducted in the United Kingdom and the United States "indicat[ing] that not only is female adolescent delinquency more prevalent than official figures indicate, but also that it is more qualitatively similar to male delinquency than the official figures lead one to believe" (p. 86) when status offenses are omitted from consideration. Aggressiveness is reported as the common feature marking recidivism in male and female offenders.

"Reverse sex bias" was demonstrated in a study by Lewis, Shanok, Cohen, Kligfeld, and Frisone (1980, p. 1215) who compared the records of male and female violent adolescents from the same urban area of Connecticut incarcerated or admitted to an adolescent unit of a state psychiatric hospital. A significant difference was found between the percentage of females (54% of 13 subjects) and males (30% of 22 subjects) hospitalized. The authors stated "aggressive behaviors that in adolescent boys are often treated as the deliberate acts of healthy youngsters are more likely to be recognized as psychologically aberrant when performed by girls" (p. 1215).

Race and Socioeconomic Status

Davis and Leitenberg (1987) noted the absence of control variables such as "socioeconomic status, neighborhood living conditions, or offense densities" (p. 421) in studies of race of adolescent sexual offenders. In their discussion of possible racial bias reflected in Uniform Crime Report statistics, these authors note the overrepresentation of black adolescents in 1980 and 1981 arrest statistics for sexual crimes (64% whites, 35% blacks) including forcible rape (42% whites, 58% blacks) as compared with all crimes (74% whites, 24% blacks). Inadequate control of race and socioeconomic status variables is evident, also, in the research of juvenile offenses that do not include sexual crimes.

Thornberry (1973) used the data of Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin which included the records of 3,475 Philadelphia boys labeled delinquent in behavior (a cross-sectional cohort study). Failing to compare race with socioeconomic status, he concluded that black subjects were sentenced more severely than white subjects, low socioeconomic subjects were sentenced more severely than high socioeconomic subjects, and control of seriousness of the crime and rate of recidivism did not affect the findings at the levels of the police, intake hearing, and juvenile court. These results contradict the findings of earlier comparable studies described by Thornberry.

Lewis, Balla, and Shanok (1979) reviewed the data of a study they had previously detailed in the literature that consisted of the clinical examination of the medical histories of 109 children randomly selected from a population known to the juvenile court. The conclusion of the authors' re-evaluation indicated race bias as the determining factor in the incarceration of black delinquent juveniles and the failure to receive needed psychological and medical services. The authors note that:

If psychiatrically disorganized black adults need to demonstrate severe behavioral disorganization in order to receive treatment, black juvenile delinquents are required to evidence still greater psychopathology in order to obtain treatment. This is because the economically deprived environment from which the black delinquent often comes, the behaviors with which he is charged, and his adolescent stage of development influence the white diagnostician to dismiss even the most bizarre and illogical acts as manifestations of normal ghetto behavior, signs of characterologic disorder, or evidence of adolescent adjustment difficulties. That his behavior is usually considered deviant and inappropriate by his own family and even by his peers is often disregarded (pp. 59-60).

Finally, these authors comment on the lack of attention to the abused and neglected black juvenile. In this study, an association between the black race and low socioeconomic status is assumed rather than established through systematic control of these two variables.

The study by Lewis et al. (1980) described above found that the variable that differentiated the two groups

was race. The psychiatric and correction subjects appeared psychiatrically and medically similar with the interesting exception that the incarcerated group had a history of significantly more head injuries. Results of comparisons of sex and race were not significant for females in the psychiatric or correctional settings in contrast to males. Hospitalized black males numbered 10% whereas hospitalized white males numbered 51%. Overall, 19% of black subjects were hospitalized compared with 54% of white subjects. Thus, the researchers concluded that "in the lower socioeconomic sectors of the urban area studied, violent, disturbed black adolescents were incarcerated; violent, disturbed white adolescents were hospitalized (p. 1215). This difference is attributed to the increased probability of misdiagnosis of the black client by the white clinician. Confinement of their study to cachement facilities for low socioeconomic residents prevented an accurate comparison with racial members from higher socioeconomic levels. The use of records (state hospital, correctional school, previous psychiatric evaluations, and local general hospital) as the only source of data for socioeconomic status was noted as a limitation of the study.

In a study comparing multiple variables of interest including gender, race, and socioeconomic status, Westendorp et al. (1986) compared two samples discrete in

time and referral source. The first sample consisted of 221 (107 males, 114 females) consecutive admissions to mental health treatment programs in 1979 and the second sample consisted of 55 (51 males, 4 females) consecutive placements in the juvenile justice system in 1981. Variables (listed in order) identified as determinants of placement into either the mental health or the correctional facilities were ethnicity, gender, MMPI assessment of depression, previous mental health history, level of productivity, drug use, parental marital history, and parental religious preference. The use of a discriminant function analysis indicated race as the most influential variable which led the authors to suggest racism. Socioeconomic status indices did not differentiate between the mental health subjects and juvenile justice subjects, but the authors acknowledge the confounding effects of other demographic variables of race and single-parent families.

Size

Shanok, Malani, Ninan, Guggenheim, Weinstein, & Lewis (1983) in their comparison of the hospital records of 29 delinquent males and 25 nondelinquent males who were admitted to the adolescent inpatient unit of a hospital in a one year time period concluded physical size was another variable influencing the dispositions of violent

offenders. The two groups were not distinguished by psychiatric or neurological symptomatology, learning disabilities or behavioral correlates of delinquency as established in the literature. However, the delinquent subjects had a higher incidence of prior psychiatric hospitalizations and were significantly more violent since childhood. Further, 24% of the mothers of delinquent subjects reported past psychiatric hospitalization in comparison with 4% of the mothers of the nondelinquent subjects. The authors, puzzled about when and why the classification of delinquency replaced that of mental illness since the violent behaviors were first exhibited in childhood by the delinquent subjects and were "not new manifestations of psychopathology" (p. 584), attributed their findings to the developmental physical changes in size associated with transition from childhood to adolescence.

To summarize, the validity of the procedures employed by the juvenile justice system to accurately differentiate between and place court-referred juveniles is called into question. The predominant nonlegal variable influencing the assessment of treatment needs, and the outcome of sentencing and placement in the studies discussed above was found to be race. The closely related nonlegal variable of socioeconomic status was not adequately controlled for in most of the studies. Additionally, a

history of violence rather than a history of mental illness appears to increase the likelihood of being labeled delinquent. A weakness in these studies was the failure to systematically compare legal variables of seriousness of the offense and prior offenses and nonlegal variables of gender, race, and socioeconomic status.

Gender comparisons are rare, but research findings suggest a two-way sexual discrimination process. For the female juvenile, the label of mental illness may be the outcome of violation of the culturally imposed definition of socially appropriate female behavior (for instance, aggression toward others). A contradictory label of delinquency is applied to the male juvenile exhibiting the same behaviors which are perceived as consistent with the stereotypical definition of male behavior. Status offenders may be more readily labeled delinquents if female. Unfortunately for both genders, many of the status offenses such as running away and promiscuity would benefit from mental health interventions directed toward the juvenile and the family. The minority male suffers from a compounding effect of both sexual and racial discrimination resulting in a greater likelihood of incarceration than majority and minority females and majority males. A final discriminatory mechanism having sexual and racial ramifications which may influence the dispositions of males and females is physical size.

The transfer of juveniles between the mental health and juvenile justice systems has prompted the suggestion that society determine the system ultimately responsible for the violent juvenile offender (Shanok, Malani, Ninan, Guggenheim, Weinstein, & Lewis, 1983). An alternative that combines the two systems in treating the violent juvenile offender is described by Hartstone and Coccozza (1983) as "one small component in a continuum of care" (p. 222). However, the authors urge caution in interpretation and application of the study results, examination of cost-effectiveness of the program, and evaluation of the need for such a program since their findings indicated small statistical group differences and fewer juveniles than expected met the admission criteria of violent and mentally ill. Also, program costs were higher than state training schools, but were reportedly less than mental health residential facilities. Westendorp et al. (1986) recommended further research evaluating mental illness and legal statutes and mental health and juvenile justice treatment outcomes. Yet, cost-effectiveness and success rates of treatment programs within the mental health and juvenile justice systems are dependent on accuracy of assessment and placement. Labeling the behaviors or offenses committed by juveniles as delinquent or nondelinquent and determining disposition decisions according to gender, race, or socioeconomic status prove

to be inaccurate as well as discriminatory practices.

Studies Comparing Juvenile Sexual and Nonsexual Offenders

Descriptive studies of the juvenile sexual offender population are numerous (e.g., Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kaplan, 1986; Becker, Kaplan, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kavoussi, 1986; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Groth, 1977; McClay, 1960; Shoor, Speed, & Bartelt, 1966; Smith, Monastersky, & Deisher, 1987; Waggoner, 1941). Whereas the employment of a delinquent comparison group is not unknown (e.g., Atcheson & Williams, 1954; Doshay, 1943; Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus, 1979; Markey, 1950; Tarter, Hegedus, Alterman, & Katz-Garris, 1983), only Awad et al. (1979) matched subjects on any variable. Comparison groups have consisted of adult sex offenders with a history of juvenile sex offenses, delinquent youth, violent delinquent youth, nonviolent delinquent youth, and delinquent youth with a history of sexual and nonsexual offenses. Davis and Leitenberg (1987) conclude their literature review with the notable observation that "we do not know if adolescent sex offenders truly differ from normal adolescents or from other delinquents who have never committed a sexual offense on a host of variables that have been clinically implicated but never empirically investigated in a controlled fashion" (p. 425).

Retrospective studies of juvenile sexual offender subjects are few (e.g., Atcheson & Williams; 1954; Shoor et al., 1966).

Recommended Assessment Procedures Specific
to Juvenile Sexual Offenders

Relatively little information is available regarding the personality functioning of juvenile sexual offenders in contrast with adult sexual offenders as noted by Smith et al. (1987) who found that "the few studies that have been published are limited by the use of measures of unknown reliability, by inadequate description of the samples, or by the lack of comparison groups" (p. 422). Yet, recommendations regarding the assessment of the juvenile sexual offender extend beyond the traditional battery of clinical interview and psychological tests to focus specifically on the sexual offending behaviors and associated factors (Bonner, 1986; Groth & Loreda, 1981; Thomas & Rogers, 1983). Bonner (1986) offered an expansion of the test battery utilized by Thomas and Rogers (1983) in the assessment of intrafamilial juvenile sexual offenders at the Juvenile Abuser Treatment Program in Washington, D.C. This modified test battery consists of the "Wechsler Intelligence for Children-Revised or the Otis Quick Scoring Test; Achenbach's Child Behavior Checklist; the Rorschach, Thematic Apperception Test, the

Jesness Inventory, or Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory; and the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale" (p. 5).

Thomas and Rogers (1983) have attempted to standardize the assessment procedure and provide a rating system to evaluate prognosis for treatment. Data related to six factors including intellectual functioning, school adjustment, family characteristics, relationships with peers, functioning within society, and psychological functioning is collected, rated, and then used to determine whether to accept into the treatment program. Refusal to provide treatment to referrals was based on "lack of eligibility" (i.e., refusal to consent, too young or too old, etc.) or extremely poor prognosis for treatment (e.g. multiple prior offenses, extremely low mental functioning, and so forth)" (p. 141). Treatment outcome is not addressed by the authors although 60 juvenile sexual offenders had been evaluated, more than half of the 60 had initiated treatment with four cases actually completing treatment, and three had dropped out of treatment at the time of publication.

Groth and Loredó (1981) treat assessment of the juvenile sexual offender as a process that focuses upon differentiation between normative sexual behaviors and sexual behaviors that range from nonaggressive, self-directed to aggressive, victim-directed (p. 33). Eight

questions are addressed in this evaluation including:

1. What is the age relationship between the persons involved?
2. What is the social relationship between the persons involved?
3. What type of sexual activity is being exhibited?
4. How does the sexual contact take place?
5. How persistent is the sexual activity?
6. Is there any evidence of progression in regard to the nature or frequency of the sexual activity?
7. What is the nature of the juvenile's fantasies that precede or accompany his behavior?
8. Are there any distinguishing characteristics about the persons who are the targets of the juvenile's sexual activities? (p. 33-36).

Groth and Loredó (1981) consider developmental issues including any history of sexual abuse, current life situation with particular attention to family dynamics, and evidence of psychopathology, mental retardation, organicity, and substance abuse. Becker and Abel (1984) have standardized a structured clinical interview to assess juvenile sexual offenders at the Sexual Behavior Clinic.

Data collected includes:

- (1) number of categories of deviant sexual interests
- (2) order of importance of deviant sexual interests
- (3) number of reported victims of sex crimes by category

- (4) number of completed sex crimes by category
- (5) duration of deviant sexual interests by category
- (6) reported use of sexually deviant fantasies
- (7) personality characteristics
- (8) effects of alcohol and pornography on deviant sexual behavior
- (9) quality of social, assertive and empathy skills
- (10) presence of nondeviant sexual behavior and interest
- (11) degree of force used during the commission of sexual crimes by category
- (12) reported ability to control each of his deviant sexual interests (p. 10).

Another recommended assessment is the evaluation of the cognitive distortions evident in the juvenile's self-rationale regarding the offense(s) and his or her sexual interests. Samenow's (1984) description of the cognitions of offenders regarding their offending behaviors provides support for this procedure. Ryan, Lane, Davis, and Isaac (1987) reference "thinking errors which rationalize and support the behaviors" (p. 387) in their discussion of the juvenile sexual offender.

In a comparative review of the literature on research with juvenile sexual and nonsexual offender populations discussed in the following sections, it becomes apparent that the emphasis on sexual deviation is an elemental distinguishing factor in the assessment and evaluation of

current functioning and prognostic indicators. Research reporting psychological test findings will be described in the next section.

Results of Psychological Assessment:

Personality Functioning

Distinguishing between juvenile sexual and nonsexual offenders, Markey (1950) presented brief case examples including eight males diagnosed as psychoneurotic following a psychological assessment that included the Rorschach. Markey (1950, p. 722) described his test battery as "the usual social and medical examinations ...and one or more projective tests". Among the eight subjects, two could clearly be established as exhibiting sexually aggressive behaviors while one boy was actually victimized by an adult male. The other case descriptions are in need of clarification to establish the presence of offending behaviors. Of the one male and four females diagnosed as psychopathic personality or character neurosis, the male was identified as an offender while two of the four girls described were victimized by an adult male and father. Markey noted the similarities between psychological assessments, including intellectual functioning, of the juvenile delinquents in the control group and the juveniles charged with immorality. Dysfunctional families and poor personality integration were concluded to be factors in the

expression of symptomatic deviant sexual behaviors.

Lewis, Shanok, and Pincus (1979) administered a full battery of tests consisting of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children, Bender-Gestalt, Rorschach, Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests and Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test in addition to a psychiatric and neurological evaluation. A history of physical abuse was determined in 76.5% of the sexual offenders and 75.5% of the violent offenders. Similar percentages of the subjects (78.6% of the sexual offenders and 78.6% of the violent offenders) had witnessed extreme violence perpetrated particularly against the mother. Generally violent behaviors were exhibited by both groups by about six years of age. Onset of sexually offending behaviors occurred before age 16 in 21.8% of the sexual offenders. No significant differences in the test results were found by the authors who were impressed by the findings of hallucinations, paranoid ideation, and major and minor neurological impairment equally represented in both groups, suggesting similar etiologic explanations.

Similar to the battery suggested by Bonner (1986), Awad et al. (1984) utilized clinical evaluations, WISC-R, Rorschach, and the Thematic Apperception Test. Additionally, two unstructured interviews with the parents and an unstructured family interview were conducted. Family dysfunction was common among both groups exemplified by 40% living with both parents, 79% of the subjects and 58% of the

controls were separated over a long term from one parent, and a significant number of parents of both groups suffered from substance abuse and psychiatric disorders. Family violence was also a factor in the homes of both groups. One-fourth had witnessed physical and/or sexual violence in the home, 33% had a history of physical abuse and/or neglect, and sexual deviance was reported in the families of 38% of the subjects and 43% of the controls. Psychiatric problems were identified as follows: 20% had previously been hospitalized, 33% had received psychiatric treatment, and 50% had been identified with emotional problems. A slightly greater number of sexual offenders were from the middle class who demonstrated less truancy, substance abuse and temper tantrums than controls. Yet, the authors concur with previous studies regarding the similarities in psychological functioning of juvenile sexual offenders and the control group of delinquents.

Waggoner and Boyd (1941), without formal testing, devised categories of emotional immaturity, parental rejection, personality deficits, and juvenile delinquency in their etiological classification of 12 representative case studies. The sexual offenses committed by the 5 boys accused of other juvenile delinquent acts were interpreted as etiological similar to the causative factors associated with delinquency. Premature sexual stimulation by others (a reference to the victims of sexual abuse and the subjects

who had consented to homosexual acts) was proposed as a rationale for the later sexual offenses committed by the subjects who exhibited "fairly well-established sexual patterns" (p. 289) with an average onset during the years of 6 to 10. The personality deficits of 3 subjects were related to low intellectual functioning and physical handicaps and shared a common etiological factor of poor parent-child relationships with the other classifications. The psychopathology, including antisocial behavior, of the parents of the subjects was noted as influential in shaping their personality development from biological and environmental standpoints. Developmental issues were viewed as integral in the prevention of establishment of a pattern of sexually offending behaviors.

Continuing the practice of distinguishing between juvenile sexual offenders with a history of nonsexual offenses and those without such a history, Doshay (1943) discussed the "social pathology operating in the lives of the children" (p. 31-32) represented by death or serious disability of the parents and broken homes occurring in approximately 50% of the cases of the subjects of both groups. Physical neglect occurred in 15.7% of the primary offenders' cases and 53.4% of the mixed offenders' cases. Physical abuse ("extreme cruelty") was found in 2.8% of the primary offenders' cases perpetrated by the father in all 3 cases and 8.8% of the mixed offenders' cases. Nervous and

mental disorders were found in 31.5% of the primary offenders and 68.5% of the mixed offenders. The mixed offender group differed on temperament and behavior disorders.

Atcheson and Williams (1954) claimed a significant difference between male sex offenders and delinquents was "personality maladjustment" (p. 369) as 20% of the sex offenders were diagnosed with a psychiatric disorder in comparison to 3.2% of the control group. No significant difference was found between the female groups. This finding would have complemented the results of Doshay (1943). Particularly significant was the fact that both studies used subjects referred to court clinics. However, personality maladjustment was operationally defined as:

"major personality disorder ...indicated by (1) direct mention of abnormal mechanisms in the recorded psychiatric examination; (2) a record of remand to a psychiatric hospital for examination; (3) committal to a psychiatric hospital; (4) direct referral to a psychiatric clinic (p. 369)".

Therefore, the employment of subjective assessment of psychopathology and generalized, confounding definitions of sexually offending behaviors call into question the validity of both study outcomes.

Sexually offending behaviors as symptomatic of underlying personality structure is one perspective offered by the following researchers. The first study involved no

control group whereas the second study used adult sex offenders as a source of comparison. Treatment of the juveniles seen by Maclay (1960) was not specifically focused on the sexually offending behaviors. He described insecure personality as a major contributing factor to the development of sexually offending behaviors in addition to inadequacy of parental support. Groth (1977) described the adolescent rapist and child molester as similar in psychosocial functioning to their adult counterparts. For adolescents, sexually offending behaviors were symptomatic of an inadequately developed self identity. The aggressiveness of the sexual offense served to separate the categories of rapist and aggressive child molester from passive child molester. Impulsivity and poor control, inadequate interpersonal skills, underachievement and minimal frustration tolerance described the psychological functioning of both adult and adolescent aggressive offenders. The passive child molester was said to identify with children and rely on psychological force rather than physical force.

In other studies lacking a control group, standardized testing employing the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and several interviews of the individual and family were used in the assessment of 262 subjects by Smith et al. (1987). Of these, a total of 39.6% complained of a history of physical or sexual abuse. Less than 1% were

incarcerated. Principal component analysis of the MMPI subscale scores found high loadings on four dimensions including Frequency and Hypomania scales suggestive of "impulsive acting out" (first factor), Depression and Social Introversion scales, indicative of "social inhibition, depressed affect, and low energy" (second factor), Masculinity/Femininity and Hysteria scales representative of "characterological over-reliance on repression and denial" (third factor), and Lie and Masculinity/Femininity scales reflective of "propensity to naively deny difficulties along with a hypermasculine identification" (fourth factor) (Smith et al., 1987, p. 425-426). Relying on a review of research findings, the authors concluded that their sample (although they employed no comparison groups) was "most comparable to normal and less violent non-sexual delinquent populations" (p. 429). Furthermore, they assumed their sample differed from incarcerated sexual offenders and other incarcerated nonsexual offenders in the degree of aggression.

Failing to indicate the specific psychological tests administered, Shoor et al. (1966) interpreted the results from a psychodynamic perspective. The juvenile defined as a child molester was typically passive-aggressive in personality and confused about his sexual identification and role. Sexual and social "panimmaturity" (p. 783) was proposed as an appropriate description of the adolescent

child molester related to his "selection of an immature object for expression of sexual impulses" (p. 788).

Becker, Kaplan, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kavoussi (1986) reported no history of psychiatric hospitalizations of subjects or family members in their study of adolescent intrafamilial sexual offenders. Psychopathology was evident in 73.7% of the subjects as assessed with the Kiddie-Subjective Affective Disorder Survey (Kiddie-SADS) and the modified Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-III diagnoses (SCID) and the Aggression Rating scale. Based on clinical interviews of 19 of 22 subjects, DSM-III diagnoses included conduct disorder (nine socialized, three aggressive), attention deficit disorder (five), alcohol or marijuana abuse (four), adjustment disorder with depressed mood (two), social phobia (two), dysthymia (one), and post-traumatic stress disorder (one). Five subjects demonstrated no evidence of DSM-III disorders. A history of sexual abuse was indicated by 23% of the subjects. They were victimized by non-family members in 3 cases and by a brother and uncle in the remaining 2 cases. Normative sexual histories were reported by 95% of the subjects with age at onset ranging from 7 to 15 years.

Reflecting a difference in findings with their study of intrafamilial offenders, Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kaplan (1986) reported that past psychiatric hospitalizations accounted for 3% of their subjects,

represented by intrafamilial and extrafamilial adolescent sexual offenders. A family history of criminal behavior or psychopathology was insignificant with 4.5% of the subjects. Histories of physical abuse (16.4%) and sexual abuse (17.9%) were reported. A structured clinical interview and the Aggression Rating scale were reportedly used in assessment of the subjects, but clinical data was not included in the article.

In summary, studies comparing juvenile sexual offenders with nonsexual offenders found no significant differences in psychological functioning based on formal test results (e.g. Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus, 1979; Markey, 1950; Awad et al. 1979). Where formal testing was employed instruments, recommended by researchers of juvenile sexual offenders and commonly used in a variety of psychological settings, included the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Rorschach, and the Wechsler intelligence scales (Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus, 1979; Awad et al. 1979; Smith et al. 1987). Results of the study by Atcheson and Williams (1954) indicating a higher percentage of juvenile sexual offenders assigned psychiatric diagnoses was found to be based on inaccurate measurement or definition of psychiatric dysfunction. Further, no formal battery of tests was used. In the comparison of juvenile sexual offenders with a history of nonsexual offenses and those without, Doshay described the "mixed" offender group as more pathological.

Structured clinical interviews of the adolescent intrafamilial sexual offender subjects of Becker, Kaplan, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kavoussi (1986) revealed evidence of psychopathology in almost two-thirds of the sample. The lack of a control group prevents generalization beyond this study. Questioning the findings of Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus (1979) and Tartar et al. (1983) regarding the possibility of a similar explanation for the etiology of physical violence and sexual violence, Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kaplan (1986) point out that juveniles in the community may differ from those incarcerated. A measure of sexually deviant interests was presented as a means of exploration of other etiological factors. Smith et al. (1987) concur with this suggestion, but determined that less violent sexual offenders were more psychologically and socially similar to normal and less violent nonsexual offenders.

Results of Psychological Assessment:

Intellectual Functioning

Impressions of intellectual functioning gleaned from test data or clinical estimates are usually imbedded as one finding of the psychological assessment or are included in the description of the subject. Three studies were found which compared the formal test results of juvenile sexual and nonsexual offenders. Intelligence scores obtained primarily from the administration of the Stanford-Binet

Intelligence Scale averaged 91.9 for the male sexual offenders, 94.5 for the male nonsexual offenders, 92.2 for the female sexual offenders, and 92.6 for the female nonsexual offenders by Atcheson and Williams (1954). Although no scores or ranges of scores from the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R) were reported by Lewis, Shanok, and Pincus (1979), juvenile sexual offenders consistently read and performed at lower levels than the control group of nonsexual offenders. Awad et al. (1979) was impressed by the WISC-R Full Scale I.Q. scores which indicated 24% of the juvenile sexual offenders attained scores below 80 in comparison with 8% of the juvenile offenders. The difference was attributed to the juvenile sexual offenders' performance on nonverbal subtests. A significant difference was reported between the Full Scale I.Q. score of 88 for the juvenile sexual offenders and 95 for the juvenile offenders. Both mean scores fall within the Average range of intellectual functioning, however. Only 1 subject was identified as functioning within the mental retardation range with an I.Q. score of 69 (Mild Mental Retardation range). In summary, no significant differences in intellectual functioning were reported by Atcheson and Williams (1954) and Lewis, Shanok, and Pincus (1979).

In a study designed to compare intellectual, psychoeducational, and neuropsychological functioning of 31

violent, 28 nonviolent, and 14 juvenile sexual offenders, Tarter et al. (1983) evaluated subjects at the Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic. Subjects included those without evidence of positive neurological findings or psychotic symptoms. The subjects' average age was 15.63 years. Forty-three subjects were white and thirty subjects were black. Tests administered to each subject included the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised or the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale for Adults, Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude, Peabody Individual Achievement Test, and the Pittsburgh Initial Neuropsychological Test System. A comparison of the subjects' Andrews Scale violence ratings and test results revealed no correlation between violent antisocial behavior and cognitive capacity. Full Scale I.Q. scores fell within the Average range for all 3 subject groups including sex offenders (Full Scale IQ score of 89.7 and standard deviation of 10.29), violent offenders (Full Scale IQ score of 90.18 and standard deviation of 10.89), and nonviolent offenders (Full Scale IQ score of 95.5 and standard deviation of 13.70).

Clinical estimates of intelligence were provided by Markey (1950) who judged no significant differences in intelligence scores between juvenile sexual offenders (males - 92.8; females - 89.0) and juvenile offenders (males 91.0; females 86.0) believing most subjects were functioning within the Average range. Using no control group, Maclay

(1960) found a majority of his subjects to be operating cognitively within the Average range. The gross range varied from mentally retarded to superior functioning. His dependence on clinical estimations of intellectual abilities revealed a major procedural weakness in that reliability of the clinical estimations was not established. Waggoner and Boyd (1941) also vacillated between reporting test results and estimates of intellectual functioning. Subjects committing sexual offenses comparable to contemporary definitions included 3 within the Average range, 1 within the Borderline range, and 1 within the Mild Mental Retardation range. Doshay estimated no difference in intellectual functioning among juvenile sex offenders and the control group of mixed offenders.

In the comparison of typologies of juvenile sex offenders, Shoor et al. (1966) noted a mean I.Q. score of 108 within a range of scores from 75 to 135. Standard deviations were not reported. Based on clinical judgment, the authors determined that "although these boys are invariably academic underachievers, we have found no correlation with intellectual level" (p. 785). Unfortunately, the test utilized in the study and a breakdown of scores among passive and aggressive child molesters were not presented in the description of the data. Also, the possibility of a learning disability was not pursued with academic screening tests. Groth (1977) also

neglected to provide specific information regarding tests, but reported mean I.Q. scores ranging from 89.7 for child molesters to 97.7 for rapists in his generalization that rapists tend to score higher on standard I.Q. tests than child molesters.

The conclusions reached in a majority of the studies indicate juvenile sexual offenders do not vary significantly, in terms of intellectual functioning, from juvenile offenders. The studies had numerous methodological problems including inconsistencies and omissions in data collection and reporting and the underuse of standardized tests, combined with over-reliance on the use of and reliability of clinical estimation of intelligence. These methodological weaknesses are evident in the studies comparing juvenile sex offender types as well. Yet, intellectual functioning within the Average range was reported across typologies of juvenile sexual offenders, consistent with the findings of comparisons of juvenile sex offenders with juvenile offenders.

Nonlegal Variables

Gender. The morality code of the day was applied equally to males and females without evidence of gross discrimination in the study by Waggoner and Boyd (1941). However, the role of the subject as a victim of early childhood sexual abuse was not clearly delineated in the

examination of 6 males and 1 female. The suggestion of the possibility of false allegations of sexual abuse was offered only in the case of the female subject. The authors made no references to the issue of gender.

The compilation of results obtained by Markey (1950) revealed 1 female and 11 male subjects charged with a sexual offense. In contrast, 24 female and 13 male subjects were charged with morality offenses including consensual heterosexual intercourse and homosexual activity.

Atcheson and Williams (1954) found a majority of the females (79%) were assigned to the category of nonspecific charges and 7.2 and 13% were assigned to the categories of specific sex offenses and unrelated charges, respectively. In contrast, 68.9% of the males comprised the category specific sex offenses and 18.9% and 12% were assigned to the categories nonspecific charges and unrelated charges. Accordingly, Atcheson and Williams distinguish among juveniles charged with sexual offenses as they report "it is apparent from these findings that specific charges usually involved sexual deviations in the male, whereas nonspecific charges are usually blanket terms implying promiscuity in the female and frequently sexual curiosity of a rather normal nature in the male" (p. 367). Findings indicated no significant difference in disposition with the exception of females who were placed in training schools twice as frequently as the control group of delinquent subjects.

Conclusions reached by Atcheson and Williams included placement recommendations of training schools for the female accused of sexual status offenses and the mentally retarded male, community treatment resources for the female accused of sexual status offenses and sexually curious male, and inpatient treatment for the males diagnosed with personality disorders.

The study by Fehrenbach et al. (1986) illustrated the trend toward reduction in charges of morality offenses in studies of sexual offenders. Indecent liberties with a child were committed by 59% of the 297 male subjects and 100% of the 6 female subjects. Children under the age of 6 comprised 100% of the victims of the female subjects and 50.6% of the male subjects. Babysitting proved to be a risk factor for child victims under age 6. Sexual offenses while babysitting were committed by 47% of the male subjects and 63% of the female subjects. Child victims seven and older comprised 39% of the total.

The relative omission of females from the studies of juvenile sexual offenders during the 1960's and 1970's may be indicative of the effects of social change. Prior to Fehrenbach et al.'s (1986) inclusion of female subjects, behaviors targeted for study involved primarily noncriminal acts with no victims.

Influence of Race and Socioeconomic Status. Similar to the studies of juvenile nonsexual offenders, the nonlegal variables of race and socioeconomic status in studies comparing juvenile sex offenders and juvenile nonsexual offenders have not been reliably examined together.

The following studies compare juvenile sexual offenders and juvenile nonsexual offenders who were court referred. Primary (sexual offense history) and mixed (sexual and nonsexual offense history) offender groups did not differ significantly on analysis of race; however, socioeconomic status was found to be significantly higher among the primary offenders in Doshay's study (1943). Overall, an impressive number of subjects (52.8% of the mixed offenders and 35.1% of the primary offenders) were subjectively determined to live in "bad neighborhoods" (p. 41).

Awad et al. (1979) cited that "two consistent findings are the diversity of racial and socio-economic background" (p. 105) in the literature on juvenile sexual offenders. The studies fail to report their statistical results in their comparison of the race of juvenile sexual offenders and nonsexual offenders beyond a comment describing the subjects as from "diverse religious and racial background reflecting the cultural diversity of Metropolitan Toronto" (p. 108). Subjects represented both the middle-class (54%) [sic] and lower-class (51%) [sic] with no significant

distinction based on parents' education, income, and occupation. The authors note that the Clinic's total delinquent population differs significantly in socioeconomic status as only 25% were from the middle class. The authors hypothesize that:

"The higher incidence of middle-class sexual offenders may be due to several factors. Middle-class juveniles may commit more sexual than other kinds of offenses or may be more often charged for sexual as compared to other kinds of delinquencies. Middleclass sexual offenders may be referred to the Clinic more often than middle-class juveniles who commit non-sexual offenses because they are perceived as being more dangerous or more disturbed" (p. 113).

In comparing juvenile violent, nonviolent, and sexual offenders, Tarter et al. (1983) elected to forego further analysis of race as a contributing factor after determining "no systematic group by race findings" beyond differences commonly attributed to the battery of tests utilized. (The tests included the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised or the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude, Peabody Individual Achievement Test, and Pittsburgh Initial Neuropsychological Test System.) Ethnic groups represented in the study were blacks and whites, but unfortunately, no numbers were reported.

Utilizing the category of "less than marginal income" (receipt of any form of financial assistance or employment of the mother), Atcheson and Williams (1954) found no significant difference between juvenile sexual

offenders and nonsexual offenders. This category was combined with other qualified measures of "social stress" including "unsatisfactory homes" and "broken homes" (p. 368) to determine an interaction effect. However, these operational definitions reflect the influence of social mores no longer applicable in contemporary society.

Among studies lacking comparison groups of juvenile offenders, discussion of and rationale for demographic descriptions of sample populations have been inconsistently provided. Waggoner (1941) reported the estimated socioeconomic status and race of 11 of 12 subjects. Subjects assigned to the middle class numbered 6 and those assigned to the lower class numbered 5. Race was determined through assignment of specific ethnic groups including Jewish (2), Polish American (3), Irish American (1), Syrian American (1), and English American (1). A racial bias seems evident in the substitution of religious affiliation rather than origin of nationality in the case of the Jewish subjects. But more importantly, a subjective estimation is utilized in the determination of socioeconomic status.

Shoor et al.'s (1966) comparison of aggressive and passive child molesters ruled out socioeconomic level as a related factor although the middle class was represented by a "small majority" (p. 785). The fact that all 80 subjects were Caucasian was noted by the authors: "Mexican-Americans comprise a large percentage of this county although very few

are referred for these offenses. Neither Negro nor Oriental boys were referred for child molesting, although there are many of them in the community" (p. 785).

Fehrenbach et al. (1986) has succeeded in a more objective calculation of socioeconomic status. Through the use of the Hollingshead Two-Factor Index of Social Position, they found that all social classes were represented among the 189 subjects. No further analysis was provided preventing comparison of type of offense and racial differences.

Racial distribution is described by the clinicians of the Sexual Behavior Clinic in New York City without reference to socioeconomic status. Becker, Kaplan, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kavoussi (1986) suggested in their study of juvenile sexual offenders that the inner city location of the clinic accounts for the ethnic make-up of the sample of juvenile incest offenders as the majority of the subjects were black (54%) and hispanic (32%). The study of this clinic's entire juvenile sexual offender population reflected a similar racial distribution of blacks (63%), hispanics (25%), and whites (12%) (Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kaplan, 1986).

Subjectivity and inconsistency marked the rather mixed results obtained from the comparison of juvenile sexual offenders and juvenile nonsexual offenders. No rationale was offered explaining why one variable was deemed more

relevant and included at the expense of the other. An additional shortcoming of the research was the neglect of the interaction effect of race and socioeconomic level. Operational definitions were not adequately established and subjective evaluations of the researcher were employed in the determination of socioeconomic status and race. Given the above, juvenile sex offenders revealed a tendency toward higher socioeconomic status when compared with juvenile offenders (Doshay, 1943; Awad et al., 1984). Atcheson and Williams (1954) found no significant differences, however. When examined in isolation, juvenile sex offenders represented all socioeconomic levels equitably (Awad et al., 1984; Waggoner, 1941, and Fehrenbach et al., 1986).

Race was more frequently reported as demographic information; however, Doshay (1943) and Tarter et al. (1983) found no significant differences in their comparisons of juvenile sex offenders and juvenile nonsexual offenders. Location of the clinic in an area populated by minorities was suggested by Becker, Kaplan, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kavoussi (1986) in explaining the high minority representation of their sample. Yet, Shoor et al. (1966) and Waggoner (1941) describe all white subjects referred by the juvenile justice system. Finally, rural settings have not been studied and may offer contrasting information to that obtained in metropolitan urban areas.

Size. The relationship between prediction of risk to the community and physical size of the juvenile is an area of neglected research. Significant differences in age, a related issue, were discerned among the three groups of offenders studied by Tarter et al. (1983) with violent offenders as the oldest group and sexual offenders as the youngest group. However, physical size was not studied as a contributing factor.

Legal Variables

Identification of Sexual Offenses. The phenomenon of labeling is accompanied by a clinical naivete, possibly stemming from a lack of extensive exposure to juvenile sexual offenders. Early studies of juvenile sexual offenders offer evidence of the generalization of sexual deviancy to include consenting heterosexual and homosexual activity among juvenile peers; prostitution by juveniles without corresponding recognition of the responsibility or the implicit sexual deviance of the older adolescent or adult consumer; and sexual victimization of juveniles by parents and other adults (e.g., Atcheson & Williams, 1954; Doshay, 1943; Maclay, 1960; Markey, 1950; Waggoner & Boyd, 1941). The arduous process of developing comprehensive assessment procedures can be likened to a trial and error search for the right questions to ask. Yet, studies of the characteristics of juvenile sexual offenders reveal a

progressive trend focused on recognition of and identification of a range of sexually offending behaviors in addition to exclusion of irrelevant criterion behaviors.

Waggoner and Boyd (1941) presented clinical data on 25 juvenile sexual offenders, ranging in age from 11 through 16, that encompassed several pertinent observations. Of significant interest, the authors reported findings only on juveniles "who adopted aberrant practices as a regular and preferred pattern of behavior" (p. 276) from a holistic perspective inclusive of environmental, social, and emotional factors. The 12 case studies reported in detail included 5 subjects with a history of sexual abuse in all cases and physical abuse in 3, whose current sexual offense was prostitution with older males. Behaviors suggestive of gender identity disorder and homosexual relationships were prevalent in the case descriptions.

Studies such as Markey's (1950) of immorality charges, brought against 25 males and 25 females (ranging in age from 13 to 17 years) by the Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court, offer rather blunt insight into the evolution of labels attached to juvenile sexually offending behaviors. Charges filed against the females included "21 cases of heterosexual intercourse; one case of a homosexual aggressor (revealed); 1 case with no objective evidence of sex activity; and 2 cases of incest (father)" whereas charges against the boys included "13 cases of fellatio or other homosexual activity;

7 cases of sexual assault and intercourse; 4 cases of voyeurism, obscenity and exhibitionism; and one case of burning a dog" (p. 723). Markey suggested that "forms of sex delinquency " including homosexuality, sodomy, pederasty, fellatio, incest, voyeurism, and fetishism as "acts (that) can appear in adolescents who give promise of good psychosexual health" (p. 720). Victims of sexual offenses numbered 4 (2 males and 2 females). Males in the control group were more frequently charged with incorrigibility (6) and assault and battery (4), whereas females were more frequently charged with runaway (4) and stealing (3) in addition to incorrigibility (14).

Another example is provided by Atcheson and Williams (1954) who surveyed all juveniles ranging in age from 7 to 16 charged with sex offenses, demonstrated promiscuity, or "unusual sex behavior" (p. 366) evaluated at the Toronto Juvenile and Family Court from 1939 to 1948. The sample of 116 males and 167 females was compared with a control group of delinquents. Juvenile sex offenders were categorized by:

- (1) Specific sex offences - exhibitionism, indecent assault, immorality, rape, indecent acts, etc.
- (2) Nonspecific charges - vagrancy and incorrigibility, the charge being laid chiefly because of sexual promiscuity.
- (3) Unrelated charges - truancy, theft, breaking and entering, malicious damage, etc., in which sexual misconduct was also a presenting problem" (p. 367).

Doshay (1943) compared clients seen at the New York City Children's Court clinic including a group of 108

juveniles charged with sexual offenses (primary offenders) and a group of 148 juveniles charged with sexual offenses and other offenses (mixed offenders). Sexual offenses ranged from excessive or mutual masturbation to violent sexual assault. Sexual behaviors not commonly regarded currently as offenses, such as spoken or written obscenity and passive fellatio, were included as target behaviors of study. The groups ranged from 7 to 16 years of age at the time of treatment and 16 to 28 years of age at the time of the outcome study 6 years later.

Maclay (1960) classified 29 males, aged 9 through 16 years of age, into five categories consisting of indecent assault (17), sexual intercourse (2), both cases involving a 16 year old boy with a 14 year old girlfriend), indecent exposure (3), homosexual practices (5), and other offenses (2 boys who defecated in a church after breaking and entering). The case studies of indecent assault and indecent exposure conform more readily to a current understanding of sexually offending behaviors.

Representative of an increase in discrimination of sexually offending behaviors, an evaluation comparing 24 juveniles charged or convicted of a sexual offense and 24 delinquents referred to the Family Court Clinic, was conducted by Awad et al. (1984). He examined subjects 11 to 16 years of age with a mean age of 14. Sexual offenses identified included rape or attempted rape (46%), indecent

assault such as fellatio (19%) and touching women's breasts and genital areas then running (19%), exhibitionism (12%), and obscene phone calls (9%).

A comparative study of 17 violent juvenile sexual offenders and 61 violent juvenile nonsexual offenders sentenced to a secure correctional school unit was conducted over 18 months by Lewis, Shankok, and Pincus (1979) to determine psychiatric, neurological, or psychoeducational differences. The average age of the offender in both groups was 15. Forms of sexual assault convictions represented among the sexual offenders included rape or attempted rape of females (eight), anal intercourse or attempted anal intercourse of young males and assault of women (two), and other forms of sexual assault of females (seven).

Definition of terms have varied dependent on the variable(s) deemed essential in classification of offending behaviors. Shoor et al. (1966) conducted an early study of 80 juveniles separated into groups of aggressive and nonaggressive child molesters seen at the Santa Clara County Juvenile Probation Department from 1962 to 1964. Groth (1977) evaluated 26 juvenile sexual offenders and 37 adult offenders with a juvenile history of sexual assault at the Center for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Sexually Dangerous Persons. The adolescent sample represented slightly older subjects as the boys ranged in age from 15 to 17 years. Subjects who offended against same age peers or

persons 10 years older were termed rapists (44). Subjects who offended against children five years or younger than the offender were termed child molesters (19). Doshay (1943), as indicated previously, differentiated between juveniles with a history of sexual offenses and juveniles with a history of sexual and nonsexual offenses in an attempt to differentiate between patterns of delinquency.

Extending and modifying the definitions used by Groth (1977), Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kaplan (1986) utilized detailed descriptors in the evaluation of 67 adolescent males charged or convicted of a sexual crime (including 22 incest offenders). The subjects were 13 to 19 years of age with a mean of 15.47 years. Specifically, the numerous categories were divided into major groupings of pedophile (victim more than 5 years younger than the subject), rapist (victim less than 5 years younger than the subject), consensual incest, frottage, voyeurism, and mooning. Subcategories were based on age and sex of the victim and relationship of the victim to the offender as outlined in the section "definition of terms". Overall, pedophiles accounted for 41 subjects, committing 63 acts completed and 9 acts attempted involving 62 victims. Rapists numbered 17, committing 39 rapes and 10 attempted rapes involving 23 victims. Subjects involved in consensual incest totaled 2, committing 155 acts between them with 2 victims. Other offenses included frottage (4), voyeurism

(2), and mooning (1).

Twenty-two adolescent males charged or convicted of intrafamilial sexual crimes were selected as a subsample of the population described above by Becker, Kaplan, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kavoussi (1986) at the Sexual Behavior Clinic at the New York Psychiatric Institute. One result of the study was the clarification of the commonly used, but essentially vague term of incest. Ages of the subjects ranged from 13 to 18 years. Primary incest diagnoses included female incest pedophile (11), male incest pedophile (6), female incest rape (2), and male incest rape (1). Consensual incest with a female was reported in 2 cases. Additional nonincest diagnoses were reported as female pedophile (1), male pedophile (1), rape (1), frottage (1), voyeurism (2), mooning (2), and obscene phone calls (1). By category of offenses, victims totaled 22 of pedophilia, 4 of rape, 6 of frottage, 10 of voyeurism, and 3 of mooning. The authors conclude that the varied findings resulted in the categorization of the subjects as follows:

(1) adolescents who engage in consensual sexual behavior with a peer-age relative; (2) adolescents who initially engaged in consensual sexual behavior with a peer-age relative, but then engaged in coercive sex behavior when the relative no longer consented; (4) [sic] adolescents who have developed a deviant sexual interest pattern and meet DSM-III diagnosis for paraphilia; and (5) adolescents who engage in nondeviant sexual behavior and have incidental occurrence of deviant sexual behavior" (p. 96).

Monastersky and Smith (1985) define a "sexual offense

continuum" (p. 171) that distinguishes between the degree of aggression and physical contact with victims. The continuum includes nonaggressive hands-off (exposure, voyeurism, obscene phone calls and letters, masturbating with women's underwear), aggressive hands-off (breaking and entering for the purpose of stealing women's underwear, any activity from first category that increases victim proximity), and aggressive hands-on (fondling, oral-genital contact, penetration, uses force, weapon or threatens to, doesn't stop with victim distress) (p. 171). In the application of these categories of sexually offending behaviors, Fehrenbach et al. (1986) studied 297 males and 8 females ranging in age from 11 to 17 years with a mean of 14.8 at the Juvenile Sexual Offender Project. Categories were comprised of indecent liberties (59%), rape (23%), exposure (11%), and hands-off offenses (7%). Females committed the same offense of indecent liberties with a child six years or younger.

Naivete has been replaced with the assumption that under-reporting occurs under different circumstances so that self-reports of juvenile sexual offenders must be compared with official and social data sources (Becker & Abel, 1984; Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kaplan, 1986). The label of sexual offender currently applied to juveniles relies less on general violations of social codes or mores, although charges of status offenses are still common. As replacements of the more archaic systems of classification,

increasingly complex multi-factor definitions have been developed specifying type of sexual behavior, age of victim in relationship to the offender, sex of victim, and relationship to the victim. Seriousness of the offense can be more readily ascertained when facts associated with the offense are considered in this manner. Degree of aggression employed and physical proximity to the victim are additional elements considered in the definition of sexually offending behaviors.

Disposition Related to Seriousness of the Offense and Use of Force. A primary issue in the study of juvenile sexual offenders is the delineation of offender typologies and subsequent dispositions matched not only to the characteristics of the offender, but also to features of the seriousness of the offense and use of force. Degree of force employed in the commission of the sexual offense is generally agreed as influential in determining the security needs of the offender and the community.

Thus, a related effort by researchers has been to distinguish between high and low risk groups of offenders based on seriousness of the act(s) through increasingly comprehensive assessment procedures.

In their 1985 article, Monastersky and Smith recommend community treatment for nonaggressive juveniles and institutional treatment for aggressive juveniles. Smith (cited in Knopp, 1985) distinguishes four primary

considerations in the assessment of juvenile sexual offenders for appropriate placement. Specifically, these considerations include:

- 1) seriousness of referral offense; 2) treatability/manageability of offender;
- 3) probability of sexually reoffending (with and without recommended intervention); and
- 4) likely danger to the community, with and without recommended intervention" (p. 17).

In the formulation of a decision to place a juvenile sexual offender in an outpatient setting, Groth, Hobson, Lucey, and St. Pierre (1981) essentially provide exclusionary criteria including threat or use of physical force, evidence of bizarre or ritualistic sexual acts, history of offending sexual or nonsexual behaviors, indicators of psychopathology including psychosis, mental retardation, substance abuse, and organicity, and denial of the offending behavior. Further, the juvenile must demonstrate that he/she is functioning adequately in other life areas.

In a rare study of an incarcerated population, Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus (1979) determined no differences in force utilized by the subjects in this study which included physical force or beatings, use of a knife, and attempted hanging. The comparison group had also committed multiple serious offenses. Representative convictions were for murder, assault with a weapon, armed robbery, and arson. The disposition of the subjects was incarceration in a secure unit of a correctional school.

Groth's (1977) clinical interviews of juvenile sexual offenders and adult sexual offenders with a juvenile history of sexual offenses found the use of a weapon to differentiate between nonaggressive or passive child molesters (100% never used a weapon) and the more aggressive offenders. A knife was used by 26% of the aggressive child molesters and 40% of the rapists. Rapists (20%) more frequently used a blunt instrument in the commission of the assault than aggressive child molesters (10%). Groth did not compare disposition and use of force. However, his study reports overall disposition decisions resulted in 13% of 47 subjects, with a known history of sexual offenses, removed from the community to placements including juvenile residential programs (4), and correctional facilities (2). In conclusion, Groth recommended that assessment and secure treatment facilities are essential components in an effort to protect the community from the sexually assaultive juvenile as well as accurately recognize the needs of the offender who is too often misdiagnosed as adolescent adjustment reaction.

Shoor et al. (1966) failed to adequately describe or quantify aggression exhibited by their subjects, but their conclusions support Groth's. Use of force is purported to distinguish between passive and aggressive child molesters. This position is illustrated in the following statement:

In the aggressive child molester, physical violence and sexual expression are closely

correlated, and his modus operandi clearly demonstrates this (p. 785).

Shoor and his colleagues also recommend removal from the community to a secure environment for this type of offender. The offender who presents as sexually immature and does not utilize force or violence can be treated in the community. Ultimately, the authors suggest that the "key to proper management and disposition is the differentiation between the passive versus the aggressive child molester" (p. 787).

More frequent research has been conducted in outpatient settings contingent upon the receipt of a referral for evaluation by the court or community agency. Doshay (1943) reported a similarity in the number, kind, and degree of force utilized in the commission of the sexual offenses by both groups (juvenile sex offenders and juvenile mixed offenders) with the exception of 12 incest cases in the mixed offender group. Clinical recommendations and court dispositions were found to be complementary. Court dispositions resulted in placement of 75.9% of the primary offenders and 52.8% of the mixed offenders on probation, 3.7% of the primary offenders and 39.8% of the mixed offenders in correctional institutions, 9.2% of the primary offenders and 5.4% of the mixed offenders to child care institutions and foster placement, 0.9% of the primary offenders and 1.3% of the mixed offenders to psychopathic hospitals, and 7.4% of the primary offenders and 0.7% of the mixed offenders discharged. Evidently, the mixed offenders

were viewed as a greater threat to the community as a greater percentage (45.5%) were removed from the community compared with 13.8% of the juvenile sexual offenders. Finally, juvenile sexual offenders in the primary group were more often discharged without action taken than in the mixed offenders group.

Assigned ratings of aggression ranged from 2.71 to 3.33 with an average of 3 (physical coercion) for both male rapists (average aggression rating of 3.04) and pedophiles (average aggression rating of 2.92) who were seen as outpatients by Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kaplan (1986). In comparison, the average aggression rating for frotteurs, voyeurs, and mooners was 1.17 (noncoercion). Current living situations was the recommendation for 82% of the subjects remaining in community placements including family members, guardians, or alone, and 4.5% in foster homes and homes for runaways. Placement for an undetermined length of time in detention centers and Division of Youth group homes involved 13.4% of the subjects. At the time of the referral, legal status for the subjects consisted of probation (43.3%), presentence (25.4%), Division for Youth Facilities (11.9%), parole (6.0%), PINS or persons in need of supervision (4.5%), Adjudicated Contemplating Dismissal (3.0%), and not officially charged (6.0%). The findings confirm for the authors the need to intervene to interrupt the development

of a deviant sexual pattern in the adolescent so that he/she may learn control at an early point in his/her life.

Becker, Kaplan, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kavoussi (1986) found that 91% of the incest offender outpatients lived primarily among family members, legal guardians or alone. Division for Youth group homes and shelter placements totaled 9%. Legal status was distributed among probation/parole supervision (45.5%), presentence (9.1%), Division for Youth facilities (9.1%), Social Service Agencies referral (31.8%), and Legal Aid referral (4.5%). Consistent with their study of juvenile sexual offenders (including this population of incest offenders), the aggression rating for rapists (average aggression rating of 3) was only slightly higher than for pedophiles (average aggression rating of 2.86).

Subjects in the study by Fehrenbach et al. (1986) were placed at the time of referral, with family members (92%), foster home (4%), juvenile institution or group home (5%), and other (2%). Use of force was evaluated in 173 subjects of which 4% reported the use of weapons, 33% reported the use of physical force, 12% used the threat of force or a weapon, and 28% used intimidation or bribery.

In an attempt to differentiate between offender typologies, Tarter et al. (1983) rated the degree of violence utilized with the Andrews Scale (violence ratings scale) and determined "little relationship...between

cognitive performance and rating of the delinquent's most violent act" (p. 566). The subjects were temporarily detained at the time of the study, yet, the incarceration period had not exceeded several weeks for any subject at any time.

Generally, studies assessing seriousness of the offense and use of force in both court-referred and voluntary outpatient and incarcerated populations have determined no significant differences among juvenile sexual offenders and juvenile nonsexual offenders. Groth's 1979 study presents the only exception. He found use of force to discriminate between passive child molesters and aggressive child molesters/rapists. One possible explanation suggested by Davis and Leitenberg (1987) is a possible correlation between increase in age and increase in use of force. No relationship between use of force and disposition appears to be firmly established in the determination of disposition of juvenile sexual offenders.

Recidivism in Sexual and Nonsexual Offenses.

Recidivism can be reported in terms of history of prior offenses committed or offenses committed following the target offense. Both types of recidivism rates are utilized in the prediction of risk the offender presents to the community. An early example of prospective reporting, Doshay's (1943) comparison of New York City Court Clinic juveniles found that 3% of the juveniles with a history of

sexual offenses only (primary offenders) repeated nonsexual offenses. Of the juveniles who had previously committed sexual and nonsexual offenses (mixed offenders), 5% repeated sexual offenses and 22% repeated nonsexual offenses. Doshay concluded the primary juvenile sexual offender who receives legal and clinical intervention does not recidivate on sexual offenses in contrast to the juvenile who commits sexual and other offenses. Prognostic indicators of recidivism were proposed as background, personality, and general behavior rather than the sexual offense since the primary offenders and mixed offenders were similar only in the area of sexual offenses.

The following describe prospective studies of juvenile sex offenders with no control group. Primarily based on the report of the involved probation officer, 21 of the subjects in Maclay's (1960) study of his clinic population were said to have a satisfactory outcome in terms of recidivism and general functioning. However, the dates of follow-up were not constant. Records of 112 male juvenile sexual offenders evaluated at the University of Washington's Adolescent Clinic and who were in the community for at least 17 months were reviewed by Smith and Monastersky (1986). They determined that their instrument developed to assess risk of recidivism was inaccurate. The authors recommend that the Risk Criteria not be used to determine risk of reoffending although the instrument may facilitate a comprehensive

evaluation of the youth. The primary problem regarding the instrument appeared to be the incorrect assignment of items to risk levels. Examination of recidivism rates obtained through prospective collection of data, resulted in the identification of 3 groups including a nonreoffending group (50.9%), a nonsexual reoffending group (34.8%), and a sexual reoffending group (14.3%). The majority of the sexual reoffenders had also committed one or more nonsexual offenses as well. Significant differences seemed apparent between the nonsexual reoffenders and the sexual offenders.

Other retrospective studies have compared recidivism rates of sexual and nonsexual juvenile offenders. In the Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus (1979) study of an incarcerated population, prior nonsexual offenses had been committed by 100% of the juvenile nonsexual offenders and 94% of the juvenile sex offenders. In contrast, prior sexual offenses had been committed by 59% of the juvenile sex offenders. Disposition is not reported in the study of Toronto Family Court referrals by Atcheson and Williams (1954). Of the male sex offenders, 2.6% were reported to recidivate in sexual offenses although no pattern was established. Sex offenders' rate of recidivism increased to 40.5% in non-sexual offenses compared with 54.7% of the control group. Awad et al. (1979) in studying Family Court Clinic referrals, determined a recidivism rate of 46% of subjects

with a history of prior arrests for sexual offenses. Patterns of behavior were often found including indicators such as similarity of offenses committed and victims of the same sex (i.e., males as victims or females as victims at each offense). A history of prior arrests for delinquent acts was isolated among 50% of the sex offenders and 75% of the comparison group. Accordingly, the authors determined the risk to the community presented by these subjects was high based on their recidivism and aggression rates.

Comparison of recidivism rates of offense histories of juvenile sexual offenders (with no control group) has been conducted in several studies. Shoor et al. (1966) collected data on prior offenses from the population of juvenile sexual offenders seen at the Santa Clara County Juvenile Probation Department. Specific statistics are not available regarding a comparison of sexual offenses with nonsexual offenses. Prior Juvenile Department referrals for various offenses including "child molest, burglary, runaway, (and) cruelty to animals" were reported for 21% of the subjects. In addition, 40% of the subjects reportedly had a history of prior delinquent behaviors not referred to the Juvenile Department including "beyond control, child molest, firesetting, indecent exposure, and school problems".

In Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kaplan's (1986) study of their outpatient population of juvenile sexual offenders, 28% reported a history of arrests for nonsexual

offenses and 90% reported a history of arrests for sexual offenses. When the juveniles accused of incestuous sexual offenses are examined in isolation, a history of arrests for nonsexual offenses is reported by 50% and a history of arrests for sexual offenses is reported by 72% (Becker, Kaplan, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kavoussi, 1986). Sexual activity with peers that was consensual in nature was reported by a majority of the subjects including "nongenital sexual behavior" (82%) and "genital sexual behaviors" (58%) (p. 441).

In 171 of the subjects studied by Fehrenbach et al. (1986), 57.6% claimed a prior sexual offense including rape (68 subjects), indecent liberties (174), exposure (34), and other offenses (21). Nonsexual offenses were committed by 40% of the 171 subjects. Conclusions reached by Fehrenbach et al. included:

The results of this study are consistent with the observation that sexual offenses are not simply isolated incidents involving normally developing adolescents. In fact, more than half the subjects committed at least one known prior sexual offense. Repetition of sexual offending was found most commonly among the hands-off offenders and least commonly among hands-on offenders. Also, subjects referred for hands-on offenses against adults were least likely to have a record of previous sexual offense. This inverse relationship between apparent seriousness of offense and prior history may be related to a greater tolerance for hands-off offenses in the community and a resultant decreased likelihood of reporting to authorities until the offense is repeated (p. 231-232).

Groth (1977) examined the significance of prior

sexual offenses only. He suggested the method of offending rarely varies in terms of victim choice and method. The referral offense was not the first offense for 76% of the peer-aged rapists, 60% of the significantly older victim rapists, and 79% of the child molesters according to data compiled from legal and social sources. Nor was the deviant sexual assault the first sexual experience for 86% of the subjects who reported a prior normative sexual experience.

In conclusion, relevant factors associated with degree of risk to the community at large in relationship to the treatment needs and treatability of the offender must be carefully evaluated. With the exception of two early studies by Doshay (1943) and Atcheson and Williams (1954), the results seem to suggest that prior offense histories of juvenile sexual offenders are likely to include both sexual and nonsexual offenses. Further, the rate of nonsexual offense recidivism reported by both sexual and nonsexual offenders does not appear to vary significantly. A compilation of results suggests that juvenile sexual offenders with a history of nonsexual offenses are more likely to be incarcerated. There was also the suggestion that factors of use of force and proximity to the victim may influence reporting of offenses to the authorities.

Summary

Studies predating the recent reemergence of interest in the juvenile sexual offender are distinguished by the comparison of juveniles charged or convicted of sexual offenses with a control or comparison group. This is in contrast to the current use of descriptive statistics to describe juvenile sexual offenders with no control group. Generally, the study findings illustrate the increase in specificity of potential relevant factors related to the etiology of offending behaviors in general and sexual offending behaviors in particular.

The majority of the studies with the exception of Awad et al. (1984) found no significant difference in intellectual functioning among juvenile sexual offenders and nonsexual offenders. Findings of psychological and neurological assessments were similar for the two groups although Atcheson and Williams (1954) reported a significant difference in personality dysfunction of the male juvenile sexual offenders in comparison with the male nonsexual offenders. Due to the early onset of violent behaviors in both groups (which predated the onset of sexual offenses among the juvenile sexual offenders), Lewis, Shanok, and Pincus (1979) proposed a possible similar etiology for violent offenders. Conflict regarding the rate of recidivism in sexual offenses by juvenile sexual offenders was evident in the studies reviewed although there was

general agreement about the history of nonsexual offenses apparent in both populations.

Differential processing of males and females charged with sex offenses related to labeling is evident in the majority of the early studies in terms of charges, sentencing, and placements. This corresponds to Mann's (1984) discussion of the legal treatment of the female juvenile delinquent. Distortion of the sexual behaviors exhibited by adolescents (curious boys vs. promiscuous girls) is exposed in the accumulated data. Socioeconomic factors and race did not vary significantly among juvenile sexual offenders. In comparison, the socioeconomic status of juvenile sexual offenders tended to be higher than that of juvenile nonsexual offenders, but no differences related to race were detected between the two groups.

Overall, the findings of the current literature review proffer further support to Awad et al.'s (1984) statement that "the same factors which have been found to contribute to juvenile delinquency in general seem to be found in juvenile sexual offenders" (p. 112). The limited number of studies involved in the literature review must be considered when formulating hypotheses based on the above information.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The following describes in further detail the retrospective study of juveniles charged with sexual offenses and a comparison group of juveniles charged with property or person offenses. The files maintained by a large southwestern county juvenile department were used in the study.

Subjects

Subjects included male juveniles charged with a sexual offense(s) and referred to the juvenile department psychology unit for testing during the years 1984 through July 1988. The juveniles may have also been charged with other offenses against property or persons of a nonsexual nature. A comparison group of male juveniles charged with nonsexual offense(s) against property or persons was employed. Subjects in any group may have had a history of sexual or nonsexual offenses against persons or property (other than the target offenses). The age range of the subjects was 10 years, 0 months through 17 years, 11 months and included subjects eventually certified as adults since

Instruments

In conformance with the assessment procedures utilized by the juvenile department psychological staff, children who obtained standard scale achievement scores on in the 80-90 range and above on the Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R) were administered the Culture Fair Intelligence Test or the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT). Subjects who obtained standard scale achievement scores in the 60-70 range and below were administered the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised (WISC-R) or the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Adults-Revised (WAIS-R) dependent on the age of the subject. A review of the literature revealed no references for the WRAT-R, PPVT, Culture Fair Intelligence Test, or the WAIS-R for juvenile offenders or juvenile sexual offenders. However, these instruments are commonly used in psychological test batteries administered in a variety of settings and with multiple populations.

The Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (Jastak & Wilkinson, 1984) is comprised of 2 levels, each of which is divided into 3 subtests of Reading, Spelling, and Arithmetic. Level 1 is designed for children 5 years 0 months through 11 years 11 months and Level 2 is designed for persons 12 years 0 months through adulthood. The WRAT-R is an age-normed test that provides raw scores, grade equivalents, standard scores, and percentiles. Internal

consistency is measured by a type of test reliability termed person separation. Ranges of estimates across age groups and test levels are as follows: Reading 1 (.86-.98), Spelling 1 (.88-.94), Arithmetic 1 (.78-.87), Reading 2 (.93-.98), Spelling 2 (.92-.97), and Arithmetic 2 (.81-.97). Content validity is described as apparent and supported by the results of a Rasch model analysis. Construct validity is reported as item separation reliability coefficients which include coefficient ranges of: Reading 1 (.96-.99), Spelling 1 (.97-.99), Arithmetic 1 (.98-.99), Reading 2 (.98-.99), Spelling 2 (.98-.99), and Arithmetic 2 (.98-.99). Concurrent validity with the Peabody Individual Achievement Test is based on more than 20 studies and 1000 subjects. Average correlations are: .87 (WRAT:Reading with PIAT:Reading Recognition), .74 (WRAT:Reading with PIAT:Reading Comprehension), .75 (WRAT:Spelling with PIAT:Spelling), and .66 (WRAT:Arithmetic with PIAT:Arithmetic).

The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test was developed in 1965 by Lloyd M. Dunn and published by the American Guidance Service, Inc. The PPVT serves as a brief, objective nonverbal scale for wide clinical use in diverse populations since pointing or indicating yes or no in some fashion is the minimal requirement. The age range is 2 years, 6 months to 18 years. Derived scores are comprised of age equivalent, standard score equivalent, and percentile

equivalent. A median coefficient of equivalence of .77 was obtained in correlation studies comparing I.Q. raw scores and age. Content validity is established through the inclusion of all words found in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary of 1953 that could be illustrated. Construct validity (Dunn & Markwardt, 1970) is based on the congruence between the intelligence quotient of the PPVT and the Wechsler tests although the PPVT intelligence quotient may, on the average, be higher by one to two points. Concurrent validity has been determined based on the positive correlation with school achievement. The normative sample was white, but did include preschool, early elementary, upper elementary, and high school subjects.

The Culture Fair Intelligence Test Scale 2 developed by R. B. Cattell and A. K. S. Cattell (Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1973) is composed of 4 nonverbal subtests including Series, Classifications, Matrices, and Conditions or Topology appropriate for 8 year old children through adults. Average reliability coefficients across 30 studies are reported as internal consistency (.87), consistency over parts (.80), and test-retest reliability (.84). For the same 30 studies, average validity estimates include concept validity (.85) and construct validity (.77).

The WAIS-R (Wechsler, 1981) includes six Verbal subtests (Information, Digit Span, Vocabulary, Arithmetic,

Comprehension, and Similarities) and five nonverbal Performance subtests (Picture Completion, Picture Arrangement, Block Design, Object Assembly, and Digit Symbol). The WISC-R (Wechsler, 1974) is composed of similar subtests with the exception that the Verbal section does not include Digit Span and Coding is substituted for the subtest Digit Symbol. Scores reported include the Verbal I.Q., the Performance I.Q., and the Full Scale I.Q. which are interpreted in terms of a global intelligence that avoids focus on any one ability. Reliability is estimated by Wechsler (1974) for both instruments. Average coefficients associated with internal consistency on the WISC-R are reported as high including Verbal (.94), Performance (.90), and Full Scale I.Q. (.96). Verbal subtest coefficients range from .77 to .86 and Performance subtest coefficients range from .70 to .85. Average corrected stability coefficients range from .71 to .88 on Verbal and Performance subtests. Coefficients for Verbal (.93), Performance (.90), and Full Scale I.Q. (.95) do not vary significantly. Calculated across all nine age groups of the WAIS-R, average reliability coefficients range from .83 to .96 on Verbal subtests, and .68 to .87 on Performance subtests. Reliability coefficients reported for the Verbal (.97), Performance (.93), and Full Scale I.Q. (.97) are high. Average stability coefficients are not reported for ages 16 and 17.

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) consists of 566 items to be coded "true", "false", or "cannot say" by the juvenile as an objective assessment of personality functioning. The instrument includes Validity scales (Question, Lie, Validity, and K) and Clinical scales (Hypochondriasis, Depression, Hysteria, Psychopathic deviate, Masculinity-femininity, Paranoia, Psychasthenia, Schizophrenia, and Hypomania). Hathaway and McKinley (1970) state that adequate reliability has been established in research utilizing the MMPI. Test-retest reliability coefficients reported from the findings of the Cottle study of normal subjects range from .46 to .76 on the Validity scales and .56 to .91 on the Clinical scales. The Holzberg and Alessi study of psychiatric subjects as reported by the authors of the Manual include coefficients that range from .75 to .93 on the Validity scales and .52 to .89 on the Clinical scales. Citing an earlier study conducted by the authors, Hathaway and McKinley report validity as indicated by positive correlations between a high score on a scale and final clinical diagnosis in more than 60% of new psychiatric admissions. Juveniles must demonstrate an ability to read on at least the 6th grade level to take the MMPI.

The Rorschach is commonly known as the inkblot test and is primarily designed as a problem-solving task. Ten inkblots are presented to the subject who is asked to

identify what he sees in response to the query "what might this be?" Test-retest reliability is evidenced in the more than 30 studies conducted at the Rorschach Research Foundation according to Exner (1986). The results of 3 studies with retest scheduled within one month included: 8 year old nonpatients with 7 day retest (.72 to .96 with exceptions of .49 for inanimate movement and .42 for diffuse shading response); 9 year old nonpatients with 3 week retest (.70 to .93 with exceptions of .20 for inanimate movement, .17 for diffuse shading response, and .64 for pure color and color naming); and adult nonpatients with 3 week retest (.59 to .96 with exceptions of .34 for inanimate movement, .41 for diffuse shading responses, and .59 for experienced stimulation). Exner believed there to be substantial support for the consistency of preferred response styles in the selection process applied to the Rorschach.

Use of Instruments with Juveniles

Ollendick (1979) found a greater frequency of higher Performance IQs in the WISC-R scores of 121 male adjudicated and incarcerated juvenile offenders when compared with the standardization sample of laborers. However, the results were not significantly different causing Ollendick to question the diagnostic use of the WISC-R for juvenile delinquency in terms of Verbal and Performance IQ splits and subtest scatter. Blumenfeld's (1979) comparison of 35

juvenile sexual offenders (termed "adolescent rape offenders" by Blumenfeld) with WISC-R and MMPI standardized samples indicated "consisten[cy] with the documented profiles of acting out adolescents" (p. 2353), but failed to distinguish the juvenile sexual offender from the juvenile offender. On the WISC-R, a significant difference was discerned between the Performance and Verbal scales. Subjects were found to significantly vary in intelligence when race and socioeconomic status were compared. Comparison of the WISC-R IQ scores of juvenile sexual offenders and juvenile offenders resulted in the finding that most functioned in the Average range of cognitive capacity when mean scores were considered (Awad et al., 1984; Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus, 1979; and Markey, 1950).

In addition to Blumenfeld's (1979) study, other researchers have sought to identify the MMPI as diagnostically useful in differentiating juvenile offenders. Tsubouchi and Jenkins (1969) discerned that the MMPIs of 100 incarcerated juvenile offenders classified as socialized delinquent, unsocialized aggressive, and runaway fell within patterns of "adaptive motivation" (socialized delinquent) and "maladaptive frustration" (unsocialized aggressive and runaway) (p. 358). Mack (1969) determined that the MMPI was not helpful in differentiating between recidivists and nonrecidivists in a delinquent population although single clinical elevated codes differed in that the 82 recidivists

more frequently had a clinically elevated Pd score and the 69 nonrecidivists more frequently had a clinically elevated Hy score. A taxonomy including categories of "psychopathic", "adjusted", and "neurotic" was developed by Gregory (1974) in his study of the MMPIs of 199 incarcerated juvenile offenders based on his successful classification of 63% of the MMPI profiles. An unknown number of sexual offenders were included in his sample. Institutionalized juvenile offenders (15), introductory psychology college students (196), and active community volunteers (15) were compared by Hawk and Peterson (1974) using the MMPI Pd, K, and L scales and 14 randomly selected items and Kohlberg's moral dilemmas. Both the criterion group of the community volunteers (53.3%) and the delinquent group (73.3%) attained scores above the 70th percentile on the Pd + k scale. However, the juvenile offender group scored significantly lower on the morality dilemmas. Thus, the authors suggested that the Kohlberg morality scores be considered in assessing social deviance versus psychopathic deviance. Two-point code classifications were found to distinguish between more violent offenders (Abnormal F and 78) and less violent "hands-off" (Smith et al., 1987, p. 429) offenders (normal profiles).

Among research studies employing the Rorschach in a battery of tests, psychological functioning of juvenile sexual offenders and juvenile offenders was not found to

differ significantly (Awad et al., 1984; Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus, 1979; and Markey, 1950). Roberts and Erickson (1969) employed the Bower, Testin, and Roberts scoring profile to distinguish between "more controlled" and "more impulsive" incarcerated juvenile offenders (p. 633). Through discriminant function analysis, Curtiss, Feczko, and Maarohn (1979) determined the Affective Ratio (Afr) to differentiate between 38 adolescent males and 30 institutionalized adolescent males who had committed reported and unreported juvenile offenses.

An estimate of force utilized during the commission of the offense was obtained through the use of an aggression rating scale described by Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kaplan (1986). No reliability or validity estimates are available. The ratings are on a scale ranging from 0 (not applicable), 1 (noncoercion), 2 (verbal coercion), 3 (physical coercion), to 4 (excessive physical coercion). Verbal approval for use of the rating system has been obtained from the authors.

Procedure

With the approval by the county juvenile department board, the records of all subjects charged with sexual offenses and tested by the psychology staff of the juvenile department during the years 1984 through 1988 were examined. A comparison group of subjects charged with

person or property offenses and tested by the psychology staff of the juvenile department during the same time period was selected by the clerical staff. Selection was based on availability of files.

Demographic information was taken from the forms recorded by the juvenile department probation officer in the juvenile department file and consisted of subject age, race, socioeconomic status (including available information specifying income and housing cost), and height and weight. Offense related information collected included the specific offense(s), type and degree of threat or force used, and prior arrests and convictions for sexual offenses and nonsexual offenses.

Intellectual functioning and psychological assessment data was gathered from the results of the battery of tests usually administered by the juvenile department staff psychologists. Standard score equivalents obtained from the intelligence tests were utilized. Comparison of discrepancies between academic achievement scores and intelligence scores served as a check of learning disability indicators (Sattler, 1982). Personality functioning was demonstrated on the MMPI using the adolescent norms with subjects 10 through 16 and adult norms with subjects 17 years of age (Archer cited in Graham, p. 84). Valid profiles included those profiles with less than 30 omissions and T-scores less than 70 on the validity subscales of L, F,

and K (Graham, 1987). Similarly, the age appropriate mean scores (Exner, 1986) on the summary scores of X+%, X-%, SCZI, DEPI, and S-CON were employed in the determination of personality functioning revealed in the Rorschach.

The juvenile department files maintained by the respective probation officers were read with particular attention to the legal court orders and face sheet to determine disposition. The police report(s) and predisposition report prepared by the probation officer aided in the assessment of degree of force used in the offense. Information regarding recidivism was collected from the face sheet and predisposition report. As the study is retrospective, data are incomplete on some subjects.

Statistical Analysis

A correlational design was employed in the study of the variables identified as influential in the disposition outcomes affecting juvenile sexual offenders and juvenile offenders. Predictor variables representative of legal factors identified were (1) type of offense, (2) use of force, and (3) recidivism. Nonlegal factors comprised the remaining predictor variables including socioeconomic status and race. Psychological functioning was an additional variable and included assessment of personality and intellectual functioning. Control of potentially

influential covariates such as age and physical size, that may have affected the grouping variable of disposition, was statistically achieved by initial comparison with all study variables. The disposition groups included no action taken, assignment to the community, removal from the community, or certification as an adult. Data collected in the course of this study included different levels of measurement and thus, necessitated multiple types of analyses. Selected statistical analyses are discussed below in association with the appropriate hypothesis.

Description of the Sample

Descriptive statistics were employed to fully describe the sample. Range and mean were reported for subject age and physical size. A frequency count of subject race was supplied. Socioeconomic status was calculated via range for income and housing costs. Range and mean were reported for recidivism and degree of force whereas frequency was noted for offense types. Likewise, range, mean, and standard deviation were computed for intelligence and academic achievement standard scores as well as Rorschach scores. Finally, frequency and mean were provided to describe MMPI subscale standard T scores.

Hypotheses

A multiple discriminant function analysis was applied to determine the significance of the contribution of predictor variables including type of offense, use of force, recidivism, personality and intellectual functioning, socioeconomic status, and race in the differentiation of types of dispositions assigned to juvenile sexual offenders and juvenile offenders.

1. Personality features would not serve to differentiate between types of dispositions. Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) was applied to determine any between group differences on Rorschach scores of SCZI, DEPI, SCON, X+%, and X-% and MMPI standard T scores on subscales of Hs, D, Hy, Pd, Mf, Pa, Pt, Sc, Ma, and Si.

2. Intellectual functioning would not generally differentiate between types of dispositions assigned to subjects. Analysis of variance was applied to determine any between group differences on intelligence standard scores and WRAT-R standard scores on Arithmetic, Spelling, and Reading subtests.

3. Offense type would not differentiate between disposition groupings. Chi-square analysis was utilized in the determination of between group differences. Offense types were classified as sexual, person, property, and mixed.

4. Use of force would not differentiate between

dispositions. Chi-square analysis was used to determine if groups differed in the degree of force applied.

5. Evidence of recidivism would not differentiate between disposition groups. Recidivism was divided into 4 types including sexual, person, property, and mixed. Analysis was completed by chi-square.

6. Socioeconomic status would differentiate between disposition types. Between group differences were determined with Chi-square analysis. Total income was grouped in \$10000 increments. Housing costs were grouped in increments of \$200.

7. Race would differentiate between disposition types. Chi-square analysis was employed in the determination of proportion of ethnic backgrounds in each disposition group. Specific racial groupings included black, white, and Hispanic.

8. Offense compared with race would differentiate between types of dispositions. A chi square analysis was employed.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Sample

Data collection revealed two basic groups of subjects, those with consistent offense histories and those with mixed offense histories. These two groups were compared on all variables using the t-test for independent samples or Pearson χ^2 test. No differences were found between groups except on recidivism. Those subjects with a mixed offense history were found to have more rearrests than subjects with a history of committing the same type offense, $t(199) = 2.93, p < .05$. Since having more arrests allows the opportunity to have arrests for more than one offense type, this is not surprising. Since the groups did not differ on any relevant variables, subjects were pooled by distributing offenders with mixed offenses to their respective disposition group within the consistent offense type group. All further analyses were conducted on the pooled sample.

All subjects in the sample were male. Analysis of variance revealed that offenders certified as adults (certified group) were older than those in the other 3

groups, $F(3, 194) = 3.77, p < .01$ (Tables 1 and 2). Further description of the sample can be found in Tables 3 through 8 located in the Appendix.

Personality Variables

Disposition groups were compared on Rorschach indices and MMPI scale T-scores using a series of Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA). The first MANOVA compared groups on the number of Rorschach responses and the Lambda summary score. Groups did not differ on either of these scores (Table 11). However, the MANOVA comparing groups on the Rorschach summary scores of the Schizophrenia Index (SCZI), Depression Index (DEPI), Suicide Constellation (S-CON), Conventional Form (X+%), and Distorted Form (X-%) was statistically significant, $F(15, 334) = 2.37, p < .01$. Univariate ANOVA revealed group differences on DEPI, $F(3, 129) = 2.71, p < .05$, and S-CON, $F(3, 125) = 4.27, p < .01$ (Tables 10 and 11). A series of contrasts was then used to compare disposition groups within the Univariate ANOVAS. Contrasts on DEPI revealed that offenders certified as adults had higher DEPI scores than subjects remanded to the community and removed from the community, $F(1, 129) = 5.70, p < .05$. Offenders removed from the community and those remanded to the community did not differ on DEPI scores. Subjects who were released with no action taken did not differ from any other groups on DEPI scores. Contrasts on

S-CON scores found that offenders remanded to the community had lower S-CON scores than those certified as adults, $F(1, 125) = 10.78, p < .001$. No other group differences were found for S-CON scores.

The MANOVA comparing scores on the MMPI validity scales (L, F, and K) among the 4 groups proved statistically nonsignificant. MMPI clinical scales Hs, D, Hy, Pd, and M/F for the disposition groupings were compared via MANOVA and found to be statistically nonsignificant. Similarly, the MANOVA comparing groups with MMPI clinical scales Pa, Pt, Sc, Ma, and Si was nonsignificant. Together, MANOVA revealed no group differences on any MMPI variables (Table 12).

Intellectual Functioning

MANOVA was utilized to compare disposition groups on measures of school achievement. Disposition groups showed no significant differences on WRAT subtest scores of Reading, Spelling, and Arithmetic (Table 113).

Analysis of variance was used to compare disposition groups on intelligence scores. Unfortunately, the juvenile department's philosophy of individualized testing resulted in marginal to insufficient numbers of subjects in each group of intelligence test scores per test. An ANOVA was not conducted to compare disposition groups on the PPVT standard scores since it would have been

meaningless due to the small number of subjects (N = 15). An ANOVA found that disposition groups did not differ on Culture Fair IQ scores, although the N of 74 was small. Groups did not differ on the WISC-R or WAIS-R FSIQ scores. To support these findings, an ANOVA comparing groups using a subject's IQ score, regardless of its source, was conducted. The outcome upheld the initial results by indicating no differences between the groups (Table 13). Therefore, this suggests that achievement and intelligence measures do not distinguish disposition groupings.

Legal Variables

Current offense was found to discriminate between disposition groups, $\chi^2 (6) = 18.72, p < .01$ (Table 14). Statistical results indicated that juvenile sex offenders were more likely to receive dispositions of no action taken or assignment to the community than violent person offenders or property offenders. Property offenders, rather than sexual offenders or violent person offenders, were more likely to receive the disposition of removal from the community. Numerically, more person offenders were certified as adults (20% compared with 6% of sexual offenders and 10% of property offenders).

Results of ANOVA procedures demonstrated that subjects certified as adults had a significantly greater number of current offenses than those with lesser

dispositions of no action taken, assignment to the community, and removal from the community, $F(3, 194) = 5.07$, $p < .01$ (Table 15). In other words, subjects sentenced with the most severe disposition have been charged with and convicted of a significantly greater number of current offenses.

Through chi-square analysis, use of force was found to distinguish between groups $\chi^2(3) = 18.85$, $p < .001$ (Table 14). Too few subjects used force at the level of noncoercion or verbal coercion. Consequently, these subjects were deleted from the analysis. Results suggested that subjects who did not use a weapon, but employed physical coercion were more likely to receive a disposition of assignment to the community. Those subjects who used a weapon (excessive physical coercion) were more likely to be certified as adults.

Utilizing chi-square analysis, type of past offenses did not differentiate disposition groups utilizing chi-square analysis. However, when number of past offenses was analyzed using ANOVA, recidivism was shown to discriminate between disposition groups $F(3, 194) = 13.63$, $p < .001$ (Table 15). Examination of contrasts between groups revealed no difference in subjects who received dispositions of no action taken or remand to the community. Increasingly higher recidivism rates were determined among subjects removed from the community and certified as adults.

Disposition groupings of assignment to the community and no action taken did not differ. Thus, more severe dispositions are associated with recidivism rate.

Chi-square analysis demonstrated that the disposition groups did not differ on the socioeconomic variables of earned income and housing costs (Table 9). Data were limited for the variable subsidies due to the variability of the cases and the particular disposition assigned to the individual (i.e., in cases where no action was taken, parent(s) and guardian(s) were not required to provide a financial statement used to determine parental or guardian contribution to the cost of institutionalized care). Therefore, no analysis was done.

Disposition groups did not differ in racial composition based on chi-square analysis (Table 9). Due to the small N found in the categories of American Indian (1) and "other" (2), these were omitted from the analysis. Further analysis of a possible relationship between racial grouping and socioeconomic status was not conducted since no differences were discerned between disposition groups on both variables.

A chi-square analysis conducted to determine if disposition groups differed on variables of racial background and current offense was nonsignificant (Table 16). Thus, in this study, minority group members are not more likely than majority group members to be arrested and charged with any particular offense.

A direct or simultaneous discriminant function analysis was performed. Variables that had been determined statistically significant in previous analyses including Rorschach summary scores of Depression and Suicide Constellation, number of current offenses, recidivism rate, type of current offense, and use of force were predictor variables. Multivariate analysis of the predictor variables was significant at $F(18, 273) = 3.584$, $p < .001$ (Tables 17 and 18). Disposition groups included (1) no action taken, (2) assignment to the community, (3) removal from the community, and (4) certification as an adult. Cases available for analysis totaled 98 after 100 cases were omitted due to missing data. No pattern seemed evident on examination of the missing data. The sample did not violate the assumptions of MANOVA and thus, the analysis continued.

Three discriminant functions were calculated resulting in a significant combined chi-square test of residual roots 1 through 3, $\chi^2(18) = 66.03$, $p < .001$. Discriminating power was found to be nonsignificant following removal of the first function. The first discriminant function accounted for 66% of the variance. Squared canonical correlations or eigenvalues indicating the distribution of shared variance among the functions were .44 for Function 1, .09 for Function 2, and .04 for Function 3.

Predictor variables with loadings in excess of .30 on

the first discriminant function included recidivism rate (.62), number of current offenses (.47), Suicide Constellation summary score (.39), and current offense type (.31). (See canonical loadings matrix of correlations between predictor variables and discriminant functions in Table 17). Pooled within-group correlations among these four significant predictor variables (alpha set at .001) are displayed in Table 19 of the Appendix. An inverse relationship that is admittedly small, $r(98) = -.14$, was discerned between number of current offenses and recidivism rate. This may be more reflective of the uncontrolled variables associated with the determination of charges. Type of current offense and recidivism rate were positively related, $r(98) = .33$, suggesting that particular offense types are associated with higher recidivism rates.

Examination of the classification matrices revealed an accuracy rate substantially greater than chance. The hit rate for the four disposition groups was 56%. The minimal acceptable hit rate was targeted at 31.25% (or 25% above chance). When the hit rate for each disposition group was inspected separately, accuracy of percentage of subjects classified was high for subjects certified as adults (75%) and those remanded to the community on probation or parole (63%). Classification of subjects where no legal action was taken fell within an acceptable margin of accuracy at 50%. The least accurate rate was that of

subjects removed from the community (42%), yet, the odds of selection were still slightly above chance.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study questioned the assumption that juvenile sexual offenders and juvenile nonsexual offenders substantively differ, with particular emphasis on the contribution of legal and nonlegal variables to disposition decisions. It was hypothesized that disposition decisions would be influenced by nonlegal variables of race and socioeconomic status based on outcome studies of juvenile offenders. Additional variables of personality and intellectual functioning were predicted to have little effect on disposition decisions. Legal variables of seriousness of the offense, determined by offense type and use of force, and recidivism were not expected to impact disposition decisions to a significant degree.

Personality Variables

The first hypothesis proposed that personality features would not serve to distinguish between types of dispositions. Differences between groups were determined on the Rorschach DEPI and S-CON summary scale scores only. Subjects certified as adults obtained the highest average

failed to endorse significantly more depression indicators than subjects where no legal action was taken. All disposition groups scored, on the average, well below the DEPI cut-off score indicating that depression is rare. Exner's (1986) recommended cut-off score of 4.0 was attained by a very small percentage of subjects including those remanded to the community (.03), those removed from the community (.02), and those certified as adults (.11). Interestingly, seriousness of the disposition does not explain why subjects certified as adults and those who face no legal outcome experience greater dysphoria than subjects probated or paroled, or removed from the community unless DEPI cut-off scores are contemplated. However, the absence of significant depressive features from the protocols of subjects who faced no legal consequences further sustains the impression that subjects faced with increasingly more serious dispositions are more likely to feel depressed.

The interpretative value of the Suicide Constellation summary score continues to be controversial and is discussed conservatively in terms of meaning, particularly since the sample included subjects below the age of 15 (Exner, 1986). Subjects certified as adults demonstrated significantly more indicators associated with "high risk for self-destruction, or a preoccupation with self-destruction" (Exner, 1986, p. 414), with an average S-CON summary score of 5.39 and standard deviation of 1.61, than subjects remanded to the

community on probation or parole, who had an average summary score of 3.75 and a standard deviation of 1.98. (The age range of subjects certified as adults was 15 to 17 years or within the range where scores can be interpreted conservatively.) A cursory examination of the outcome suggests that seriousness of the disposition would not explain this difference since the S-CON summary scores of subjects certified as adults do not vary significantly between those subjects where no action was taken (average S-CON of 4.77, standard deviation of 1.70) and those who were removed from the community (average S-CON of 4.7, standard deviation of 1.58). Similar percentages of subjects in disposition groups of no action taken (.17), removal from the community (.16), and certified as adults (.17) scored at or above the S-CON cut-off score of 7. In contrast, a much lower percentage of subjects remanded to the community produced such high S-CON summary scores (.06). However, when the cut-off scores of subjects aged 15 - 17 years only are considered, the percentages drop substantially among subjects where no action was taken (.07) and those removed from the community (.07). Thus, seriousness of the disposition may influence the potential for self-destructive ideation.

Manifestation of significant difficulties in personality functioning including depressive and self-destructive indicators are evidenced relatively

infrequently among all subjects. Albeit, depression and self-destructive potential may be more associated with seriousness of the disposition when the cut-off scores for these summary scale scores are considered. These results indicate that, generally, few subjects assigned to the juvenile justice system differ dramatically enough from their peers to warrant different treatment or placement due to psychological needs. These findings would argue against Hartstone and Cocozza's (1983) combined treatment of the violent and mentally ill juvenile offenders especially when cost effectiveness of the program and the authors' admitted difficulty in locating sufficient numbers of juveniles who were both violent and mentally ill to fill beds are considered. The increase of depression and suicidal ideation among subjects certified as adults may be a temporal relationship that is reactive in context and thus, time-limited rather than chronic or characterological in nature.

Intellectual Functioning

The second hypothesis theorized that disposition groups would not differ in academic achievement and intellectual functioning. The finding of no differences in academic achievement and intellectual functioning between disposition groups supported this hypothesis. Intelligence scores fell predominantly within the Low Average to Average

range of cognitive functioning. These findings are in agreement with past research efforts (e.g. Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus, 1979; Markey, 1950; Awad et al. 1979). Average WRAT-R achievement scores fell between the Borderline range and the lower limits of the Low Average range. Subjects achieved consistently higher average scores across groupings in WRAT-R subtests of Reading (79.40) and Spelling (77.89) than Arithmetic (74.47). Achievement scores were lower than would be expected when compared with average intelligence scores. However, the extent of the discrepancy varied depending upon the test results used for comparison (PPVT average score of 88.99, CF average score of 93.87, and Wechsler average scores of 81.55). Sattler (1982) indicated "the available evidence suggests that culture-fair tests do not show greater validity for ethnic minorities than do more verbally loaded tests, such as the Stanford-Binet and the WISC-R" (p. 382). He also warned of the "culturally loaded" (p. 383) intelligence tests such as the PPVT. Therefore, the Wechsler scales may provide a more accurate estimation of intellectual abilities. In this particular comparison of average scores, the difference between academic and cognitive abilities is lessened suggesting that the risk of learning disabilities is lowered.

Consistent with previous research efforts (e.g. Atcheson & Williams, 1954; Awad et al., 1979; Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus, 1979; Markey, 1950; Tarter et al., 1983) cognitive

abilities do not appear to distinguish disposition groups. Awad et al.'s (1979) findings regarding a greater number of sexual offenders scoring below 80 was unsupported as equivalent numbers of subjects with current charges and/or past convictions of person offenses, property offenses, and sexual offenses (or a combination) scored in the Borderline range or Mild Mental Retardation range of intellectual functioning.

Seriousness of the Offense

The third hypothesis suggested that type of offense committed would fail to discriminate group dispositions. The data did not substantiate this premise as subjects who engaged in property offenses and thus, presented the least risk to community safety, were more often removed from the community (47%). The incongruous nature of the decision-making involved in the determination of dispositions is apparent as juvenile sex offenders were more typically released to the community without legal consequences (27%) or on probation/parole (40%) although this increased the risk of danger to the public. This finding regarding the disposition outcomes of sexual offenders is consistent with past studies (Doshay, 1943; Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kaplan, 1986; Becker, Kaplan, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kavoussi, 1986; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Tarter et al., 1983) in that the majority of these offenders remain in the

community. Doshay's (1943) determination that juvenile sexual offenders were more often discharged without action was upheld. Therefore, an inverse relationship is demonstrated between seriousness of the offense type and disposition. The findings also suggest that Walsh's (1984) conclusions regarding discriminatory sentencing of adult sex offenders do not apply to juveniles.

Use of force had been thought to be antithetical to disposition grouping determinations. This contention was unsupported as the degree of force employed by subjects distinguished the disposition groups with a rather narrow focus. That is, the use of weaponry was more highly associated with adult certification procedures and removal of the offender from the juvenile justice system. Probation/parole was the more likely disposition for those subjects who did not use a weapon. Inevitable threats to community safety can be inferred from the consistency of violent behavior among sexual (86% used force) and person offenders (96% used force) across dispositions although the most violent offenders were remanded to the adult justice system. (Of course, this procedure does not guarantee placement of the violent offender away from the community and may, in fact, result in a speedier release to society due to factors such as adult jail overcrowding.) Person offenders (61%) used a weapon more frequently than sex offenders (19%). The greater majority of property

offenders were not represented as their offenses typically did not involve a victim at the scene of the crime regardless of the disposition. Previous studies (Groth, 1977; Groth et al., 1981; Monastersky & Smith, 1985; Shoor et al., 1966) recommended removal of aggressive sex offenders from the community.

Finally, rate of recidivism had been falsely believed to be noninfluential in the classification of disposition groups. Subjects with access to the community through dispositions of no action taken or probation/parole demonstrated equivalent recidivism rates. Yet, the rate of recidivism exhibited by subjects removed from the community and those certified as adults, respectively, indicated an increasing association between rearrest frequency and seriousness of the disposition.

Legal variables, comprised of type of offense, use of force, and rate of recidivism were found to discriminate between disposition groups. Severity of the disposition seemed appropriately correlated with increasing degree of force and recidivism rate. In contrast, the relationship of seriousness of the offense and disposition is apparently reversed when type of offense is considered. Property offenders were more likely to be removed from the community, but their crimes rarely involved force and victims were usually not at the scene of the crime. Juvenile sex offenders had a greater chance of being

released to the community with no action taken or placed on probation. Physical coercion and weaponry were employed predominantly by subjects charged with or convicted of offenses that involved physical and/or sexual assault.

Socioeconomic Status and Race Variables

The sixth hypothesis proposed that socioeconomic status would discern between disposition groupings. This proposal was not supported as the groups did not differ in terms of family income and housing costs. The generally low socioeconomic status of the majority of juveniles who came into contact with the county juvenile department was obvious on closer examination of the sample as a whole. Thirty-one percent of the subjects' annual family incomes fell below \$11,650, the figure established as the 1988 poverty level for a family of four (United States Census Bureau, personal communication, March 2, 1989). A total of 76% of the subjects' annual family income fell at or below \$20,000. In contrast, only 2 percent of this sample would be required to file a 1988 1040 tax return by the federal government due to earnings of \$50,000 or more annually (United States Department of the Treasury Internal Revenue Service, 1988, p. 6). Monthly housing costs of 44 percent of the subjects were \$300 or less. It should be noted that annual family income and housing costs of subjects where no action was taken may vary from these findings. In

these cases, it is possible that the family utilized their resources to obtain private defense attorneys or finance alternative interventions. Since sexual offenders were more typically released to the community with no action taken, one could speculate that the socioeconomic status of these offenders might be higher than other offender types consistent with the findings of Doshay (1943) and Awad et al. (1979).

Race was thought to distinguish between dispositions, but no differences were determined among the major racial groups represented including blacks (55%), Hispanics (15%), and whites (28%). This outcome confirms the racial data of court referred subjects gathered by Doshay (1943), and Tarter et al. (1983). As mentioned before, the geographic location and the population studied (e.g. court referred vs. incarcerated subjects; suburban vs. inner city subjects) may affect racial representation of the sample. The county studied provided an optimal study site since suburban, rural, and inner city locales are all found in this part of Texas.

The finding of race as uninfluential in the determination of disposition decisions contradicts the conclusions reached in studies of juvenile offenders (Lewis, Balla, & Shanok, 1979; Lewis et al., 1980; Thornberry, 1973; & Westendorp et al., 1986). Thornberry's (1973) association of socioeconomic status and severity of

the disposition was not sustained in this population of juvenile sexual, property, person, and mixed offenders.

The hypothesis that minority group members would be more likely than majority group members to be arrested and charged with particular offenses was unfounded. This could be attributed to objective investigations on the part of the local police and sheriff's departments. The diversity of offenses committed across races could also provide an explanation. In any case, Davis and Leitenberg's (1987) charge of racial bias in sexual crime arrest statistics was unsubstantiated in this study.

Predictor Variables

The final hypothesis proposed that nonlegal variables of socioeconomic status and race would significantly contribute to the determination of disposition decisions. Variables including type of offense, use of force, recidivism rate, and psychological functioning were predicted to have no influence. This hypothesis was not supported by the data. Instead, legal factors of recidivism rate (62%), number of current offenses (47%), and type of current offense (31%) and the psychological indice of the Suicide Constellation summary score (39%) were found to contribute to determination of dispositions. Combined, these variables successfully estimated the percentage of juveniles assigned to their respective

dispositions at a rate of 56%. The accuracy of the prediction of the percentage of subjects correctly classified ranged from 75% for juveniles certified as adults (highest recidivism rates, number of current offenses, and S-Con summary scores) to 42% for juveniles removed from the community to institutions.

The inverse relationship between a juvenile's number of current offenses and recidivism rate has no substantive meaning in this particular population since 71% of the sample had repeated offenses. Thus, these subjects have typically committed fewer offenses on their petition, which lists current charges, than are reflected in arrest records. A further explanation is suggested by the uncontrolled factors influencing the timing of the filing of the petition to the court. For example, legal procedures associated with the process of petitioning the court for certification of an adolescent as an adult are time consuming and dependent on multiple uncontrolled variables such as court docket vacancies, the requirement of psychological testing, and legal maneuvers by defense and prosecution attorneys. Thus, offenders will logically have a lower number of current offenses in contrast with a relatively higher recidivism rate.

Clearly, person offenders (85%) and property offenders (90%) reoffended at a higher rate than sex offenders (51%). Yet, these results are significantly

different from those found in earlier studies such as Maclay (1960) who reported minimal recidivism rates for sex offenders. This may be attributable to larger sample sizes and greater diversity of study samples. There is also an increasing recognition that a pattern of offenses involving only sexual assault is less likely than a pattern of mixed offenses. This study indicated the recidivism rates of sex (45%) and person (77%) offenders were more likely to include mixed offenses than property offenders (28%). Several studies (Awad et al., 1979; Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kaplan, 1986; Doshay, 1943; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Lewis, Shanok, & Pincus, 1979; Smith and Monastersky, 1986) report finding mixed offense patterns among sex offenders.

Theoretical Implications and Application

Disposition decisions were impacted predominantly by legal variables including recidivism rate (with the greatest degree of influence), number and type of current offense(s), and a psychological test indice of self-destructive potential (previously described as most likely temporal and reactive in nature). Thus, it was found that sex offenders were more likely to be released to the community with no legal action or on probation/parole and property offenders were more likely to be removed from the community and institutionalized. The relevant question, then, is do substantial differences exist between juvenile sexual

offenders and nonsexual offenders so as to warrant such discrepant dispositions?

Overall, the answer, based on the data accumulated from this study, would be "no" although dispositions were significantly different. Instead, mixed offense patterns and violence as a "modus operandus" tended to separate sex and person offenders from property offenders although property and person offenders repeated offenses at moderately higher rates than sex offenders.

Consequently, specific terms or labels such as "sex" or "person" offenders appear to be misnomers for a significant segment of the population of juvenile offenders. In fact, a more accurate label for this group of offenders may be violent offender. This may be particularly true since Groth's (1977) warning about overconcern regarding labeling juveniles as sex offenders has not been heeded as the dispositions of this sample demonstrate. Ironically, this curious reaction to the label sex offender can result in the perpetuation of the acts of the novice or at least, the failure to provide adequate intervention. Therefore, the most logical step may be to change the label and clarify the characteristics associated with the group.

Assessment of risk and distinction between low and high risk juveniles have been proposed by researchers (e. g. Groth et al., 1981; Monastersky & Smith, 1985) as stated in Chapter II. Accordingly, authors including Groth (1977)

and Shoor et al. (1966) recommend removal of the aggressive juvenile from the community. Implementation of this guideline would require much restructuring of current policy since weighting of disposition decisions would change. That is, recidivism rate, number of current offenses, and type of offense would be reduced in importance and the contribution of use of force and offense pattern would be increased in decisions regarding dispositions. For example, 88% of the sample were first time offenders including sex offenders (88%), person offenders (94%), and property offenders (84%). Under restructured disposition guidelines, property offenders would be referred to the community for services and/or treatment since the majority of the sex and person offenders used physical force and/or a weapon. (Subjects on probation had received psychological treatment in the community including 42% of the sex offenders, 27% of the person offenders, and 18% of the property offenders.) Essentially, replication of the state model emphasizing community treatment for nonviolent offenders would be a complementary direction for the overcrowded local juvenile detention center (Young & Howard, 1989).

Recommendations For Further Research

Considerable variance (34%) remained unaccounted for in the discriminant function. Possible explanations for this variance include the inclusion of more subjective (and

thus, more difficult to operationally define and measure) variables such as the attitudes and philosophies of judges and juvenile probation officers, adequacy of the defense, prior referrals and dispositions rather than recidivism and current offenses, availability of appropriate services, family support and involvement, and the perception of the juvenile's attitude toward the legal system and its representative authorities and feelings about his/her offense held by the judges and juvenile probation officers. Another area not accounted for may be the attitude of the authorities toward the type of offense perpetrated as there apparently exists a widely held conviction that sex offenders differ substantially from other types of offenders. Further analysis of these topics would help clarify the classification of juvenile offenders.

The speculation that ample family resources contributed to the juvenile sex offender's more favorable disposition could be examined through a prospective study. The relationship between the date of employment of a private attorney and disposition would be an interesting aspect to explore. Also, the initiation of private treatment for the juvenile may serve as an influential variable that sways the disposition determination.

Comparative analysis of the nature of the services extended to juvenile offenders in the community and institutions is suggested as a more cost effective and time

efficient method from which disposition decisions could be formulated. Program evaluation of services could also match the needs of the population with program strengths and alternatives. This type of evaluation could impact the focus of direct service providers and increase the number of appropriate recipients. For example, treatment for sex offenders could be modified to include treatment for aggressive offenders with a specialized component for sexual offending behaviors. Property offenders may benefit more from development of community services that are preventative in nature (e.g. developing an investment in the integrity of the community). It is envisioned that such an evaluation might result in more efficacious use of available resources such as the institution of a stringent restitution program and community service requirement rather than costly institutionalization for property offenders who employ no use of force and in fact, have no direct contact with a victim per se.

Lewis, Shanok, and Pincus' (1979) contention that a similar etiology explaining violent behavior in person and sex offenders was not supported by this study's outcome with regard to cognitive functioning and psychiatric features. Yet, violence and mixed offense patterns were common among this incarcerated population of sex and person offenders. These authors refer to "loose, rambling logical thought processes" (p. 1196) among their incarcerated subjects.

Interestingly, the Schizophrenia Index among subjects in this study fell below the cut-off score of 4 across dispositions. However, misperceptions of stimuli were common in each disposition group as indicated by the excessively low Conventional Form summary scores (X+) which ranged from an average of .49 for subjects removed from the community to .56 for subjects certified as adults. Gross distortion of reality was also evident across dispositions as demonstrated by the elevated Distorted Form summary scores (X-) which ranged from .21 for the subjects remanded to the community to .30 for the subjects who received no legal action. These results evoke Samenow's (1984) theory of cognitive distortions engaged in by offenders. Thus, these results give evidence of another area of commonality rather than dissimilarity between offenders.

Long term prospective studies should include female subjects in order to offer a new perspective on the findings which have been largely based on males only. Male victim reports of female perpetrators account for 20% of sexual abuse cases. Female victim reports of female perpetrators account for 5% of these sexual abuse cases (Finkelhor, 1984). Therefore, females are more active in the perpetration of sex offenses than is readily apparent in a review of juvenile justice cases.

Regardless of the area explored through future research, the sample must include a control group of

juvenile nonsexual offenders. The study should encompass the concept of major groups of juvenile offenders and subgroups that are more comprehensive than the division of juveniles based on current offense type. The contrast of use of force, recidivism rate, and offense pattern is necessary to define the characteristics of the offender on a general basis. This is not to say that idiosyncratic characteristics specific to a certain subgroup should not be examined and compared such as the juvenile's expression of violent behavior through physically aggressive, sexual offenses rather than physically aggressive, nonsexual offenses.

Summation

Substantive differences in intellectual abilities and demographic identifiers between offenders regardless of the disposition grouping were not supported by the data. Few subjects demonstrated serious impairment in psychological functioning across dispositions with the exception of those certified as adults who revealed more depressive and self-destructive tendencies. Use of force and patterns of mixed offenses were far more common to person and sex offenders suggesting that these labels are simplistic and inaccurate in describing the characteristics associated with these offenders. That these labels have contributed to less than optimal dispositions for offenders who have committed sexual

offenses is evident based on the study results.

Racial and socioeconomic variables were not found to contribute to disposition decisions. This lack of discriminatory practice among members of the county juvenile judiciary deserves commendation. However, a more subtle type of discriminatory practice may have been uncovered if one were to seriously apply Roberts' (1986) charge of institutional abuse (when psychosocial services are not made available to pediatric patients in a hospital setting) to the varied outcomes of disposition determinations.

It is proposed that this type of abuse can be generalized to community and institutional facilities for juvenile offenders and expanded to include the concept of appropriateness of the psychosocial services made available. An example is the potentially negative effect on nonviolent offenders housed in an institution with violent offenders when principles of learned behavior are considered (e. g. nonviolent offender learns to respond with violence in this setting). Additionally, this situation poses personal threat of harm to the nonviolent offender. This scenario not only holds the institution liable for the safety of the nonviolent offender, but would indict the institution or the State as perpetrator of institutional abuse of the rights of the nonviolent offender through the nonprovision of rehabilitation that is appropriate for his/her needs.

Resolution to this conflict may be partially found in Hilliard's (1984) call for reform of the juvenile justice system. Deinstitutionalization of juveniles convicted of property offenses, in particular, is recommended based on this study's outcome. Furthermore, it is proposed that the psychosocial needs of the violent offender are more likely to be met in an institutional setting that offers structure and limits and restricts their opportunity to reoffend during treatment designed to diminish violent acting out. Also, attempts should be made to enhance the likelihood of continuing the gains achieved while institutionalized into extra-mural settings. Since, by the very nature of these institutions, access to the targets/victims of the offender is prevented, treatment effects cannot be measured prior to re-entry into the community. Therefore, psychosocial treatments must include components which increase generalization and maintenance of appropriate behavior after re-entry. Ultimately, the safety of the community is of the utmost importance and should be given consideration in the determination of disposition decisions.

REFERENCES

- Abel, G. G., Becker, J. V., Cunningham-Rathner, J., Rouleau, J. L., Kaplan, M., & Reich, J. (1984). The treatment of child molesters: A manual. Unpublished manuscript, New York.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1987). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (rev. ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Atcheson, J. D., & Williams, D. C. (1954). A study of juvenile sex offenders. American Journal of Psychiatry, 111, 366-370.
- Awad, G. A., Saunder, E., & Levene, J. (1979). A clinical study of male adolescent sexual offenders. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 28, 105-115.
- Becker, J. V., & Abel, G. G. (1984). Methodological and ethical issues in evaluating and treating adolescent sexual offenders. Unpublished manuscript, Columbia University, New York.
- Becker, J. V., & Abel, G. G. (1984). Methodological and ethical issues in evaluating and treating adolescent sexual offenders. In E. M. Otey & G. D. Ryan (Eds.), Adolescent sex offenders: Issues in research and treatment, (pp. 109-129). Rockville: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Becker, J. V., Cunningham-Rathner, J., & Kaplan, M. S. (1986). Adolescent sexual offenders: Demographics, criminal and sexual histories, and recommendations for reducing future offenses. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1, 431-445.
- Becker, J. V., Kaplan, M. S., Cunningham-Rathner, J., & Kavoussi, R. (1986). Characteristics of adolescent incest sexual perpetrators: Preliminary findings. Journal of Family Violence, 1, 85-97.
- Blumenfeld, A. I. (1979). The adolescent rape offender: A psychological profile. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 2343B.

- Bonner, B. L. (1986, April). Issues in the treatment of juvenile sex offenders. Paper presented at the Meeting of the Thirty-second Annual Convention of the Southwestern Psychological Association, Fort Worth, Texas.
- Brown, S. E. (1984). Social class, child maltreatment, and delinquent behavior. Criminology, 22, 259-278.
- Curtiss, G., Feczko, M. D., & Marohn, R. C. (1979). Rorschach differences in normal and delinquent white male adolescents: A discriminant function analysis. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 8, 379-392.
- Davis, G. E., & Leitenberg, H. (1987). Adolescent sex offenders. Psychological Bulletin, 101, 417-427.
- Deisher, R. W., Wenet, G. A., Paperny, D. M., Clark, T. F., & Fehrenbach, P. A. (1982). Adolescent sexual offense behavior: The role of the physician. Journal of Adolescent Health Care, 2, 279-286.
- Doshay, L. J. (1943). The boy sex offender and his later career. Montclair: Patterson Smith.
- Dunn, L. M., & Markwardt, F. C., Jr. (1970). Peabody individual achievement test manual. Circle Pines: American Guidance Service, Inc.
- Earls, C. M., & Quinsey, V. L. (1985). What is to be done? Future research on the assessment and behavioral treatment of sex offenders. Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 3, 377-390.
- Exner, J. E., Jr. (1986). The Rorschach: A comprehensive system. Volume 1: Basic foundations (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fehrenbach, P. A., Smith, W., Monastersky, C., & Deisher, R. W. (1986). Adolescent sexual offenders: Offender and offense characteristics. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 56, 225-233.
- Felice, M., & Offord, D. R. (1971). Girl delinquency. A review. Corrective Psychiatry and Journal of Social Therapy, 17, 18-33.
- Figueira-McDonough, J. (1985). Are girls different? Gender discrepancies between delinquent behavior and

- control. Child Welfare, 64, 273-289.
- Finkelhor, D. (1979). What's wrong with sex between adults and children? American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 49, 692-697.
- Finkelhor, D. (1981). The sexual abuse of boys. Victimology: An International Journal, 6, 76-84.
- Finkelhor, D. (1984). Child sexual abuse: New theory and research. New York: The Free Press.
- Freeman-Longo, R. E. (1985). The adolescent sexual offender: Background and research perspectives. In E. M. Otey & G. D. Ryan (Eds.), Adolescent sex offenders: Issues in research and treatment, (pp. 109-129), Rockville: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Gil, E. (Speaker). (1985). Treating the adolescent and juvenile offender [Cassette Recording]. Portalo Valley, CA: The Institute for the Advancement of Human Behavior.
- Graham, J. R. (1987). The MMPI: A practical guide (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gregory, R. J. (1974). Replicated actuarial correlates for three MMPI code types in juvenile delinquency. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 30, 390-394.
- Groth, A. N. (1977). The adolescent sexual offender and his prey. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 21, 249-254.
- Groth, A. N., Hobson, W. F., Lucey, K. P., & St. Pierre, J. (1981). Juvenile sexual offenders: Guidelines for treatment. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 25, 265-272.
- Groth, A. N., Longo, R. E., & McFadin, J. B. (1982). Undetected recidivism among rapists and child molesters. Journal of Crime and Delinquency, 28, 450-458.
- Groth, A. N., & Loreda, C. M. (1981). Juvenile sexual offenders: Guidelines for assessment. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 25, 31-39.
- Hartstone, E., & Coccozza, J. (1983). Violent youth: The impact of mental health treatment. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 6, 207-224.

- Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1970). Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Manual (rev. ed.). New York: The Psychological Corporation.
- Hawk, S. S., & Peterson, R. A. (1974). Do MMPI psychopathic deviancy scores reflect psychopathic deviancy or just deviancy? Journal of Personality Assessment, 38, 362-368.
- Hilliard, W. O. (1984). Mental health in juvenile corrections. Emotional First Aid, 1, 17-25.
- Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. (1973). Measuring intelligence with the Culture Fair Tests: Manual for scale 2 and 3. Champaign, Ill: Author.
- Jastak, S., & Wilkinson, G. S. (1984). The Wide Range Achievement Test: Administration Manual. (rev. ed.). Wilmington: Jastak Associates, Inc.
- Knight, R. A., Rosenberg, R., & Schneider, B. A. (1985). Classification of sexual offenders: Perspectives, methods, and validation. In A. W. Burgess (Ed.), Rape and sexual assault (pp. 420-433). New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Knopp, F. H. (1985). The youthful sex offender: The rationale and goals of early intervention and treatment. New York: Safer Society Press.
- Lewis, D. O., Balla, D. A., & Shanok, S. S. (1979). Some evidence of race bias in the diagnosis and treatment of the juvenile offender. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 49, 53-61.
- Lewis, D. O., Shanok, S. S., Cohen, R. J., Kligfeld, M., & Frisone, G. (1980). Race bias in the diagnosis and disposition of violent adolescents. American Journal of Psychiatry, 137, 1211-1216.
- Lewis, D. O., Shanok, S. S., & Pincus, J. H. (1979). Juvenile male sexual assaulters. American Journal of Psychiatry, 136, 1194-1196.
- Liska, A. E. (1981). Perspectives on deviance. Englewood: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Longo, R. E. (1982). Sexual learning and experience among adolescent sexual offenders. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 26, 235-241.

- Longo, R. E., & Groth, A. N. (1983). Juvenile sexual offenses in the histories of adult rapists and child molesters. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 27, 150-155.
- Longo, R., & McFadin, B. (1981, December). Sexually inappropriate behavior: Development of the sexual offender. Law and Order, 21-23.
- Maclay, D. T. (1960). Boys who commit sexual misdemeanours. British Medical Journal, 5167, 186-190.
- Mack, J. L. (1969). The MMPI and recidivism. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 74, 612-614.
- Mann, C. R. (1984). Female crime and delinquency. University: The University of Alabama Press.
- Markey, O. B. (1950). A study of aggressive sex misbehavior in adolescents brought to juvenile court. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 20, 719-731.
- Marks, P. A., Seeman, W., & Haller, D. L. (1974). The actuarial use of the MMPI with adolescents and adults. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McClelland, A. M. (1982). Changing rates or changing roles - adolescent female delinquency re-assessed. Journal of Adolescence, 5, 85-98.
- McManus, M., Alessi, N. E., Grapetine, W. L., & Brickman, A. (1984). Psychiatric disturbance in serious delinquents. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 23, 602-615.
- Monastersky, C., & Smith, W. (1985). Juvenile sexual offenders: A family systems paradigm. In E. M. Otey & G. D. Ryan (Eds.), Adolescent sex offenders: Issues in research and treatment, (pp. 164-175). Rockville: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Ollendick, T. H. (1979). Discrepancies between Verbal and Performance IQs and subtest scatter on the WISC-R for juvenile delinquents. Psychological Reports, 45, 563-568.
- Reiss, A. J. (1967). Sex offenses: The marginal status of the adolescent. In J. H. Gagnon & W. Simon (Eds.), Sexual deviance (pp. 43-77). New York: Harper and Row.

- Roberts, M. C. (1986). Failure to provide psychosocial services is institutional abuse. Childrens Health Care, 14, 132-133.
- Roberts, R. E., Abrams, L., & Finch, J. R. (1973). "Delinquent" sexual behavior among adolescents. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 7, 162-183.
- Roberts, A. H., & Erikson, R. V. (1969). Measuring impulse control in institutionalized delinquents using Rorschach content and thought process scales. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 74, 632-634.
- Ryan, G. (Ed.). (1986, June). Interchange. (Available from The C. Henry Kempe National Center for the Prevention and Treatment of Child Abuse and Neglect, 1205 Oneida Street, Denver, Co.)
- Ryan, G., Lane, S., Davis, J., & Isaac, C. (1987). Juvenile sex offenders: Development and correction. Child Abuse and Neglect, 11, 385-395.
- Samenow, S. E. (1984). Inside the criminal mind. New York: Times Books.
- Sattler, J. M. (1982). Assessment of children's intelligence and special abilities. (2nd. ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Shanok, S. S., Malani, S. C., Ninan, O. P., Guggenheim, P., Weinstein, H., & Lewis, D. O. (1983). A comparison of delinquent and nondelinquent adolescent psychiatric inpatients. American Journal of Psychiatry, 140, 582-585.
- Shoor, M., Speed, M. H., & Bartelt, C. (1966). Syndrome of the adolescent child molester. American Journal of Psychiatry, 122, 783-789.
- Siegel, L. J., & Senna, J. J. (1981). Juvenile delinquency: Theory, practice and law. St. Paul: West Publishing Company.
- Smith, W. R., & Monastersky, C. (1986). Assessing juvenile sexual offenders' risk for re-offending. Criminal Justice & Behavior, 13 115-140.
- Smith, W. R., Monastersky, C., & Deisher, R. M. (1987). MMPI-based personality types among juvenile sexual offenders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 43, 422-430.

- Tarter, R. E., Hegedus, A. M., Alterman, A. I., & Katz-Garris, L. (1983). Cognitive capacities of juvenile violent, nonviolent, and sexual offenders. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 171, 564-567.
- Texas Department of Human Resources. (1981). Texas Family Code. Austin: Texas Department of Human Resources.
- Thomas, J. N., & Rogers, C. M. (1983). A treatment program for intrafamily juvenile sexual offenders. In J. G. Greer & I. R. Stuart (Eds.), The sexual aggressor: Current perspectives in treatment, (pp. 127-143). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.
- Thornberry, T. P. (1973). Race, socioeconomic status and sentencing in the juvenile justice system. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 64, 90-98.
- Tsubouchi, K., & Jenkins, R. L. (1969). Three types of delinquents: Their performance on MMPI and PCR. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25, 353-358.
- United States Department of the Treasury Internal Revenue Service. (1988). Your federal income tax (Publication 17). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Waggoner, R. W., & Boyd, D. A. (1941). Juvenile aberrant sexual behavior. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 11, 275-291.
- Walsh, A. (1984). Differential sentencing patterns among felony sex offenders and non-sex offenders. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 75, 443-458.
- Wechsler, D. (1974). Manual for the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (rev. ed.). New York: The Psychological Corporation.
- Wechsler, D. (1981). Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised Manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation.
- Westendorp, F., Brink, K. L., Roberson, M. D., & Ortiz, I. E. (1986). Variables which differentiate placement of adolescents into juvenile justice or mental health systems. Adolescence, 21, 23-37.
- Wolfe, F. A. (1985, March). Twelve female sexual offenders. Paper presented at the Meeting of Next Steps in Research on the Assessment and Treatment of

Sexually Aggressive Persons (Paraphiliacs), St.
Louis, Mo.

Young, L. E., & Howard, J. (1989, March). Juvenile
facilities crowded. The Dallas Morning News,
pp. 33 A, 36 A.

APPENDIX
STATISTICAL DATA

Table 1

Age By Disposition

Variable	No Action	Assign	Remove	Cert	F
Age					
N	23.00	66.00	64.00	24.00	3.77*
Mean	14.64	14.61	14.70	15.79	
SD	1.43	1.46	1.97	0.59	

* $p < .01$

Table 2

Univariate F Test - Age

Source	SS	DF	MS	F
Between	27.83	3	9.28	3.77*
Within	477.26	194	2.46	

*p < .01

Table 3

Personality Functioning By Disposition

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
No Action Taken				
Ror R	30	10.00-35.00	19.47	6.23
Ror L	30	00.30-14.00	2.46	2.93
S-CON	30	01.00-08.00	4.77	1.70
DEPI	30	00.00-03.00	1.23	0.86
SCZI	30	00.00-05.00	2.47	1.17
X+	30	00.13-00.71	0.50	0.15
X-	30	00.00-00.56	0.30	0.14
MMPI L	6	44.00-76.00	52.50	11.81
MMPI F	6	55.00-87.00	68.83	11.22
MMPI K	6	40.00-81.00	55.67	16.86
HS1	6	45.00-83.00	66.33	16.42
D2	6	46.00-88.00	66.50	14.98
HY3	6	46.00-94.00	68.67	16.15
PD4	6	55.00-75.00	65.00	7.75
MF5	6	34.00-74.00	59.67	14.24
PA6	6	49.00-84.00	64.17	13.20
PT7	6	42.00-67.00	55.00	9.25
SC8	6	51.00-75.00	60.17	9.87
MA9	6	38.00-75.00	58.67	14.19
SI0	6	47.00-61.00	53.50	6.38

(table continues)

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
Assign Community				
Ror R	38	12.00-51.00	22.68	8.02
Ror L	38	00.15-35.00	2.63	5.52
S-CON	36	01.00-10.00	3.75	1.98
DEPI	38	00.00-04.00	1.05	.99
SCZI	38	00.00-05.00	1.90	1.39
X+	38	00.26-00.87	.55	.17
X-	38	00.00-00.48	.21	.14
MMPI L	12	40.00-72.00	51.58	10.72
MMPI F	12	34.00-80.00	53.58	12.18
MMPI K	12	43.00-69.00	49.83	8.29
HS1	12	38.00-93.00	52.00	15.17
D2	12	40.00-65.00	53.92	8.16
HY3	12	37.00-75.00	55.08	9.17
PD4	12	41.00-88.00	65.83	13.40
MF5	12	43.00-83.00	59.83	10.20
PA6	12	42.00-76.00	54.42	9.86
PT7	12	33.00-75.00	56.67	12.33
SC8	12	35.00-75.00	56.58	12.49
MA9	12	41.00-79.00	59.33	10.81
SI0	12	35.00-63.00	49.33	9.46

(table continues)

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
Removed Community				
Ror R	48	10.00-43.00	20.31	7.86
Ror L	48	00.00-21.00	3.19	4.52
S-CON	45	02.00-09.00	4.71	1.58
DEPI	47	00.00-04.00	1.00	0.86
SCZI	46	00.00-04.00	2.04	1.07
X+	48	00.13-00.87	0.49	0.18
X-	48	00.05-00.61	0.27	0.15
MMPI L	20	35.00-85.00	54.35	11.25
MMPI F	20	42.00-83.00	60.65	12.46
MMPI K	20	24.00-62.00	45.40	10.10
HS1	20	39.00-82.00	59.80	12.00
D2	20	43.00-83.00	62.00	11.01
HY3	20	39.00-77.00	57.95	10.19
PD4	20	49.00-92.00	67.45	10.45
MF5	20	36.00-83.00	58.35	11.71
PA6	20	42.00-73.00	56.50	9.15
PT7	20	38.00-82.00	60.70	13.23
SC8	20	40.00-81.00	61.65	12.97
MA9	20	45.00-88.00	59.05	10.07
SI0	20	41.00-89.00	54.45	10.99

(table continues)

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
Certified				
Ror R	18	10.00-44.00	20.22	10.22
Ror L	18	00.29-07.75	2.26	2.19
S-CON	18	03.00-09.00	5.39	1.61
DEPI	18	00.00-04.00	1.72	1.27
SCZI	18	00.00-05.00	2.00	1.19
X+	18	00.18-00.92	0.56	0.22
X-	18	00.00-00.59	0.28	0.15
MMPI L	3	49.00-58.00	54.00	4.58
MMPI F	3	50.00-77.00	66.33	14.36
MMPI K	3	47.00-49.00	48.33	1.16
HS1	3	47.00-87.00	64.00	20.67
D2	3	49.00-69.00	60.33	10.26
HY3	3	41.00-76.00	55.67	18.18
PD4	3	56.00-69.00	63.67	6.81
MF5	3	60.00-67.00	63.00	3.61
PA6	3	55.00-60.00	57.00	2.65
PT7	3	61.00-65.00	62.67	2.08
SC8	3	58.00-75.00	67.33	8.62
MA9	3	55.00-83.00	66.00	14.93
SI0	3	38.00-54.00	48.67	9.24

Table 4

Sample Personality Functioning

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
Ror R	134	10.00-51.00	20.78	7.94
Ror L	134	00.00-35.00	2.74	4.28
S-CON	129	01.00-10.00	4.55	1.79
DEPI	133	00.00-04.00	1.17	0.98
SCZI	132	00.00-05.00	2.09	1.21
X+	134	00.13-00.92	0.52	0.18
X-	134	00.00-00.61	0.26	0.14
MMPI L	41	35.00-85.00	53.24	10.57
MMPI F	41	34.00-87.00	60.20	12.95
MMPI K	41	24.00-81.00	48.42	10.77
HS1	41	38.00-93.00	58.78	14.55
D2	41	40.00-88.00	60.17	11.34
HY3	41	37.00-94.00	58.51	11.89
PD4	41	41.00-92.00	66.34	10.61
MF5	41	34.00-83.00	59.32	11.02
PA6	41	42.00-84.00	57.05	9.92
PT7	41	33.00-82.00	58.83	11.93
SC8	41	35.00-81.00	60.37	12.14
MA9	41	38.00-88.00	59.59	10.95
SI0	41	35.00-89.00	52.39	9.87

Table 5

Intellectual Functioning By Disposition

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
No Action Taken				
Academic Tests				
WRAT-R Reading	43	47-119	77.77	15.64
WRAT-R Spelling	43	54-116	77.70	15.79
WRAT-R Arithmetic	43	49-101	74.05	12.17
Intelligence Tests				
PPVT	4	71-91	80.75	8.26
Culture Fair	14	79-113	93.64	8.45
Wechsler	23	66-105	81.83	10.67

(table continues)

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
Assigned Community				
Academic Tests				
WRAT-R Reading	63	46-134	82.24	17.70
WRAT-R Spelling	63	55-115	80.35	15.50
WRAT-R Arithmetic	63	53-113	76.95	12.95
Intelligence Tests				
PPVT	7	76-105	92.71	9.55
Culture Fair	24	70-109	92.25	10.21
Wechsler	29	42-108	84.90	13.97

(table continues)

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
Removed Community				
Academic Tests				
WRAT-R Reading	63	47-123	77.79	17.42
WRAT-R Spelling	62	30-112	76.10	16.87
WRAT-R Arithmetic	63	25-106	75.21	14.34
Intelligence Tests				
PPVT	2	94-99	96.50	3.54
Culture Fair	25	81-122	93.48	8.98
Wechsler	33	64-104	84.15	11.31

(table continues)

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
Certified				
Academic Tests				
WRAT-R Reading	23	46-114	79.87	17.12
WRAT-R Spelling	23	54-118	77.39	17.39
WRAT-R Arithmetic	24	52-91	71.67	10.83
Intelligence Tests				
PPVT	2	70-102	86.00	22.63
Culture Fair	11	84-109	96.10	8.97
Wechsler	10	71-82	75.30	3.86

Table 6

Sample Intellectual Functioning

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
Academic Tests				
WRAT-R Reading	192	46-134	79.50	17.08
WRAT-R Spelling	191	30-118	78.02	16.21
WRAT-R Arithmetic	193	25-113	75.08	13.07
Intelligence Tests				
PPVT	15	70-105	89.13	11.26
Culture Fair	74	70-122	93.50	9.20
Wechsler	95	42-108	82.88	11.74

Table 7

Description of the Sample

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
No Action Taken				
Age	44	12-17	14.64	1.43
Height	42	50-73	64.74	4.95
Weight	42	65-275	132.71	41.33
Recidivism	44	00-08	2.23	2.67
Assign to Community				
Age	66	11-17	14.61	1.45
Height	66	53-73	66.08	4.44
Weight	66	70-230	129.39	28.60
Recidivism	66	00-08	1.18	1.78
Removed from Community				
Age	64	12-17	14.70	1.97
Height	63	58-74	65.91	3.82
Weight	63	80-210	131.62	23.77
Recidivism	64	00-18	3.22	3.33
Certified				
Age	24	15-17	15.79	0.59
Height	24	56-76	67.50	4.61
Weight	24	86-172	135.63	24.13
Recidivism	64	00-18	3.22	3.33

Table 8

Summary Description of the Sample

Variable	Freq	Range	Mean	SD
Age	198	12-17	14.79	1.60
Height	195	50-76	65.91	4.42
Weight	195	65-275	131.60	29.81
Recidivism	198	0-18	2.58	3.16
Current Offense #	198	1-9	1.49	0.98

Table 9

Income, Housing Costs, and Race By Disposition

Variable	No Action	Assign	Remove	Cert	Total
Income					
0-10k	5	11	10	3	29
11-20k	7	17	17	2	43
21-30k	1	6	4	0	11
>30k	5	2	5	0	12
Housing Costs					
<\$200	3	9	7	1	20
\$200-400	4	6	8	2	20
>\$400	4	11	10	1	26
Race					
White	11	22	18	5	56
Black	23	34	36	16	109
Hispanic	8	10	9	3	30

Table 10

Rorschach Summary Scores By Disposition

Variable	No Action	Assign	Remove	Cert	F
S-CON					
N	30.00	36.00	45.00	18.00	4.27**
M	4.77	3.75	4.71	5.39	
SD	1.70	1.20	1.58	1.61	
DEPI					
N	30.00	38.00	47.00	18.00	2.70*
M	1.23	1.05	1.72	1.72	
SD	0.86	0.99	1.27	1.27	
SCZI					
N	30.00	38.00	46.00	18.00	
M	2.47	1.90	2.04	2.00	
SD	1.17	1.39	1.07	1.19	
X+					
N	30.00	38.00	48.00	18.00	
M	0.50	0.55	0.49	0.56	
SD	0.15	0.17	0.18	0.22	
X-					
N	30.00	38.00	48.00	18.00	
M	0.30	0.21	0.27	0.15	
SD	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.15	

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 11

Univariate F Tests - Rorschach Summary Scores

Source	SS	DF	MS	F
S-CON				
Between	38.28	3	12.76	4.27**
Within	373.64	125	2.99	
DEPI				
Between	7.63	3	2.54	2.70*
Within	117.95	125	0.94	
SCZI				
Between	5.10	3	1.70	1.17
Within	182.16	125	1.46	
X+				
Between	0.13	3	0.04	1.49
Within	3.69	125	0.03	
X-				
Between	0.16	3	0.05	2.57
Within	2.55	125	0.02	
RORR				
Between	205.62	3	68.54	1.09
Within	8183.10	130	62.95	
RORL				
Between	16.64	3	5.55	0.30
Within	2419.34	130	18.61	

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 12

Univariate F Tests - MMPI

Source	SS	DF	MS	F
L				
Between	62.59	3	20.87	0.18
Within	4408.97	37	119.16	
F				
Between	1089.47	3	363.16	2.39
Within	117.95	125	0.94	
K				
Between	521.49	3	173.83	1.56
Within	4118.47	37	111.31	
HS1				
Between	996.49	3	332.16	1.65
Within	7466.53	37	201.80	
D2				
Between	776.72	3	258.91	2.19
Within	4369.08	37	118.08	
HY3				
Between	790.38	3	263.46	2.01
Within	4859.87	37	131.35	
PD4				
Between	59.94	3	19.98	0.17
Within	4443.28	37	120.09	
MF5				
Between	63.33	3	21.11	0.16
Within	4789.55	37	129.45	

(table continues)

Source	SS	DF	MS	F
PA6				
Between	393.15	3	131.05	1.37
Within	3542.75	37	95.75	
PT7				
Between	258.27	3	86.09	0.59
Within	5433.53	37	146.85	
SC8				
Between	350.55	3	116.85	0.78
Within	5546.97	37	149.92	
MA9				
Between	135.00	3	45.00	0.36
Within	4662.95	37	126.03	
SI0				
Between	245.97	3	81.99	0.83
Within	3653.78	37	98.75	

Table 13

Univariate F Tests - Intelligence and Achievement

Source	SS	DF	MS	F
Academic Tests				
WRAT-R Read				
Between	706.96	3	235.65	0.81
Within	54323.39	187	290.50	
WRAT-R SPELL				
Between	584.67	3	194.89	0.74
Within	4408.97	37	119.16	
WRAT ARITH				
Between	556.56	3	185.52	1.08
Within	32083.34	187	171.57	
Intelligence Tests				
PPVT				
Between	499.06	3	166.35	1.43
Within	1276.68	11	116.06	
Culture Fair				
Between	111.64	3	37.21	0.43
Within	6066.86	70	86.67	
Wechslers				
Between	771.39	3	257.13	1.92
Within	12190.34	91	133.96	
Combined IQ Tests				
Between	269.94	3	89.31	0.59
Within	25057.48	179	139.99	

Table 14

Offense Type and Force by Disposition

Variable	No Action	Assign	Remove	Cert	x2
Current Offense					
Sex	24	35	18	9	18.72*
Person	11	15	15	10	
Property	9	16	31	5	
Force					
Physical	21	36	20	3	18.85**
Weapon	11	11	11	14	

*p < .01**p < .001

Table 15

Current Offense Number and Recidivism by Disposition

Variable	No Action	Assign	Remove	Cert	F
Cur Off#					
N	44.00	66.00	64.00	24.00	5.07*
M	1.36	1.32	1.48	2.17	
SD	0.75	0.53	0.80	1.99	
Recidivism					
N	44.00	66.00	64.00	24.00	13.63**
M	2.23	1.18	3.22	5.33	13.63
SD	2.67	1.78	3.33	4.25	

* $p < .01$ ** $p < .001$

Table 16

Race by Current Offense

Variable	Sex	Person	Property	Total
White	24	9	23	56
Black	49	30	30	109
Hispanic	10	12	8	30

Table 17

Results Of Discriminant Function Analysis Of Dispositions

Correlations of
Predictor Variables
with Discriminant
Functions

Predictor Variables				Univariate F (3, 94)
	1	2	3	
Recidivism	0.62	0.31	0.20	9.61**
Curr Off #	0.47	-0.50	0.06	6.22**
S-CON	0.39	0.27	-0.73	4.72*
DEPI	0.25	-0.31	-0.32	2.03
Force	0.14	0.25	0.27	0.80
Curr Off Type	0.31	0.55	0.64	3.91*

* $p < .01$ ** $p < .001$

Table 18

Univariate F Tests - Predictor Variables

Source	SS	DF	MS	F
Recidivism				
Between	226.34	3	75.45	9.61**
Within	738.40	94	7.86	
Curr Off #				
Between	22.25	3	7.42	6.22**
Within	112.00	94	1.19	
S-CON				
Between	43.04	3	14.35	4.72*
Within	285.74	94	3.04	
DEPI				
Between	6.26	3	2.09	2.03
Within	96.45	94	1.03	
Force				
Between	1.14	3	0.38	0.80
Within	44.98	94	0.48	
Curr Off Type				
Between	3.49	3	1.16	3.91*
Within	27.99	94	0.30	

*p < .05**p < .01

Table 19

Pooled Within-Group Correlations Among Predictors

Variable	Recid	Curr Off#	S-CON
Curr Off#	-0.14		
S-CON	0.04	-0.05	
Curr Type	0.33	0.08	-0.06

VITA

Jana Gober Zimmerman

Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: A DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS OF DISPOSITIONS
OF MALE JUVENILE SEXUAL AND NONSEXUAL
OFFENDERS

Major Field: Counseling Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Midland, Texas, January 21,
1957, the daughter of David and Grace Gober.
Married to Jubal G. Zimmerman on August 4, 1979.

Education: Graduated from Permian High School, Odessa,
Texas, in May, 1975; received Bachelor of Science
Degree in Education from Texas Tech University in
May, 1979; received Master of Science degree from
Oklahoma State University in December, 1984;
completed requirements for the Doctor of
Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in
April, 1989.

Professional Experience: Teacher, Lorenzo Independent
School District, August, 1979, to August, 1980;
Child Placement Worker, Texas Department of Human
Resources, October, 1980, to January, 1981, and
July, 1981, to November, 1982; Social Worker,
Oklahoma Department of Human Services, February,
1983, to August, 1983; Therapist, Sunbeam Family
Services Sexual Abuse Treatment Program, January,
1985, to August, 1985; Research Assistant,
University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center,
Oklahoma Children's Memorial Hospital, Department
of Adolescent Medicine, April, 1985, to August,
1986; Clinical Psychologist, Terrell State
Hospital, September, 1988, to present.