UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

APPLYING GENERAL STRAIN THEORY TO JUVENILE SEX OFFENDERS

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Sharla Stettnisch Colbert
Norman, Oklahoma
2004

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/780

UMI Number: 3143540



UMI Microform 3143540

Copyright 2004 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

APPLYING GENERAL STRAIN THEORY TO JUVENILE SEX-OFFENDERS

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

BY

_____
Susan F. Sharp, Chair

_____
Harold Grasmick, Member

_____
Margaret Kelley, Member

_____
Craig St. John, Member

_____
D.L. Wieder, Member

©Copyright by SHARLA STETTNISCH COLBERT 2004
All Rights Reserved.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee Dr. Susan F. Sharp, Dr. Harold Grasmick, Dr. Craig St. John, Dr. Margaret Kelley, and Dr. D.L. Wieder. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Susan F. Sharp, my dissertation chair, for all of her unwavering support she has given me over the past six years. I want to say "thank you" to all the members for their continuous push so that I may finish before starting a new job and for spending a piece of their summer reviewing this piece.

Next, I would like to thank my peers who helped me in this long process. Rex Ann, you are truly a great friend and I appreciate you lending an ear when needed. Also, those long trips to Norman in times of need were greatly appreciated. Stephanie, thank you for being there for me during this journey. You saying, "Well . . . . . it could be worse" was cajoling at just the right times. Also, I enjoyed the uplifting songs you would sing on my voicemail, again, making tough days a little more bearable. I am proud to have you both as lifelong friends and look forward to more great times together. And to the others who have helped me remain somewhat sane, I want to thank you: sweetie, packie, my bunko friends, the Lawton crew, and the "unmentionables." To all of you, good people are truly hard to come by.

And to my family, who have been there for me throughout this process, I thank you all from the bottom of my heart. I am forever indebted to you for your incessant love and support. It is in part because of your sacrifices that I have been able to succeed academically. Thank you.

I dedicate this dissertation to my children, Bailey and Xeven. Everything I do is for the both of you. I would like to thank you both for having patience with me while I was “working on a paper” for several hours at a time. With those numerous trips to the computer lab, you both have gained some great computer skills as well. Together, we can do all things. Just remember, no matter what obstacles you encounter in life, stay dedicated to your goals and you will eventually reach them. Thank you God for my children.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements……..……iv

Table of Contents……..……...…….……...…vi

List of Tables…….....……...…..viii

Abstract……...……...……..ix

Chapter One: Introduction……..……..…….1

Chapter Two: General Strain Theory……..……...3

Tests of General Strain Theory……...……7

Chapter Three: Juvenile Sex Offenders……..…..…14

Factors Predicting Sexual Offending…….…...…….15

Chapter Four: GST and Juvenile Sex Offenders……...……24

Chapter Five: Hypotheses……..…….…..27

Chapter Six: Methodology…….……..…….29

Data…….....…….……29

Secondary Data and Self-Report Data…….……...…..31

Control Variables……..…….……..32

Dependent Variable…….……..……..32

Theoretical Independent Variables……...…33

Chapter Seven: Analysis……..……44

Procedures……..…….44

Sample Characteristics……..……..44

Means for Strain Variables…….…….……45

Logistic Regression Analyses…….……...…..46

Chapter Eight: Discussion…….……...……..…..……50

Significant Research Findings…….……...…..……..51

Chapter Nine: Conclusion and Future Research…….……56

Limitations and Future Research……..……..…..……...56

References……..58

Tables…….63

List of Tables

TABLE

1. Items Included in Negative Life Events with Parents (NLEP)…….65

2. Items Included in Negative Life Events with Drugs (NLED)……..66

3. Factor Loadings for Items in Academic Problems Items…….67

4. Factor Loadings for Peer Hassles Items……..68

5. Items Included in Maltreatment 1 (MAL1)…….69

6. Factor Loadings for Items in Maltreatment 2 (MAL2)……70

7. Factor Loadings for Items Included in Parental Fighting…….71

8. Factor Loadings for Items Included in Negative Relations with Adults..…72

9. Factor Loadings for Items Included in Social Support…….73

10. Factor Loadings for Self Efficacy/Mastery and Self-Esteem Items……74

11. Factor Loadings for Depression Items……...75

12. Factor Loadings for Antisocial Behavior Items…….76

13. Demographic Variables by Groups (Sex Offenders and Other Violent Offenders)…….……77

14. Mean Numbers for Strain Variables by Offense Categories (Sex Offenders and Violent Non-Sex Offenders)……..…….78

15. Logistic Regression: Strain Measures and Control Variables. Sex Offenders (1) versus Violent Offenders (0). Odds ratios in Parentheses ( )……79

16. Logistic Regression: Strain Measures, Control Variables, and Mediating Variables. Sex Offenders (1) versus Violent Offenders (0). Odds ratios in Parentheses( )…….80

17. Logistic Regression: Strain Measures, Control Variables, Mediating Variables, and Coping Mechanisms. Sex Offenders (1) versus Violent Offenders (0). Odds ratios in Parentheses ( )…….81

Applying General Strain Theory to Juvenile Sex Offenders

ABSTRACT

Various studies have examined why people commit sexual offenses, but most have dealt with adult offenders. An increasing number of studies show that juveniles are committing sexual offenses at higher rates than in the past. Studies also suggest that many offenses continue to go unreported. As with other violent crime, the vast majority of juvenile sex offenders are male. I investigate juvenile sex offenders from the perspective of General Strain Theory, using data obtained from 253 juvenile males in state custody in Oklahoma during the summer of 2001 (the Oklahoma Juvenile Data). I compare two subsets of juvenile males, those who self-report some sort of sexual offense (molestation or rape) during their lifetime (n=47) to those who self-report committing another type of violent offense (n=193). According to General Strain Theory, there are three major sources of strain: the failure to achieve positively valued goals, the loss of positive stimuli, and the presentation of negative stimuli (Agnew 1985). I identify and examine sources of strain, as well as other factors, which may help explain the difference in violent but non-sex offending juveniles and juvenile sex offenders. The findings from this exploratory study will be helpful in developing programs for reducing sex offenses among youth.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Sexual offenses are no longer a "kept secret" in the United States as they once were a few decades ago (Coontz 1995). The sex-offending population is normally seen as adult males, although juvenile sex-offenders are steadily increasing. It is estimated that one-fifth of the rapes and one-half of the cases of child molestations committed in the United States each year are committed by juveniles (Hunter 2000). Further, close to one half of all adult sex-offenders report committing their first sexual offense in their teenage years (Groth, Longo, and McFadin 1982). It is likely that these numbers are underestimated, as researchers can only study those who are either in the juvenile justice system or through self-reported incidents.

Juveniles sexually offend for many different reasons including mental health reasons, personality factors, being under the influence of drugs or alcohol, and familial factors. The reasons for sexual offenses are copious. Factors that have received the most attention include: maltreatment, viewing pornography, substance abuse, and exposure to aggressive role models or violence (Hunter 2000).

The central question of this study is "do juvenile sex-offenders differ from other violent non-sex offenders and if so, in what ways?" Numerous medical theories, studies, and tests exist that attempt to understand sex-offenders and their behaviors. To date, few tests of criminological theories on sex-offenders exist. This study will attempt to look at the problem of juvenile sex-offenders from a criminological standpoint, using General Strain Theory (GST). Some research suggests that deviant acts are dominant in the lower class. Other research has shown that delinquent acts

are just as common in the upper and middle classes (Agnew 1985) and not just occurring among the lower class. The data on juvenile offenders indicate that juvenile sex-offenders come from a wide range of classes.

The current study utilizes General Strain Theory to examine the central questions. GST argues that stressors or strain may create negative emotional affective states. These negative emotions can lead to deviant and criminal behaviors if not mediated by personal resources and coping skills. Furthermore, different types of strain and reactions to strain may lead to different types of deviant behaviors. Unlike previous strain theories, GST encompasses all sources of strain that individuals can experience, across social classes, and can, therefore, explain a broad range of deviant behaviors. Further, Agnew (1997) argues that adolescence can bring with it frustration that adults may not experience. The new experiences that come along with adolescence and the teenage years bring on new stressors and strains in areas such as social circles, school, and family, which could lead to deviant or criminal behavior. Therefore, GST is well-suited to answer the question of this study.

CHAPTER II

General Strain Theory

The sociological study of the relationship between strain and deviant behaviors is drawn from the works of Emile Durkheim. Durkheim argued that at least one form of deviance, suicidal behavior, is the result of strain that results from either too little or too much social integration. From Durkheim's perspective, there are two types of integration: attachment and regulation. In his work, *Suicide* (1951), he discussed four types of suicide: altruistic, anomic, egoistic, and fatalistic. Suicide stems from how integrated, or non-integrated, a person is into society. Too little attachment to society is linked to egoistic suicide, while too much attachment is linked to altruistic suicide. Likewise, too much social regulation leaves the individual very little personal choice and can lead to fatalistic suicide. On the other hand, too little regulation leads to anomie or normlessness and anomic suicide. Durkheim's work came from a macro-level perspective, revealing how society played a role in an individual's action; whereas, most theorists at the time were focusing on micro-level perspectives of crime.

Robert Merton drew from the concept of anomic suicide, or the feeling of anomie that Durkheim proposed, and stated his primary aim was to see how societal pressures caused some people to be non-conforming rather than conforming (1957). Anomie can occur in a society where there is a strong emphasis on goals, but not a definite way of achieving the goals. Again, people experience normlessness. They desire the culturally approved goals but have limited access to the institutionalized means of achieving them. In other words, people want economic and material success in society,

but they do not all have the same means to achieve the societal goals. This creates a strain, or what Merton referred to as anomie. Merton (1938) described five different responses to the juncture of culturally approved goals and institutionalized means: conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreatism, and rebellion. Innovation occurred when the individual accepted the culturally approved goals, but the institutional means were not available. He defined retreatism as "falling out" of society, not having societal goals or the means to gain the goals. These people have a subculture adaptation to their situation. It is within this group that sex-offenders who lack social skills to deal with society may emerge, as many sex-offenders are antisocial and withdraw from society. Merton's strain theory has been criticized because it focused heavily on material success. Further, it assumed that everyone in society has the same material goals, that only access to the approved means of achieving these goals differs. His theory focused on long-term goals, and some would argue that juveniles do not center their attention on long-term goals, but more on immediate, short-term goals.

Albert Cohen (1955) elaborated on Merton's theory to see how strain could explain delinquency. He stated that juveniles have little interest in long-term goals. He looked at juveniles and said that they engaged in behaviors, not for economic gain, but for status gain. An example was purposeless crimes or crimes by a gang that could not be explained by Merton's theory. Cohen proposed that the juveniles committed such crime to gain status among their peers. Not having a high status could lead to a feeling of anomie, or strain. To deal with such strain, juveniles could either conform to middle-class values and norms, giving in to the idea that they were subordinate, or they could establish their own value and norm structure. This latter choice is what Cohen stated juvenile delinquents do when they act out in criminal behavior.

Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin (1960) set out to resolve conflicts between Robert Merton, who said that members of the lower-class strive for monetary success, and Albert Cohen, who said they strive for status. They stated that there are three categories of delinquency committed by lower-class youth. These categories, crimes committed for making money, skill in using violence, and illegal drug use, arose from the strain that the juveniles felt when expectations were unfilled or blocked. An important aspect added by Cloward and Ohlin is that although some people have access to legal means of attaining societal goals, others have access to illegal means that exist in their neighborhoods. Still, others do not. These illegal means could be pawnshops or junkyards, providing opportunities to achieve societal goal success. The drug-using subculture of juveniles lacked both legitimate means and illegitimate means, causing them to turn to others like themselves and "drop-out" of society. Thus, three types of delinquents could emerge. Those who had access to illegal means would engage in property crimes, others who would engage in fighting, and the "double-losers" would become social dropouts, engaging in drug use.

Building upon these previous theorists, as well as drawing from the medical sociology and social psychological literature on strain, Robert Agnew developed General Strain Theory. GST does not concentrate only on strain experienced by the lower class or economic strain. It incorporates all types of stressors and strains, regardless of gender and socioeconomic status (SES). Indeed, Agnew argued that strain results from negative relationships with others. According to GST, there are three major sources of strain: the failure to achieve positively-valued goals, the loss of positive stimuli, and the presentation of negative stimuli (Agnew 1985). The first source of strain is straightforward, in that an individual is unable to achieve positively-

valued goals. These goals are ones that are meaningful to the individual but the means to achieving these goals are somehow blocked. He posited that three types of this kind of strain exist: a blockage between expectations and aspirations, a blockage between expectations and actual achievements, and strain produced from the ascription of just and fair outcomes (Agnew 1992).

For the second source of strain, Agnew argued that the loss or removal of positive stimuli, can also lead to deviant behavior. When the individual feels the loss of positive stimuli, "he or she attempts to prevent its loss, retrieve what was lost, or seek revenge on those who removed the positive stimuli" (Agnew 1992:57).

The third source of strain, the presentation of negative or noxious stimuli, has been left out of criminology and the study of deviance compared to the other two sources of strain (Agnew 1992: 58). If individuals are presented with negative stimuli, this may cause them to act out in some form of deviant behavior. Such negative stimuli could include "child abuse, adverse relations with parents and teachers, negative school experiences, adverse relations with peers, neighborhood problems, and homelessness" (Agnew 1992:59).

The three major sources of strain that GST describes result in negative affective states such as anger or other negative emotions, which, in turn, may lead to an increased likelihood of deviance (Agnew 1992). Strain from outside factors in society can cause negative feelings in an individual; the most notable feeling applicable to crime is anger. Individuals become angry when they blame negative circumstances on others in society, and this can direct them to act out. In essence, when individuals acts out because of strain, this action is due to anger, according to

Agnew (1992). General Strain Theory proposes that an increase in strain could lead to an increase in anger, which may lead to an increase in delinquent behavior.

Not all people who experience strain act out in deviant ways, and the theory has taken into account mediating effects that could decrease the effects of strain. GST posits that the greater the coping skills and greater self-efficacy (Agnew and White 1992) people hold, the less likely they will act out in a delinquent manner. Agnew stressed the idea that the more strain individuals are subject to; the more likely they are to commit crimes (Agnew 1992). This is due to the idea that an individual's coping mechanisms are continually being "taxed" and his or her threshold is pushed to the limit, leading to a greater tendency to act out negatively (Agnew 1992:60). GST also examines the role in which equity, or the sense of fairness or justice, may reduce the strain created by failure to achieve the positive aspirations (Agnew 1992).

Tests of General Strain Theory

A good test of GST should not only take into account the three main sources of strain, but also account for the legitimate coping skills of an individual as well as his or her overall feeling of control (Broidy 2001). Agnew (1992) posits that three different types of coping strategies exist: cognitive, emotional, and behavioral. These can be used to reduce the strain the individual is experiencing. Cognitive coping skills allow individuals to rationalize the stress they are feeling and may come in three different forms. First, individuals may minimize or place less importance on the event, person, or circumstance that is causing them strain. The second form involves the individual maximizing any positive outcome in order to overshadow the negative, thus, minimizing the fact that a negative outcome was present. The third way of

cognitively coping with strain is to accept the fact that negative events or experiences occur and come to grips with the inequity (Agnew 1992). Emotional coping skills involve accepting that strains exist, but limiting or removing their effects on the person. Individuals use many different methods for removing the feeling of strain from their lives. For example, a person feeling strain may deal with it by using relaxation techniques, such as reading a book or meditating, to alleviate the feeling of strain. Others may take on a form of exercise, such as jogging or aerobics. Finally, behavioral coping skills for dealing with strain involve actively seeking out positive stimuli in order to escape the negative stimuli. Individuals will seek out something or someone positive to make them feel better, hence alleviating their feeling of strain.

General Strain Theory has been tested on many different social groups and has been used to examine deviant behaviors in both males and females. Agnew and White (1992) tested GST on delinquency and drug use, taking into account association with delinquent peers and self-efficacy. Their longitudinal study consisted of data including 1,380 New Jersey adolescents aged 12, 15, and 18 interviewed between 1979 and 1981. Their strain measures included items relating to strain such as negative life events, life hassles, negative relations with adults, parental fighting, neighborhood problems, being unpopular with opposite sex, occupational strain, and clothing strain. Included in their control measures were a differential association measure, a delinquency measure, and a drug use measure. A self-efficacy scale was also included. They found that five of the eight strain variables were significantly related to delinquency and/or drug use, with negative life events and life hassles the most important strain variables. Further, they found that when self-efficacy was low, strain produced delinquency but not drug use. “Strain is most likely to lead to

delinquency when self-efficacy is low" (Agnew and White 1992: 491). In addition, they reported that when the adolescent had many delinquent friends, strain had a greater effect on both delinquency and drug use. Their findings supported GST, even when controlling for their control and differential association measures.

Guided by Agnew and White, Paternoster and Mazerolle (1994) conducted a more comprehensive test of GST. This was performed with a longitudinal sample of adolescents from the first and second waves of the National Youth Survey (NYS) consisting of 2,360 youths ranging in age from 11-17. Their strain measures include neighborhood problems, negative life events, negative relations with adults, school/peer hassles, and traditional strain. Included in their study was a measure of self-efficacy. They found four of the five strain variables were significantly related to delinquency. The one not significant was school/peer hassles. In other words, the adolescents that lived in neighborhoods with extreme social problems, such as crime and physical deterioration, and who had poor relationships with parents and teachers had significantly higher delinquency than the adolescents who experienced less strain. Further, they agreed with Agnew in that "general strain is negatively related to Social Control and positively related to Delinquent Peers" (Paternoster and Mazerolle 1994: 251).

An important addition to the previous tests of GST came from Timothy Brezina (1996). He examined teenage violence toward parents as an adaptation or coping mechanism to familial strain. The data consisted of 2,213 male public-high-school students from the first and second waves of the Youth in Transition survey. Two hypotheses were tested: did strain produce negative affects, such as anger, resentment, fear and despair, and did delinquent behavior actually reduce the effects of

strain. Three scales were created to measure strain: parental punitiveness, having mean teachers, and dissatisfaction with school. Four scales were used to measure negative affective states: anger, resentment, anxiety, and depression. His findings supported his hypotheses that strain was significantly associated with negative emotional states and delinquency seemed to reduce the strain from these negative emotional states. Just as Agnew's GST suggested, delinquency may help juveniles cope with problems created by negative social relations (Agnew 1992) or negative emotional states. Therefore, when the juvenile felt strain, he or she tried to alleviate such strain by acting out defiantly.

Another test using GST was conducted by Hofmann and Cerbone (1999) looking at stressful life events among adolescents. They hypothesized that stressful life events over a time can escalate a juvenile's potential for delinquent behavior. Their data consisted of adolescents from the Family Health Study (FHS), a longitudinal study conducted in an the upper Midwestern U.S. metropolitan area and consisting of adolescents ranging in age from 10-13. Their primary strain measure was stressful life events, which included numerous questions from previous general strain theory studies. They also included measures of delinquency, mastery, and self-esteem. The results of their study found that negative life events can accumulate for adolescents, increasing their involvement in delinquency. Further, they found that negative life events had a greater effect on males from lower-income homes and who possessed low self-esteem or mastery. They posited that the build-up of these life events "overpower" coping resources and lead to greater delinquent behaviors.

Merianos (2002) studied the influence of general strain theory on incarcerated juveniles to see whether the juveniles that were in a gang experienced

more strain than those not in a gang. Her sample consisted of 1,029 adolescents in the Texas Youth Commission in 1994. She used five measures from Agnew and White's (1992) earlier test of GST: negative life events, maltreatment, school and peer hassles, negative relations with adults and family anger. She found that gang members were significantly more likely to have experienced more life stressors, reported higher levels of school and peer hassles, were more likely to report having negative relationship with their father and their teachers, and had higher levels of family anger than non-gang members.

Although initially developed to explain delinquent behavior, GST can also be used to explain other types of deviance (Broidy and Agnew 1997). Sharp et al. (2001) mirrored the idea of Brezina (1996) that delinquency could reduce the feelings of strain. They focused solely on females, using a sample of 96 college women at the University of Oklahoma to examine purging, an eating disorder behavior adopted most often by females. The study focused on the negative affective states of depression and anger, determining if the negative affective states led to purging. They reported that purging behavior was associated with anger, but only with high levels of depression. This contradicted the existing literature (Agnew and White 1992) showing that anger was associated with delinquent behavior at low levels of depression.

Another important study of gender differences in strain was by Hoffmann and Su (1997). They focused on sex differences in the effect of stress on delinquency and drug use, as stress theory suggested that males and females react to strain differently. Their data consisted of two waves of the High Risk Youth Study comprised of juveniles ranging in age from 11-17, with a final sample size of 393 females and 410 males. Their strain measurement was a scale comprised of numerous questions from

previous GST tests. Other variables included are stressful life events, family attachment, school attachment, grades, drug use, and delinquency. Contrary to what they expected, there were no sex differences in their findings. They found that "stressful life events among female and male adolescents are similarly associated with delinquency and drug use" (70). They acknowledged that their study did not include any coping mechanism measures that could help explain their findings.

From its beginnings, many studies have been conducted to test General Strain Theory. This review of the GST literature highlights many of the variables that I will be using in this study. I will draw from the three basic tenets of Agnew's General Strain Theory (1985) in order to evaluate the strain measures in my study. The failure to achieve positively valued goals will be measured with the variable academic problems. The loss of positive stimuli will be measured with the variables peer hassles and negative relations with adults. The third tenet of GST, the presentation of negative stimuli, will be measured with the variables maltreatment, parental fighting, and negative life events. Drawing from the literature, the mediating variables will include three measures of negative affective states: anger, anxiety, and depression. The other mediating variables that are fundamental to GST, which will be included in this study, are social support, self-efficacy/mastery, and self-esteem. Although research has been performed on GST examining gender differences, the data for this study did not include any female sex-offenders. None of the above tests of GST used sex-offenses as a dependent variable as I will do in this study. Therefore, this study will use General Strain Theory to examine the influence of these strain variables on delinquent but non-sex offenders and juvenile sex-offenders. It is anticipated that some measures

will not have the same results when applied to sex-offenders as they do when applied to other delinquent offenders.

CHAPTER III

Juvenile Sex-Offenders

It is important when studying juvenile sex-offenders to determine how they are "labeled" in society. In order to be labeled a "sex-offender" in the criminological arena, the individual has to have been convicted of a sex-related offense. This does not include those who have not been caught or those who been clinically diagnosed with a sexual disorder or labeled a "clinical sex-offender" (Burdon and Gallagher 2002). Some clinical diagnoses of juveniles under the age of 13 do not label juveniles as sex-offenders, but instead just describe them as "sexually acting out" (Randall 2002). Some researchers would suggest that most sex-offenders suffer from some sort of mental disorder (Burdon and Gallagher 2002). According to the fourth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV), individuals who have been clinically diagnosed with a sex-related disorder are said to suffer from some form of paraphilia (American Psychiatric Association 1994). Therefore, we can see that depending upon the medicalization of deviance, some researchers would lean more towards medical reasons as to why sex-offenses occur. Others suggest more sociological reasons as to why they occur.

Sex-offenders represent a wide range of individuals. Just as some criminological research suggests that criminals do not tend to specialize (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990), the same holds true with sex-offenders. Research suggests that sex-offenders are involved in multiple acts of sexual deviance, with some reporting two or more paraphilias and multiple victim types (i.e., male or female; family member or non-family member) and some with or without physical contact (Knapp

1996; Strate, Jones, Pullen, and English 1996). A widely accepted definition of a juvenile sex-offender is "a minor who commits any sexual act with a person of any age (1) against a victim's will, (2) without consent, or (3) in an aggressive exploitative or threatening manner" (Ryan and Lane 1991, 1).

Others have studied juvenile male sex-offenders and describe them as: "…lonely and socially isolated from peers; they prefer the company of younger children; they are naïve and lack suitable sex education; and they frequently experience disturbed family relations" (Fehrenbach, Smith, Monastersky, and Deisher 1986: 226).

Juvenile sex-offenders in treatment are predominantly white males in their middle teenage years (O'Callaghan and Print 1994; Ryan and Lane 1991). The explanations of their offending differ depending upon which type of literature is examined, including medical, environmental, and sociological research.

Factors Predicting Sexual Offending

Previous research on sex-offenders can be categorized as focusing on one or more factors. These factors include personality, substance abuse, family, and other non-controllable factors such as biology and birth order. Some of these factors will parallel the literature on General Strain Theory. Yet, as with all theories of deviance, none of these factors are all encompassing for determining why juveniles commit sexual offenses.

Personality Factors/Biological Factors

A characteristic found in adult sex-offenders, especially those with the most chronic and violent episodes, is a psychopathic trait that affects the person's behavior

(Rice, Harris, and Quinsey 1990). Psychopathic traits can be separated into two types of behavior: callous and unemotional behavior and impulsive/antisocial behavior (Caputo, Frick, and Brodsky 1999; Hare, Hart, and Harpur 1991). The callous and unemotional behavior is characterized by such traits as "superficial charm, absence of empathy, absence of guilt, and shallow and constricted emotions," whereas the impulsive and antisocial behavior is characterized by "repeated criminal acts, poor impulse control, boredom susceptibility, poor planning ability, short-term marital relationships, and failure to accept responsibility for actions" (Caputo, Frick, and Brodsky 1999: 341). Although these characteristics of psychopathic behavior have been studied in adult sexual offenders, they have not been widely studied in the juvenile sex-offender population. However, one study has added to our knowledge in this area. Examining family violence and psychopathic traits in juvenile sex-offenders, Caputo and colleagues (1999) categorized juveniles into three sub-groups: sex-offenders, violent offenders, and non-contact offenders. They found that the callous personality trait to be directly associated with juvenile sex-offenders. The results for the callous/unemotional scale showed that sex-offenders had a dramatically higher score than the violent offenders and non-contact offenders, with a $p<.01$. The impulsive behavior trait, on the other hand, was not significantly different for sex-offenders but was correlated with juvenile offending in general (Caputo et al. 1999).

The examination of personality traits as conditioning variables in tests of General Strain Theory has been recently recommended (Agnew et al. 2002). These authors suggested that it is important to examine the role of relatively stable personality traits that they characterized as negative emotionality and low constraint. Their measures were similar to those found in tests of low self-control (Gottfredson

and Hirschi 1990). Using measures of negative emotionality/low constraint based on teacher and parent reports of juvenile behaviors and attitudes, they found a link between negative emotionality/low constraint and their measures of strain as well as with delinquency. However, they also offer the caveat that measures of negative emotionality may be highly correlated with measures of anger (Agnew et al. 2002).

The focus then switches from personality dysfunctions to more biological or non-controllable dysfunctions. Brown and Stein (1997) studied adult male sex-offenders with intellectual disabilities in the southeast of England. They found that offenses by males with intellectual disabilities were more likely to consist of touch or masturbation, rather than penetrative sex. These findings would be hard to replicate, as their measurements of intellectual disabilities are unclear. Other research examining intellectual abilities/disabilities of juvenile sex-offenders has conflicting results. Ferrara and McDonald (1996) found that between one-fourth and one-third of juvenile sexual offenders had some sort of neurological impairment. However, Gilby, Wolf, and Goldbert (1989) studied juvenile sex-offenders with mental retardation and did not find a significant difference in the frequency of acts compared to juveniles with borderline or higher intellectual functioning. Studies of intellectual abilities and juveniles are normally studied through academic success. Typically, studies would show that juvenile delinquents show academic difficulties (Fehrenbach, Smith, Monastersky, and Deisher, 1986; Miner, Siekert, and Ackland 1997), although other research has found that male juvenile sex-offenders have above-average academic performance (O'Brien 1991).

Although these are not sociological factors and are not examined in my research, biological features cannot be overlooked. Research on the impact of external or non-

controllable variables on male sex-offenders, such as prenatal hormone exposure and birth order, has been widespread. Recently, the role of prenatal factors has become more dominant in the medical literature. For example, some research has looked at the relationship between hormone levels of men while inside the womb and sexual orientation, stating that low levels of androgens in the fetal brain may be correlated with homosexuality (Dorner, Rohde, Stahl, Krell, and Masius 1975; Ellis and Ames 1987). If this holds true, hormonal levels could play a part in other sexual behaviors.

Other studies looked at birth order of males and sex-offenders. The "older brother effect" is the notion that homosexual men have a later birth order among their siblings than heterosexual men (Blanchard 1997). This has been studied among sex-offenders (Bogeart, Bezeau, Kuban, and Blanchard 1997). They found that homosexual and bisexual pedophiles had a later birth order among male offspring than heterosexual pedophiles. Birth order was not significant with regard to having sisters. Furthermore, Blanchard and Bogeart (1998) found that birth order was significant for both homosexual and heterosexual offenders against adult victims, yet birth order for both types of offenders against children was not significant.

Raboch and Raboch (1986) examined birth order for several sub-groups of sexually deviant males, including sexually dysfunctional men, sexual offenders against women, exhibitionists, pedophiles, and homosexual delinquents. They found that sexually dysfunctional men were more frequently an only child, compared to the homosexual delinquents and pedophiles of who were more likely to be the last of three or more children. Others have found that the larger number of older brothers was positively correlated with deviant responses on the Most Deviant Index, a general measure of sexual deviance, and that "offenders with longer birth intervals to their

next younger brother showed greater sexual deviance on three indices" (Cote, Earls, and Lalumiere 2002:77).

Substance Abuse

The substance abuse literature on whether juvenile sex-offenders are users of illegal drugs varies greatly, depending upon the source. Although many juvenile sex-offenders report having problems with drugs (Kahn and Chambers 1991; Miner, Siekert, and Ackland 1997), the actual role of drugs is vague. There is considerable variation reported in the relationship between juvenile sex-offending and substance abuse. Lightfoot and Barbaree (1993) studied juvenile offenders and conducted a thorough review of the literature on juvenile sex-offenders who were under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time of their offense. They conclude that the percentage of juvenile sex-offenders who were under the influence of drugs or alcohol ranged from 3.4% to 72%. The reason for such a wide range is this. Waserman and Kappel (1985) sampled adolescent sex-offenders and found 10% under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs at the time of the offense. And, Vinogradov, Dishotsky, Doty, and Tinklenberg (1988) sampled 63 adolescent rapists. They found that 72% admitted to being under the influence of one or more drugs at time of rape and that the majority were regular users. As Davis and Leitenberg (1987) put it:

> "There are no data to indicate whether adolescents who commit sexual offenses are more likely than other adolescents to have a history of alcohol or drug use problems, or whether there is a higher incidence of adolescent sex-offenders in the drug or alcohol abusing population of adolescents than in the general population of adolescents (p.420)."

Family Factors

In a more sociological vein, the literature on juvenile sex-offending is overloaded with studied considering familial factors as explanations for offenses. The focus tends to lean towards psychoanalytic factors and factors of violence, including violence between family members and previous sexual assaults on the juveniles. These variables correspond more directly with the strain theory literature.

Psychological Family Factors

Some theorists, using psychoanalytic reasoning, state the origin of sexual psychopathic behavior lies in the parent-child relationship, suggesting that psychiatrists need to examine the psychosexual development of boys (Deutsch 1950). This Freudian approach posits that one reason for male homosexuality and deviant sexual activity is that a woman's dominance over her husband overshadowed the father as a strong role model, pushing the son towards identifying more with the mother. Although this might sound like a plausible option, psychoanalytic theory is impossible to test empirically as the subconscious cannot be tested.

Family Violence

Another factor frequently related to juvenile sex-offending family violence, both between the parents and between parents and children (Lewis, Shanok, and Pincus 1981). Lewis and colleagues (1981) examined the correlation between juvenile sex-offending and family violence. Their sample consisted of three groups of juveniles in the only correctional facility in Connecticut. Their sample included a group of juvenile sex-offenders (n=17), a group of juvenile violent offenders (for murder or arson) who had not committed a sexual offense (n=61), and a group of less

violent juvenile offenders (n=19). Psychological tests, such as the WISC, Bender-Gestalt, and the Rorschach, provided their data. They found that sex-offenders as well as violent non-sex offenders had experienced abuse or witnessed extreme violence more than the less violent juveniles. They found that 79% of the juvenile sex-offenders reported observing extreme violence in their family, as opposed to only 20% of the less violent delinquents. With regard to ever being abused, 77% of the sex-offenders reported having ever been abused compared to only 29% of the less violent delinquents.

Caputo, Frick, and Brodsky (1999) also examined family violence and juvenile sex-offending, namely the degree of violence offenders witnessed against women in their family. The sample included 70 incarcerated males in an Alabama juvenile institution. The sample was divided into three categories: sex-offenders (n=23), violent offenders (n=23), and non-contact offenders (n=30). The family violence measure was a scale measuring violence "directed by a child's father or father-figure against his mother or mother-figure" (Caputo et al. 1999: 345). They found that all of the juvenile offenders witnessed a high rate of domestic violence, with no significant differences among the groups. Yet, about three times the number of sex-offenders and violent offenders witnessed severe domestic violence compared to the non-contact group, with a $p<.09$.

In particular, having experienced sexual abuse appears to be highly correlated with juvenile sex-offending. A review summarizing the literature on juvenile sexual offenders cited numerous studies that found this link (Righthand and Welch

2001, citing Fehrenbach et al. 1986; Kahn and Chambers 1991, and Kobayishi et al. 1995). The summary report also suggested that family violence is strongly linked to juvenile sex-offending (Righthand and Welch 2001).

One study has examined juvenile sex-offending from a criminological perspective. Colbert and Kelley (2002) studied the types of strain that predict sex-offending using GST. The data consisted of 274 juveniles housed in facilities in Oklahoma, 47 of whom were sex-offenders. They compared the two groups, using several GST measures, to determine if specific strain measures predicted sex-offending. Their findings confirmed that sex-offenders were solitary individuals, showing more antisocial behavior and parental fighting than juvenile delinquents who had not committed a sexual offense.

Peer Hassles

The literature on peer relations and offending is somewhat mixed. Some research has indicated that adolescent sex-offenders tend to be socially isolated (Fehrenbach et al. 1986: 226). Other research has suggested that social development is poor in juvenile sex-offenders, especially those who were victims of sexual abuse themselves (Hummel et al. 2000). However, this is not necessarily true of all delinquents, as evidenced in a recent study. Agnew and colleagues (2002) found that their measure of peer hassles was not predictive of delinquency in general. When they examined the interaction between negative emotionality with "being picked on by kids," their measure of peer hassles, they found that among older delinquents with high levels of negative emotionality, poor peer relationships and perceptions of being picked on by peers did predict delinquency. They pointed out that juveniles might respond to being

picked on by peers in either a passive manner or a very aggressive manner (Agnew et al. 2002). However, in the case of juvenile sex-offenders, there is the potential for a third response: sexual offending against younger or weaker juveniles.

CHAPTER IV

GST and Juvenile Sex-Offenders

Most theories about juvenile sexual offenses come from the medical field, tending to posit that personality and biological disorders explain juvenile sex-offending. Yet, these theories do little to explain who isn't a sex-offender. Perhaps sociological and criminological approaches can provide additional information about sex-offenders. Because of its ability to predict different types of deviance, General Strain Theory may be able to add to our knowledge about the predictors of juvenile sex-offending.

In the current study, I utilize General Strain Theory, to examine the influence of strain variables on violent but non-sex offenders and juvenile sex-offenders. I analyze whether certain types of strain have the ability to predict juvenile sex-offending in a larger population of juvenile offenders. There is already precedent for examining different subgroups of the same population. For example, Cleary (2002) used Self-Control Theory to examine three different groups of adult offenders, including two subgroups of sexual offenders. Her research indicated that there were significant differences in the three groups of offenders. Further, Caputo et al. (1999) examined family violence while using a sample of three subsets of juveniles, including sex-offenders, violent offenders, and non-contact offenders. As noted earlier, they did find that about three times the number of sex-offenders and violent offenders witnessed severe domestic violence compared to the non-contact group.

The literature on juvenile sex-offenders suggests that different types of strain may be more associated with juvenile sex-offending than with non-sex offending. For example, Brown and Stein (1997) reported that sex-offenders were more likely to have

intellectual disabilities. Ferrara and McDonald (1996) found neurological impairments to be relatively common among juvenile sex-offenders. Other research, however, suggests the opposite. Gilby and colleagues (1989) did not find intellectual ability to be related to the level of sex-offending. Still other research suggests that academic performance is diminished among all juvenile offenders (Fehrenbach et al. 1986; Miner et al. 1997). These studies suggest that academic strain or intellectual ability may be related to juvenile sex-offending, although the direction is unclear. The data available for this study do not include extensive data on academic or intellectual abilities. Yet, because of its relevance to the literature, I will incorporate a measure of academic strain called "academic problems" to further explore the role of academic strain/intellectual ability in sex-offending.

Family violence has also been found to predict juvenile sex-offending (Lewis et al. 1981). In addition, Caputo et al. (1999) reported that witnessing family violence was related to juvenile sex-offending but not to other violent and non-violent juvenile offending. The literature on General Strain Theory shows that sources of strain include parental fighting (Merianos 2002) and negative relations with adults (Paternoster and Mazerolle 1994). Therefore, the current study will incorporate a measure of parental fighting and a measure of negative life events with parents.

One study of sex-offenders suggested that negative life events in the family could have a significant impact on the likelihood of juvenile sex-offending. In particular, loss of a parent through death or divorce was significantly related to juvenile sex-offending (Hummel et al. 2000). Parental substance abuse was not found to be related (Hummel et al. 2000).

Prior tests of GST have incorporated some additional measures of strain that will be included in this study. Strain related to family income is an important type of stress among juveniles and should be examined for its relationship with sex-offending. The role of peer relationships should also be thoroughly examined. Given that the literature on juvenile sex offending suggests that sex-offenders have poor relationships with peers (Hummel et al. 2000), a measure of peer hassles will be incorporated. Additionally, negative relationships with adults have been found to be associated with higher levels of delinquency (Paternoster and Mazerolle 1994; Merianos 2001). Measures of these sources of strain are included in the present study.

Personal resources are also important. For example Broidy (2001) and Brezina (1996) measured the presence of coping skills, while others have tested the importance of the juvenile feeling a sense of control, mastery, or high self-esteem (Agnew and White 1992; Broidy 2001). Agnew (1992) argues that personal resources may mediate the effects of strain on delinquency. In the dataset I am using, there are three types of personal resource measures available: self-esteem, mastery and social support.

One other variable appears to be important. It is one type of antisocial attitude in which they refer to as "callous and unemotional behavior" (Caputo et al. 1999; Agnew et al. 2002). Therefore, a measure of antisocial attitude is included. Other variables that have relevance in the sex-offending literature, such as biological factors or birth order, could not be tested in the current study. The data I use do not indicate such measures, although it would be appropriate to examine them in future studies.

CHAPTER V

Hypotheses

A body of literature exists on juvenile sex-offenders, and the explanations for why they offend vary greatly. It is imperative to learn why juveniles offend sexually to aid in developing prevention programs. As noted, scholarly activity has focused on personality factors, familial factors, and biological factors, and no clear or concise answers have been presented that adequately explain juvenile sex-offending.

To date, little research has examined juvenile sex-offending utilizing the basic tenets of Agnew's General Strain Theory. Many researchers have used the same or similar scales to test general strain theory in various populations (Agnew and White 1992; Brezina 1996; Merianos 2001; Paternoster and Mazerolle 1994). Although it is unusual to study a delinquent group that is already incarcerated, it has been done in previous tests of GST (Colbert and Kelly 2002; Merianos 2001) and in previous tests of juvenile sex-offending (Caputo et al. 1999; Colbert and Kelley 2002; Lewis et al. 1981). In an earlier paper, I found that certain types of strain, such as parental fighting, predicted sex-offending in an institutionalized population of juveniles. I want to disentangle the strain measures to determine if more specific strain measurements exist that would differentiate between juvenile sex-offenders and violent juvenile non-sex-offenders. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to use general strain theory to examine if specific strain variables exist that explain juvenile sex-offending as something different from juvenile non-sex-offending..

Based on the literature review, I anticipate that parental fighting, negative life events with parents, maltreatment, peer hassles, mastery, and antisocial behavior will be related to juvenile sex-offending as opposed to violent non-sex-offending.

Additionally, I predict that there will be no difference between juveniles who have committed a sex-offense and violent non-sex offenders in terms of negative life events with drugs, family income, academic problems, social support, self-esteem, and depression.

CHAPTER VI

Methodology

In this chapter I describe the dataset, the sample, the data collection process, and the selection and measurement of the control, dependent and independent variables. A brief discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of using secondary data and self-report data is also presented.

Data

The data I used are the Oklahoma Juvenile Data, collected between May 2001 and August 2001.[1] The dataset consisted of 274 juveniles in state custody in Oklahoma and residing in a juvenile detention facility, collected as part of a state-required youth assessment (contracted by the Department of Mental Health Substance Abuse Services, MHSAS, and paid for by CSAT). Of the 274 juveniles interviewed, 253 were male and 19 were female. I limited my analysis to the 253 males, as there were no female sex-offenders.

Using Computer Assisted Personal Interviews (CAPI), data were gathered using face-to-face interviews with youth ranging in age from 13-18. All juveniles had entered the Oklahoma state juvenile facilities within the past year. Oklahoma Juvenile Affairs (OJA) mailed consent forms to parent(s) or guardian(s) of juveniles who were under the age of 18. Once the consent forms were voluntarily signed by the parent and sent back to OJA, the list of eligible juveniles was sent to the University of Oklahoma research coordinator.

1Principal Investigator, Dr. Kelly Damphousse, the University of Oklahoma. *Oklahoma City Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Juvenile Survey.* Center for Substance Abuse Treatment.

The interviewers consisted of undergraduate and graduate students attending the University of Oklahoma. The interviewers attended an eight-hour training course on how to perform face-to-face interviews as well as on using CAPI. The interviewers then went to eight different facilities within the State of Oklahoma.

The list of eligible interviewees was given to a coordinator at each facility. The juvenile facility coordinator was chosen at each facility's discretion. The facility coordinator would bring the subject into a room where the interviewer would be waiting. The interview would read a consent form to the juvenile to see if he wanted to participate. So, even if the parents consented to their child participating in the study, the juvenile could still refuse to participate. If the offender was 18 years of age, a parent or guardian was not contacted; only consent from the 18 year old was needed. Nearly all parents and guardians consented to the research project. The cooperation rate of the juveniles whose parents gave consent or who were 18 was over 95 percent. Participation by the offenders was voluntary, but most were eager to participate, as participants received two chocolate candy bars for their participation. Once the juvenile signed a consent form, the interviewer began with the interview. A variety of topics included in the interview included past drug use and criminal behavior, gang membership, relationships with peers, relationships with family members, and numerous school and education variables. Most of the survey questions were developed by the Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse and called the Texas Youth Corrections Survey Questionnaire.[2]. The Department of Mental Health Substance Abuse Services did alter some of the questions based on discussions with

[2] I would like to thank Rebecca Moore at the Office of Juvenile Affairs for her assistance in obtaining the data.

the Office of Juvenile Affairs legal staff. Interviews took approximately one and one-half hours to complete.

Secondary Data and Self-Report Data

The use of secondary data has its advantages and disadvantages. Some of the advantages include quickness in getting the data, availability of the data, and cost effectiveness. A main disadvantage with using secondary data is finding a dataset that includes all the necessary questions needed for a valid research study. Ideally, examining general strain theory and juvenile sex-offenders would begin with designing a survey instrument that would incorporate every measure of strain theory and all measures discussed in the previous literature on sex-offenders. Unfortunately, time, availability of this ideal sample, and financial constraints make this unfeasible for this project.

Researchers have cast doubt on the validity of self-reports of sensitive subjects. A problem with sensitive self-report data is that the respondent could have been embarrassed to admit to some behaviors or distrusted the interviewer, thus an underreporting of incidents. Some studies are now relying on other measures, such as arrest reports, to help validate self-reported surveys. No additional validation measure was available for this study.

Control Variables

Race

Race (RACE) of the juvenile was classified into one of six groups: (1) Anglo or white, (2) African American, (3) Hispanic, (4) Asian, (5) American Indian, and (6) Something else. I recoded the race variable so that (1) White and (0) Other. This was

done because of the racial make-up of my sample, with Whites making up over half of the sample.

Age

The subject's age was asked during the interview. For this study, AGE was left as a continuous variable. The age range of the sample was 13-18. The mean age for the sample is 16 ½ years old.

Socioeconomic Status

This variable (LUNCHES) was measured with the question, "When you were in school did you qualify for reduced cost or free lunches." This answer was coded as (1) Yes or (2) No. I recoded the responses so that (1) Yes and (0) No.

Dependent Variable

Two groups are used for this analysis. The first group consisted of juveniles who self-reported a criminal sexual act. The question in the survey asked, "In your lifetime, regardless if you have ever been arrested for it or not, have you ever committed sexual assault or rape." Forty-seven respondents, or 17.3% of the entire sample, admitted to sexual assault or rape in their lifetime. Thirty-five of the sex-offenders also reported they had committed a violent crime.

The second group consisted of juveniles who answered affirmatively to having committed a violent crime, but they did not report having committed a sex-offense. I combined five questions that measure violent crime. The five questions asked, "In your lifetime, regardless if you have ever been arrested for it or not, have you ever 1) seriously injured or killed someone, 2) beat someone up without using a weapon, 3) cut someone with a knife, 4) committed a robbery without a weapon, and 5)

committed a robbery with a gun." Of the 253 males, 228 reported having committed a violent offense. Thirty-five of these subjects had also committed a sexual offense. The forty-seven subjects who had committed a sexual offense, regardless of whether they had committed another violent offense, were coded 1. The remaining 193 violent offenders were coded 0. Thirteen subjects had committed neither a violent offense nor a sexual offense. They were omitted from the analysis, as this subgroup was too small to be considered separately from the other offenders. The analyses are thus restricted to the 240 offenders who reported engaging in either a sex-offenses or a violent non-sex offense. Almost twenty percent (19.6%, n=47) of the sample used in the subsequent analyses reported having committed a sexual offense.

Theoretical Independent Variables

Although the literature review on juvenile sex-offenders shows biological factors as being important, there were no biological variables in the dataset. However, there were measures relevant to General Strain Theory. The primary theoretical independent variables were negative life events, school or peer hassles, maltreatment, parental fighting, negative relations with adults, social support/coping skills, self-efficacy, self-esteem, and anger. The questions used in these scales are reported in Appendix A.

Negative Life Events

Previous empirical tests of GST included a measure called Negative Life Events (Agnew and White 1992; Brezina 1998; Merianos 2001; Paternoster and Mazerolle 1994). The juvenile sex-offender literature has also indicated the importance of negative life events within the family (Hummel et al. 2000). I used this concept to create two scales, Negative Life Events Parents (SCNLEP), and Negative

Life Events Drugs (SCNLED). The survey asked, “Has any of these things happened to you in the past two years: Parent or guardian lost his/her job, Parents divorced or separated, Your family moved to a new place, A new adult moved into your household, and You changed schools. The answers were coded (1) Yes and (2) No. I recoded the responses so that (1) Yes and (0) No. I then summed the scores for the five questions to create SCNLEP. The questions used for this variable are reported in Table 1. The range of this scale was 0 to 5 and the mean was 1.94.

[Table 1 About Here]

The questions used to create SCNLED were, “How often did the juvenile’s father figure drink, How often did the juvenile’s mother figure drink, How often did the juvenile’s father figure use drugs and How often the juvenile’s mother figure use drugs.” The responses were coded as (1) Every day during the day, (2) Every evening, (3) Several times a week, (4) Only on weekends, and (5) Only on special occasions. I recoded the responses so that high scores represented higher negative life events with drugs. I then summed the scores for the four questions to create SCNLEP. The questions used for this variable are reported in Table 2. The range of this scale was 0 to 20 and the mean was 3.10.

[Table 2 About Here]

Academic Problems/Peer Hassles

Agnew and White (1992) posited "life hassles" as being a source of loss of positive stimuli, or the experiencing of negative stimuli. Paternoster and Mazerolle (1994) and Merianos (2001) used this concept in their empirical studies, calling their measures "School/Peer Hassles." Based on the literature on juvenile sex-offenders (Hummel et al.), I chose to create two scales to measure this concept, academic problems (SCAP) and peer hassles (SCPH). The first scale, SCAP, was composed of five items. The questions asked, "How strongly do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements: I have trouble reading, I have trouble doing math, and I get restless in school." Responses were coded as: (1) Strongly agree, (2) Somewhat agree, (3) Somewhat disagree, and (4) Strongly disagree. The remaining questions that comprised the academic problems scale were: "I was in a special education or resource class for reading, and I was in a special education or resource class for writing." Responses were coded as (1) Yes and (2) No. I recoded responses for all five questions so that high scores represented high academic problems. I conducted a factor analysis for this scale and removed one question "I get restless in school." The factor analysis for the remaining questions is reported in Table 3. I then summed the scores for the four questions to create SCAP. The range for this scale was 5 to 16. The mean for this scale was 9.70 and Alpha for this scale was .670.

[Table 3 About Here]

The second scale that I created was peer hassles (SCPH). Three items comprised the scale. I initially started with four items: "Kids in school look down on me; In my school, you need a weapon to defend yourself; They don't want people like

me in school; and The kids in my school take advantage of you if you are weak." The responses were coded as: (1) Strongly agree, (2) Somewhat agree, (3) Somewhat disagree, and (4) Strongly disagree. I recoded the four items so that high scores represented high peer hassles. A factor analysis of the data showed that one question did not factor: kids in school look down on me. The factor analysis is reported in Table 4. I then summed the scores for the three questions to create SCPH. The range for this scale was 3 to 12. The mean for this scale was 6.44 and Alpha for this scale was .575.

[Table 4 About Here]

Maltreatment

This concept has been used in previous research testing GST (Merianos 2001) as the presence of negative stimuli. Initially I started with six items that measured maltreatment, but broke the items up into two scales as it seemed they were measuring two different types of maltreatment. Therefore, I used two scales to measure maltreatment, SCMAL1 and SCMAL2. SCMAL1 is made up of two questions: "Have your parents or guardians ever been investigated by Child Protective Services and Have you or any of your brothers or sisters ever been removed from your home by Child Protective Services." The responses were (1) Yes and (2) No. I recoded the responses so that high numbers indicated higher maltreatment. I summed the scores for the two questions to create SCMAL1. As noted in Table 5, the range for this scale was 2 to 4. The mean for this scale was 2.60 and Alpha for this scale was .682.

[Table 5 About Here]

SCMAL2 was made up of four items. The juveniles were asked, "In the past year: You had no place to live, You felt unsafe or in danger, You did not have enough food to eat, and You felt unloved." These questions had responses coded as: (1) Frequently (10 or more times), (2) A few times (3-9 times), (3) Once or twice (1-2 times) and (4) Never. The questions that make up this scale were recoded so that high scores indicated high levels of maltreatment. I conducted a factor analysis for this scale that is reported in Table 6. I summed the scores for the four questions to create SCMAL2. The range for this scale was 4 to 16. The mean for this scale was 7.36 and Alpha for the SCMAL2 scale was .690.

[Table 6 About Here]

Parental Fighting

This scale was drawn from other general strain theory studies using parental fighting (Agnew and White 1992) or family anger (Merianos 2001). Research on juvenile sex-offenders suggests a correlation between juvenile sex-offending and family violence (Haapasalo and Hamalainen 1996; Lewis, Shanok and Pincus 1981; Caputo, Frick and Brodsky 1999). This scale, called SCPARF, consisted of three items that measured the level of fighting within the juvenile's home. The items were: "Adults in my family lose their tempers a lot, People in my family hit each other when they are mad, and Members of my family fight with each other a lot. The responses were coded as: (1) Strongly agree, (2) Somewhat agree, (3) Somewhat disagree, and

(4) Strongly disagree. The responses were then recoded so that higher numbers reflected higher levels of parental fighting. I conducted a factor analysis for this scale that is reported in Table 7. I then summed the scores for the three questions to create SCPARF. The range for this scale was 3 to 12. The mean for this scale was 7.23 and Alpha for this scale was .795.

[Table 7 About Here]

Negative Relations with Adults

This variable has been used by others who have measured negative relations with adults (Paternoster and Mazerolle 1994; Merianos 2001). I used this concept to make a scale, called SCNRAD, to measure this variable. The scale was composed of five questions. The first two questions were: "Overall, how would you describe your relationship with your father" and "Overall, how would you describe your relationship with your mother". The responses were coded as: (1) Usually very close, (2) Sometimes close, (3) Usually distant, (4) Usually hostile, and (5) Unpredictable extremes of behavior-sometimes close, sometimes hostile. The other three items were: "Adults in my life noticed when I was doing a good job and congratulated me for it," "I did a lot of fun things with my family," and "I look up to my parent(s) and want to be like them when I grow older." The responses were (1) Strongly agree, (2) Somewhat agree, (3) Somewhat disagree, and (4) Strongly disagree. I conducted a factor analysis for this scale that is reported in Table 8. I then summed the scores for the five questions to create SCNRAD. The range for this variable was 5 to 19. The mean for this scale was 10.03 and Alpha for this scale was .671.

[Table 8 About Here]

Personal Resources/Social Support

This variable is theoretically important, as GST posits that delinquency will be low when coping skills are high (Agnew and White 1992). This scale, called SCSOC, was made up of three items: "I really enjoyed spending time with my family, I liked to share my thoughts and feelings with my family, and When I had a personal problem I went to my family for help." The responses were (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Somewhat Agree, (3) Somewhat Disagree, and (4) Strongly Disagree. I recoded these so that higher numbers indicate higher social support. I conducted a factor analysis for this scale that is reported in Table 9. I then summed the scores for the three questions to create SCSOC. The range for this variable was 3 to 12. The mean for this scale was 7.92 and Alpha for this scale was .750.

[Table 9 About Here]

Self-Efficacy/Mastery and Self-Esteem

These two variables were measured with scales combining seven items each from the survey. In the self-efficacy/mastery scale, the items used were: "I have little control over the things that happen to me, There is really no way I can solve some of the problems I have, Sometimes I feel that I am being pushed around in life, The really good things that happen to me are mostly luck, Most of my problems are due to bad breaks, I often feel helpless in dealing with problems of life, and I have little control

over the bad things that happen to me." The responses were coded as: (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Mildly Agree, (3) Neither Agree or Disagree, (4) Mildly Disagree, and (5) Strongly Disagree. I recoded these so that higher numbers indicated higher levels of mastery. The self-esteem items include: "What happens to me in the future mostly depends on me, I can do just about anything I really set my mind to, When I make plans I am almost certain I can make them work, I am responsible for my own successes, I am responsible for my own failures, When I get what I want it is usually because I worked hard for it, and On the whole I am satisfied with myself." The responses were (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Mildly Agree, (3) Neither Agree or Disagree, (4) Mildly Disagree, and (5) Strongly Disagree. I recoded these so that higher numbers indicated higher levels of self-esteem.

I conducted a factor analysis, using Varimax rotation, of these fourteen items that was reported in Table 10. Two factors emerged. I then summed the scores on the items loading on Factor 1 to create SCMASS. The range for this variable was 9 to 35. The mean for this scale was 23.8 and Alpha for this scale was .744. I summed the scores of the items loading on Factor 2 to create SCEST. The range for this variable was 9 to 35. The mean for this scale was 24.05 and Alpha for this scale was .651.

[Table 10 About Here]

Mediating Variables

Anger

Agnew theorizes that strain creates negative affective states, which in turn may lead to deviance. Theoretically, Agnew argues that anger is the most important negative

affective state in terms of leading to delinquency. Anger was measured by the question "I got into a lot of arguments or fights with other people." The responses were (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, and (4) Frequently. Of those that responded, 4.8% responded Never, 15.6% Rarely, 32.3% Sometimes, and 47.4% Frequently. The mean for this variable was 3.20.

Anxiety

This variable was measured with the question "I felt anxious or was very stressed out." The interviewer asked the juvenile how often he felt this feeling during the year or so before coming to OJA. The responses were coded as (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, and (4) Frequently. Of those that responded, 12.2% responded Never, 20.4% Rarely, 40.4% Sometimes, and 27.0% Frequently. The mean for this variable was 2.78.

Depression

The depression scale measures the level of depression that juveniles feel. Questions included whether the juvenile had these feelings during the year or so before coming to OJA: "I didn't feel like eating and my appetite was poor, I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing, I felt depressed, my sleep was restless, I felt sad, I lost interest in doing the things I usually enjoyed, I felt suspicious and distrustful of people, I had serious thoughts of suicide, I attempted suicide, and I really didn't care much what happened to me." The responses were coded as: (1) Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Sometimes, and (4) Frequently. I conducted a factor analysis for this scale

that was reported in Table 11. I then summed the scores for the ten questions to create SCDEP. The range for this variable was 10 to 40. The mean for this scale was 22.83 and Alpha for this 10-item scale was .791.

[Table 11 About Here]

Other Measures

Antisocial Attitude

The literature on juvenile sex-offending states that callous and unemotional behavior is characterized by such traits as "superficial charm, absence of empathy, absence of guilt, and shallow and constricted emotions" (Caputo, Frick, and Brodsky 1999). Similarly, in a recent piece, Agnew suggests the importance of including this measure as a conditioning variable (Agnew et al. 2002). I began with five questions. The first three included: "When breaking a rule I feel sorry, When breaking a law I feel guilty, and It's okay to cheat on school tests." The answers were (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Mildly Agree, (3) Neither Agree or Disagree, (4) Mildly Disagree, and (5) Strongly Disagree. Two questions asked if in the past 12 months before coming to OJA, did the juvenile: "Bet money or participate in dog-fighting or Bet money or participate in cockfighting." The answers were (1) Yes or (2) No. The questions were recoded so that high scores represented higher levels of callous/antisocial behavior and attitudes. I conducted a factor analysis for this scale, eliminating one question: "It's ok to cheat on school tests."

A factor analysis of the data, using Varimax rotation, showed that the items loaded on two factors. I created two scales from these items. The first scale consisted of the questions: “When breaking a rule I feel sorry and When breaking a law I feel guilty.” The results of the factor analysis were reported in Table 12. I then summed the scores for the two questions to create SCANT1. The range for this scale was 2 to 10. The mean for this scale was 7.00 and Alpha for this 2-item scale was .815.

[Table 12 About Here]

The second antisocial scale, SCANT2, consisted of the following items. The subject was asked if in the past 12 months before coming to OJA, did the juvenile: “Bet money or participate in dog-fighting or Bet money or participate in cockfighting.” The factor analysis is reported in Table 12. I then summed the scores for the two questions to create SCANT2. The range for this variable was 2 to 4. The mean for this scale was 2.42 and Alpha for this 2-item scale was .506.

In the following chapter, I will report the results of the logistic regression analyses. Nine analyses are reported. The first analysis regresses the dependent variable (sex-offending) on the independent variables and control variables. In the next set of analyses, the three measures of affective states are added. In the final set of analyses, I have added the personal resource variables: social support, mastery and self-esteem.

Chapter VII

Analysis

Procedures

The data are analyzed in two stages using SPSS 10.0. The first stage consists of descriptive statistics with frequency distributions. I used an independent t-test or Pearson's Chi-square to test for significance between the two groups (sex-offenders and violent non-sex offenders). The second stage consists of logistic regression analyses.

Sample Characteristics

The control variables consisted of basic demographic controls, including race, age, and socioeconomic status. Table 13 presents the demographic variables of the sample comparing sex-offenders and violent non-sex offenders. The juveniles ranged in age from 13 to 18. The mean age for the sex-offenders and violent non-sex offenders were 16.47 and 16.56, respectively. More than half of the sex-offenders were white (57.4%), while 44.8% of the violent non-sex-offenders were white. Of those that responded, 77.8% of the sex-offenders reported having received reduced cost or free lunches, compared to 51.5% of violent non-sex offenders. Using a Chi-Square test, there was a significant difference between the two groups on this variable, $p<.001$, with sex-offenders being more likely to report having received reduced cost or free lunches compared to violent non-sex offenders.

[Table 13 About Here]

It is important to recognize that this sample differs from other research in one important way. My measures of sex-offending and violent non-sex offending are based on self-report of those behaviors rather than official charges. Most studies comparing juvenile sex-offenders to other juvenile offenders have used official records to categorize juvenile offenders. In this study, because the identification of offender type was based on having engaged in the behavior, there were very few non-violent offenders, making comparison to that group impossible.

Means for Strain Variables

The independent sample t-test revealed only a few strain measures as significantly different between sex-offenders and violent non-sex offenders. While sex-offenders had a higher mean score on the negative life events with parents, academic problems, maltreatment (MAL1) and (MAL2), parental fighting, depression, and antisocial behavior (ANT1) scales, the differences between the two groups were not statistically significant. Of the strain measures, the difference between sex-offenders and non-sex offenders on the social support and antisocial behavior scales were statistically significant. These are reported in Table 14. Non-sex offenders reported having both higher social support and higher antisocial behavior than sex-offenders.

[Table 14 About Here]

Logistic Regression Analyses

I ran logistic regression analyses with sex-offending regressed on the strain variables. These regressions contain nine models. In Table 15, I examined strain variables and control variables. In Table 16, I added the negative affective state

variables. In Model I, I added anger only. In Model II, I added anxiety only. In Model III I added depression only. Model IV examines all three negative affective states in addition to the strain and control variables. Table 17 repeats the analyses in Table 16, with the coping mechanisms added to each model.

First, I will examine the regression of my dependent variable on the strain and control variables. Table 15 presents the results of a logistic regression equation for the strain variables with sex-offending as the dependent variable. Maltreatment, or MAL1, has a statistically significant effect on sex-offending. (Odds Ratio: 2.404). Those who experienced the maltreatment as measured by MAL1 were more likely to be sex offenders than those who did not experience this maltreatment. In addition, whether the offender qualified for reduced cost or free lunches had a statistically significant effect on sex-offending. Those who qualified for reduced cost or free lunches were 4.8 times more likely to be sex-offenders than those who didn't qualify for reduced cost or free lunches. Furthermore, there was a significant negating effect of peer hassles on sex offending (Odds Ratio: .649). Those who scored higher on peer hassles were less likely to report sex-offending.

[Table 15 About Here]

Table 16 presents the results of a logistic regression with the addition of the negative affective state variables. In model I, anger is added by itself. Lunches, peer hassles, and maltreatment1 were statistically significant at the .05 level. Those who qualified for reduced cost or free lunches were 1.62 times more likely to be sex offenders than those who didn't qualify for reduced cost or free lunches. Further, those

who had experienced maltreatment in their lifetime were more likely to be sex offenders than those who hadn't experienced such maltreatment. On the contrary, those that experienced peer hassles were less likely to be sex offenders than those who had not experienced peer hassles. In model II, anxiety is added by itself. Again, lunches, peer hassles, and maltreatment1 are statistically significant. Those who qualified for reduced cost or free lunches and experienced maltreatment as measured by MAL1 were more likely to be sex-offenders than those who didn't qualify for reduced cost or free lunches or experience maltreatment. Those who experienced peer hassles were more likely to be non-sex offenders than those who had not experienced peer hassles. In model III, depression is added by itself. Peer hassles is not significant in this model, leaving only lunches and maltreatment1 positively statistically significant. Within the complete model, model IV, all the mediating variables are added at the same time and the only statistically significant variables were qualifying for reduced cost or free lunches, peer hassles, and maltreatment1. Those who qualified for reduced cost or free lunches were 6.1 times more likely to be sex offenders and those who experienced maltreatment were 2.78 times more likely to be sex offenders than those who didn't qualify for reduced cost or free lunches or had not experienced maltreatment. Further, those who experienced peer hassles were .644 times as likely to be sex offenders than those who had not experienced peer hassles (they were more likely to be non-sex offenders).

[Table 16 About Here]

In Table 17, I added the coping mechanisms into the logistic regression equation, with the negative affective states added separately. In model I, anger and the coping mechanisms were added. Qualifying for reduced cost or free lunches and maltreatment1 remained positively statistically significant, while peer hassles, negative relations with adults, and social support were negatively statistically significant. In other words, those who qualified for reduced cost or free lunches were 11.53 times more likely to be sex offenders than those who did not qualify for reduced cost or free lunches. Those who experienced maltreatment as measured by MAL1 were 2.95 times more likely to be sex offenders than those who had not experienced maltreatment. In addition, those who experienced peer hassles and those who had negative relations with adults were less likely to be sex offenders than those who had not experienced peer hassles or negative relations with adults. In model II, anxiety is the measure of negative affective state used in the analysis. Again, qualifying for reduced cost or free lunches and maltreatment1 were positively statistically significant, while peer hassles, negative relations with adults, and social support were negatively statistically significant. Those who qualified for reduced cost or free lunches and experienced maltreatment were more likely to be sex offenders than those who had not qualified for reduced cost or free lunches and experienced maltreatment. Those who experienced peer hassles, had negative relations with adults, and felt social support were less likely to be sex offenders than those who had had not experienced peer hassles, had negative relations with adults, and felt social support. In model III, depression was added by itself. Here again, qualifying for reduced cost or free lunches and maltreatment1 were positively statistically significant, while peer hassles, negative relations with adults, and social support were negatively statistically

significant. Those who qualified for reduced cost or free lunches and felt maltreatment as measured by MAL1 were more likely to be sex offenders than those who had not qualified for reduced cost or free lunches or felt maltreatment. However, those who experienced peer hassles, had negative relations with adults, and felt social support were less likely to be sex offenders than those who had not experienced peer hassles, had negative relations with adults, and felt social support. In the complete model (Model IV), anger, anxiety, and depression were added at the same time. Qualifying for reduced cost or free lunches, peer hassles, maltreatment1, negative relations with adults, and social support were statistically significant. Of those, peer hassles, negative life events with adults, and social support negatively affect the likelihood of being a sex offender. Those that qualified for reduced cost or free lunches and experienced maltreatment were more likely to be sex offenders than those who had not qualified for reduced cost or free lunches and experienced maltreatment. On the other hand, those who experienced peer hassles, had negative relations with adults, and felt social support were less likely to be sex offenders than those who did not experience peer hassles, had negative relations with adults, and felt social support.

[Table 17 About Here]

Chapter VIII

Discussion

This chapter will first review my hypotheses and then focus on the significant research findings and if these findings support my hypotheses. This study utilized General Strain Theory to test the influence of strain variables as predictors of sex-offending among a population of incarcerated juveniles who reported engaging in violent offending. I drew upon two prominent studies on sex offenders to guide my research. Both Caputo and colleagues (1999) and Lewis and colleagues (1981) examined family violence among juvenile sex offenders, violent offenders, and less violent or non-violent offenders. Other studies regarding General Strain Theory, including Merianos (2002), Paternoster and Mazerolle (1994), Broidy (2001), Agnew et al. (2002) and Brezina (1999), guided my study on the strain variables and coping skills variables. Yet, no one has clearly stated what makes these groups different. I added to the two bodies of literature and analyzed whether certain types of strain had the ability to predict juvenile sex-offending in a larger population of juvenile offenders.

Operating from this premise, I hypothesized that parental fighting, negative life events with parents, maltreatment, peer hassles, mastery, and antisocial behavior would be more likely to predict juvenile sex-offending as opposed to violent non-sex-offending. Additionally, I hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between juveniles who had committed a sex offense and violent non-sex offenders in terms of negative life events with drugs, family income, academic problems, social support, self-esteem, and depression.

Significant Research Findings

My hypotheses were not completely supported by the research findings. Parental fighting, negative life events with parents, mastery, and antisocial behavior were not predictors of juvenile sex-offending as predicted. These variables had no significance in any of the analyses. I was correct in that there were no significant differences between sex offenders and violent offenders in terms of negative life events with drugs, academic problems, self-esteem, and depression.

However, my prediction of no difference between the two groups in terms of the effect of family income was incorrect. Qualifying for reduced cost or free lunches was found to have the biggest effect on juvenile sex-offending. One possibility for this is that families with greater resources may be able to keep their children who engage in sex-offending out of the juvenile justice system. Families with money may be able to divert the child who has committed a sexual offense into counseling or therapy. Sexual offending is more likely to occur within the family or its social circle and is often less visible to the public and authorities. Thus, the juvenile who sexually offends may be less likely to be reported than the juvenile who engages in more visible crimes such as vandalism, theft, assault or murder. This lower visibility could lead to a disproportionate number of lower-income juveniles who sexually offend being incarcerated compared to other types of juvenile offenders. Simply stated, the families with greater resources may be able to prevent the detection and arrest of sexual offenders due to the more private nature of the act. They may not, however, be able to prevent the detection and incarceration of their children who engage in more public types of offending. Due to the measure used in this study, it is impossible to determine if all or most of the juvenile sex offenders had been charged with a sex

offense, however. This would be an interesting finding to follow up on in future research.

One of the measures of maltreatment was a significant predictor of juvenile sex-offending in all of the models, as I had hypothesized. To be more specific, sex offenders were more likely to have had parents or guardians that had been investigated by Child Protective Services and have brothers and/or sisters removed from their home by Child Protective Services than violent offenders. This was referred to previously as maltreatment. Although certain types of maltreatment have been linked to violent offenders using General Strain Theory, this type of maltreatment is more strongly linked to sex offenders. The sex-offending literature points out that many juveniles have been sexually abused themselves (Righthand and Welch 2001). It may be that the relationship between interventions by Child Protective Service and sexual offending is in part explained by sexual offending by others in the home. Unfortunately, my data did not allow me to examine this issue, with no questions available about whether or not the juvenile had himself experienced sexual abuse.

Some variables worked in the opposite direction predicted. Contrary to my expectations, sex offenders were not as likely to have experienced peer hassles as other violent offenders. Although the difference was not significant, violent non-sex offenders scored higher, on average, on their responses to statements that people like themselves weren't wanted in school, kids in school looked down upon them, and kids in their school took advantage of others who are weak. Having experienced peer hassles is parallel to the notion that sex offenders do not get along with others in their school. If they do not feel like they are part of the social group in school or close to their peers, they could feel isolated. The literature states that juvenile sex offenders

are “lonely and socially isolated from peers” (Fehrenbach et al. 1986). However, this study does not support this. I found that peer hassles was negatively related to sex-offending. In the logistic regression, this became a significant negative predictor. I had suggested that sex offenders are socially isolated (Fehrenbach et al. 1986) and would be more likely to report having experienced social rejection (Hummel et al. 2000). I found, however, that those who reported peer hassles were significantly less likely to report sex-offending. Agnew has suggested that peer abuse may be a significant predictor of violence (Agnew et al. 2002). Therefore, it may be that my findings are reflecting this relationship in that the violent non-sex offenders are responding to peer abuse with violence. Certainly, this needs to be studied in greater depth in future research.

In the current study, violent non-sex offenders reported having a lower level of social support than sex offenders. Sex offenders were more likely to report that they really enjoyed the time they did spend with their family and that when they had a personal problem they went to their family for help. I pose that since sex-offenders feel isolated from their peers, by default, they have to turn to family members if they need help. If they felt closer to their peers, they might turn to them for help and act out in other violent ways besides sex-offending. Additionally, sex offenders may have been victims of sexual abuse by a family member. While this is a negative experience for the juvenile, it also may result in stronger bonds to family abusers, albeit not healthy bonds. This area clearly merits closer examination.

Negative relationship with adults has been a variable of interest in previous tests of strain theory (Agnew and White 1992; Paternoster and Mazerolle 1994; Merianos 2002). In the current study, sex offenders were not as likely to have

experienced negative relations with adults as violent offenders. This, however, became significant only after adding in the coping variables of social support, mastery, and self-esteem. After controlling for levels of social support, mastery and self-esteem, sex offenders were less likely to describe their relationship with their father and/or mother as being poor, to report that they did not want to be like their parents when they grow older, or to report that they did not do a lot of fun things with their family. As Agnew's GST has suggested, delinquency, particular violent behavior, may help juveniles cope with problems created by negative social relations (Agnew 1992).

Unlike Agnew (1992) has suggested, I found no relationship between anger or other negative affective states and sex-offending. Yet, this is not unlikely because both groups in my sample are considered violent in crime theory. Therefore, if anger predicts violence, I would not have expected to find a significant difference in the two groups. Furthermore, Agnew (Agnew et al. 2002) offers the warning that the measures of antisocial behavior and attitudes may be highly correlated with negative emotionality, measured in this study through my two antisocial behavior variables. The literature on juvenile offenders suggested that antisocial behavior and attitudes were attributes found in juvenile sex offenders. Caputo et al. (1999) reported that juvenile sex offenders had more callous attitudes towards either violent or non-violent offenders, on average. In the current study, I had two measures of antisocial attitudes or behaviors. The first measure taps into a lack of guilt, while the second measures lack of empathy towards living creatures. Neither was a significant predictor of sex-offending. Thus, my findings differ significantly from those of Caputo and her colleagues (1999). They had anticipated finding that antisocial traits would mediate

between the effects of witnessing family violence and delinquent behavior. As proposed in my hypothesis, I expected there to be a significant difference between sex offenders and violent offenders in terms of family violence. The literature suggests that sex offenders observe more family violence than less violent offenders (Lewis and colleagues 1981; Colbert and Kelly 2002). I did not find any such difference between the two groups. It could be that sex offenders were not that different from the other violent offenders and if I could have had a third sample of nonviolent offenders, this would become significant. However, it is also quite likely that the lack of significance in the family violence measure explains the lack of significance in the effects of antisocial behaviors and attitudes (Caputo et al.1999).

Chapter IX

Conclusion and Future Research

Limitations and Future Research

As previously mentioned, the data used in this study did not include measures of previous sexual abuse of the juvenile delinquent, which is relevant according to prior studies of juvenile sex offenders. In addition, the data did not contain any female sex-offenders, which is important in the GST literature about how males and females cope with strain differently. Because of such limitations, I propose that future studies should include female sex offenders, although the numbers are scarce, as well as childhood sexual abuse questions.

The study was also limited to examining only juveniles who had been arrested for a crime and placed in the custody of the Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs (OJA). Furthermore, identification of juveniles as sex offenders, violent non-sex offenders, and non-violent offenders was based on self-report rather than official charges. My sample therefore only included twelve non-violent offenders, perhaps because of the generality of deviance (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990).

Previous studies have compared sex offenders, violent offenders, and non-violent offenders. I would have liked to be able to compare all three groups if my data would have allowed. Data on the specific crimes for which the juvenile had been placed into custody were not available for analysis, however. An important direction for future research would be to compare the official charges with the self-report data. I have no idea what proportion of the forty-seven juveniles who self-reported sex-offending were officially identified as sex offenders. It may be that all or most were. However, it also may be that my measure of sex-offending gave a truer picture of factors related

to sex-offending than studies that use official identification of sex offenders. Regardless, it is important that research on this topic explore the differences between the officially identified juvenile sex offender population and the self-reported juvenile sex offender population in addition to comparisons with other offenders.

Since sex-offending is a sensitive topic, future studies should include data from victims as well as perpetrators. Furthermore, future research on this topic should include a larger, more diverse sample. Ideally, it would include female offenders, including female sex offenders. It would also include a larger number of non-violent offenders. In addition, questions were needed to tap into the variables that have been deemed important as per the literature review. These questions would include whether the juvenile had ever been sexually abused as a child, tests measuring intellectual ability, and more questions about siblings.

REFERENCES

Agnew, Robert. 1985. “A Revised Strain Theory of Delinquency.” *Social Forces* 64 (1):151-67.

Agnew, Robert. 1992. “Foundations for a General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency.” *Criminology* 30 (1):47-87.

Agnew, Robert. 1997. “Stability and Change in Crime Over the Life Course: A StrainTheory Explanation.” in *Developmental Theories of Crime and Delinquency, Advances in Criminological Theory*, edited by Terence P. Thornberry vol. 7. New Jersey: Transaction.

Agnew, Robert Timothy Brezina, John Paul Wright and Francis T. Cullen. 2002. “Strain, Personality Traits and Delinquency: Extending General Strain Theory.” *Criminology* 40: 43-72.

Agnew, Robert and H.R. White. 1992. “An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory.” *Criminology* 30(4): 475-99.

Akers, Ronald L., Marvin D. Krohn, Lonn Lanza-Kaduce, and Marcia Radosevich. 1979. “Social Learning and Deviant Behavior.” *American Sociological Review* 44 (4):636-55.

American Psychiatric Association. 1987. “Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.” (3rd edition). Washington, DC: Author.

Blanchard, R. 1997. “Birth Order and Sibling Sex Ratio in Homosexual Versus Heterosexual Males and Females.” *Annual Review of Sex Research* 8: 7-67.

Blanchard, R. and A.F. Bogeart. 1998. “Homosexuality in Men and Number of Older Brothers.” *American Journal of Psychiatry* 153: 27-31.

Bogeart, A.F., S. Bezeau, S., M. Kuban M., and R. Blanchard. 1997. “Pedophilia, Sexual Orientation, and Birth Order.” *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 106: 331-35.

Brezina, Timothy. 1996. "Adapting to Strain: An Examination of Delinquent Coping Responses." *Criminology* 34(1): 39-60.

Broidy, Lisa M. 2001. “A Test of General Strain Theory.” *Criminology* 39(1): 9-35.

Broidy, Lisa M. and Robert Agnew. 1997. “Gender and Crime: A General Strain Theory Perspective.” *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34(3): 275-301.

Brown, H. and J. Stein. 1997. “Sexual Abuse Perpetrated by Men with Intellectual Disabilities: A Comparative Study.” *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research* 41(3):215-24.

Burdon, William M. and Catherine A. Gallagher. 2002. “Coercion and Sex Offenders: Controlling Sex-Offending Behavior Through Incapacitation and Treatment.” C*riminal Justice and Behavior* 29(1): 87-109.

Caputo, Alicia A., Paul J. Frick, and Stanley L. Brodsky. 1999. “Family Violence and Juvenile Sex Offending: The Potential Mediating Role of Psychopathic Traits and Negative Attitudes Toward Women.” *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 26(3): 338-56.

Cleary, Shawna. 2002. “Self-Control in a Criminal Sample: A Comparison of Sex Offenders and Non-Sex Offenders.” Doctor of Philosophy (Sociology) University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

Colbert, Sharla S. and Margaret S. Kelley. 2002. “Applying General Strain Theory to Juvenile Sex Offenders.”

Coontz, Stephanie. 1995. “The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap.” New York, NY: Basic Books Press.

Cote K., C.M. Earls, and M.L. Lalumier. 2002. “Birth Order, Birth Interval, and Deviant Sexual Preferences Among Sex Offenders.” *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment* 4(1): 67-81.

Davis, G.E. and H. Leitenberg. 1987. “Adolescent Sex Offenders.” *Psychological Bulletin* 101, 417-27.

Dorner, G., W. Rohde, F. Stahl, L. Krell, and W.G. Masius. 1975. “A Neuroendocrine Predisposition for Homosexuality in Men.” *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 4:1-8.

Deutsch, Helene, M.D. 1950. “The Psychology of Women: A Psychoanalytic Interpretation” 2 volumes. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Ellis, L., M.A. Ames. 1987. “Neurohormonal Functioning and Sexual Orientation: A Theory of Homosexuality-Heterosexuality.” *Psychological Bulletin* 101: 233-58.

Fehrenbach, P.A., W. Smith, C. Monastersky, and R.W. Deisher. 1986. “Adolescent Sexual Offenders: Offender and Offense Characteristics.” *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 56: 225-33.

Ferrara, M.L., and S. McDonald. 1996. *Treatment of the Juvenile Sex Offender: Neurological and Psychiatric Impairments*. New Jersey: Jason Aronson.

Gilby, R., L. Wolf, and B. Goldbert. 1989. "Mentally Retarded Adolescent Sex Offenders: A Survey and Pilot Study." *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 34(6): 542-48.

Gottfredson, Michael and Travis Hirschi. 1990. "A General Theory of Crime." Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Groth, N.A., R.E. Longo, J.B. McFadin. 1982. "Undetected Recidivism Among Rapists and Child Molesters." *Crime and Delinquency* 128: 450-58.

Hare, R.D., S.D. Hart, and T.J. Harpur. 1991. "Psychopathy and the DSM-IV Criteria for Antisocial Personality Disorder." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 100: 391-98.

Hirschi, Travis. 1969. "Causes of Delinquency." Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hoffmann, John P. and Felicia Gray Cerbone. 1999. "Stressful Life Events and Delinquency Escalation in Early Adolescence." *Criminology* 37: 343-73.

Hoffmann, John P. and Susan S. Su. 1997. "The Conditional Effects of Stress on Delinquency and Drug Use: A Strain Theory Assessment of Sex Differences. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34: 46-78.

Hummel, Peter Volker Thomke, Hartmut A. Oldenburger and Friedrich Specht. 2000. "Male Adolescent Sex Offenders Against Children: Similarities and Differences Between Those Offenders With and Those Without a History of Sexual Abuse." *Journal of Adolescence* 23: 305-317.

Hunter, John A. 2000. "Understanding Juvenile Sex Offenders: Research Findings and Guidelines For Effective Management & Treatment." *Juvenile Justice Fact Sheet*. Charlottesville, Institute of Law, Psychiatry, & Public Policy, University of Virginia.

Kahn, T.J. and H.J. Chambers. 1991. "Assessing Reoffense Risk and Juvenile Sexual Offenders." *Child Welfare* 70 (3): 333-45.

Kobayishi, J., B.D. Sales, J. V. Becker, A. J. Figueredo and M. S. Kaplan. 1995. "Perceived Parental Deviance, Parent-Child Bonding, Child Abuse and Child Sexual Aggression." *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment* 7(1):25-43.

Knapp, M. 1996. "Treatment of Sex Offenders." Pp. 13.1-13.6 in *Managing Adult Sex Offenders: A Containment Approach*, edited by K. English, S. Pullen, and L. Jones. Kentucky: American Probation and Parole Association.

Lewis, D.O., S.S. Shanok, J.H. Pincus. 1981. “Juvenile Male Sexual Assaulters: Psychiatric, Neurological, Psychoeducational, and Abuse Factors.” Pp. 89-105 in *Vulnerabilities to Delinquency,* edited by D.O. Lewis. New York: Spectrum Publications.

Lightfoot, L.O., H.E. Barbaree. 1993. “The Relationship Between Substance Use and Abuse and Sexual Offending in Adolescents.” Pp. 203-24 in *The Juvenile Sex Offender*, edited by H.E. Barbaree, W.L. Marshall, and S.M. Hudson. New York: Guilford Press.

Merianos, Dorothy. 2001. “Joining the Gang: A Reaction to Strain? A Partial Test of Agnew’s General Strain Theory.” Doctor of Philosophy (Criminal Justice) May, 2001, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.

Miner, M.H., G.P. Siekert, and M.A. Ackland. 1997. Evaluation: “Juvenile Sex Offender Treatment Program, Minnesota Correctional Facility-Sauk Centre.” Final Report-Biennium 1995-97. University of Minnesota, Department of Family Practice and Community Health, Program in Human Sexuality.

O'Brien, M. J. (1991). “Taking Sibling Incest Seriously.” In M. Q. Patton (Ed.), Family Sexual Abuse. Frontline Research and Evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

O’Callaghan, D. and B. Print. 1994. “Adolescent Sexual Abusers: Research, Assessment and Treatment in T. Morrison, M. Erooga and R. Beckett (Eds.) *Sexual Offending Against Children,* London: Routledge.

Paternoster, R., P. Mazarolle. 1994. “General Strain Theory and Delinquency: A Replication and Extension.” *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 31(3): 235-63.

Raboch, J. and J. Raboch. 1986. “Number of Siblings and Birth Order of Sexually Dysfunctional Males and Sexual Delinquents.” *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy* 12: 73-76.

Randall, Zac. 2002. Personal interview.

Rice, M.E., G.T. Harris, and V.L. Quinsey. 1990. “A Follow-Up of Rapists Assessed in a Maximum-Security Psychiatric Facility.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 5: 435-48.

Righthand, Sue and Carlann Welch. 2001. *Juveniles Who Have Sexually Offended: A Review of the Professional Literature.* Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Justice/Office of Justice Programs.

Ryan, Gail and Sandy Lane. 1991. “Juvenile Sexual Offending. Causes, Consequences, and Corrections.” Lexington Books: Toronto.

Sharp, Susan F., Toni L. Terling-Watt, Leslie A. Atkins, Jay Trace Gilliam, and Anna Sanders. 2001. "Purging Behavior in a Sample of College Females: A Research Note on General Strain Theory and Female Deviance." Deviant Behavior 22:171-88.

Strate, D.C., Jones, I., Pullen, S. & English, K. (1996). Criminal Justice Policies and Sex Offender Denial. In K. English, S. Pullen & L. Jones (Eds.), *Managing Adult Sex Offenders: A Containment Approach* (pp. 4-9). Lexington, KY: American Probation and Parole Association.

Sutherland, Edwin H. 1940. “White Collar Criminality.” *American Sociological Review* February, 5 (1): 1-12.

Vinogradov, S., N.I. Dishotsky, A.K. Doty, and J.R.Tinklenberg. 1988. “Patterns of Behavior in Adolescent Rape.” *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 58, 179-87.

Waserman, J. and S. Kappel. 1985. *Adolescent Sex Offenders in Vermont.* Burlington: Vermont Department of Health.

Table 1. Items Included in Negative Life Events with Parents (NLEP)

ITEM	
Parents or guardian lost his/her job.	
Parents divorced or separated.	
Your family moved to a new place.	
A new adult moved into your household.	
You changed schools.	
N	245
Mean	1.94
Standard Deviation	1.36
Crohbach's Alpha	.470

Table 2. Items Included in Negative Life Events with Drugs (NLED)

ITEM	
How often did the juvenile's father figure drink	
How often did the juvenile's mother figure drink	
How often the father/stepfather/mother's boyfriend use drugs	
How often the mother/stepmother/mother's girlfriend use drugs	
N	239
Mean	3.10
Standard Deviation	3.63
Crohbach's Alpha	.550

Table 3. Factor Loadings for Items in Academic Problems Items

ITEM	FACTOR LOADING
I have trouble reading.	.779
I have trouble doing math.	.678
I was in a special education or resource class for reading.	.762
I get restless in school.	---
I was in a special education or resource class for writing.	.767
Cronbach's Alpha:	.670

Table 4. Factor Loadings for Peer Hassles Items

ITEM	FACTOR LOADING
In my school, you need a weapon to defend yourself.	.723
They don't want people like me in school.	.690
Kids in school look down on me.	---
The kids in my school take advantage of you if you are weak.	.765
Cronbach's Alpha:	.575

Table 5. Items Included in Maltreatment 1 (MAL1)

ITEM	
Have your parents or guardians ever been investigated by Child Protective Services?	
Have you or any of your brothers or sisters ever been removed from your home by Child Protective Services?	
Cronbach's Alpha	.682

Table 6. Factor Loadings for Items Included in Maltreatment 2 (MAL2)

ITEM	FACTOR LOADING
In the past year:	
You had no place to live.	.725
You did not have enough food to eat.	.789
You felt unloved.	.707
You felt unsafe or in danger.	.656
Cronbach's Alpha:	.690

Table 7. Factor Loadings for Items Included in Parental Fighting

ITEM	FACTOR LOADING
Adults in my family lose their tempers a lot.	.815
People in my family hit each other when they are mad.	.852
Members of my family fight with each other a lot	.859
Cronbach's Alpha:	.795

Table 8. Factor Loadings for Items Included in Negative Relations with Adults

ITEM	FACTOR LOADING
How would you describe your relationship with your father	.511
How would you describe your relationship with your mother	.582
Adults in my life noticed when I was doing a good job and congratulated me for it	.733
I did a lot of fun things with my family.	.777
I look up to my parent(s) and want to be like them when I grow older	.668
Cronbach's Alpha:	.671

Table 9. Factor Loadings for Items Included in Social Support

ITEM	FACTOR LOADING
I really enjoyed spending time with my family	.760
I liked to share my thoughts and feelings with my family	.828
When I had a personal problem I went to my family for help	.861
Cronbach's Alpha:	.750

Table 10. Factor Loadings for Self Efficacy/Mastery and Self-Esteem Items

ITEM	FACTOR 1 LOADING	FACTOR 2 LOADING
I have little control over the things that happen to me.	.640	
There is really no way I can solve some of the problems I have.	.595	
Sometimes I feel that I am being pushed around I life.	.589	
The really good things that happen to me are mostly luck.	.611	
Most of my problems are due to bad breaks.	.590	
I often feel helpless in dealing with problems of life.	.749	
I have little control over the bad things that happen to me.	.617	
What happens to me in the future mostly depends on me.		.557
I can do just about anything I really set my mind to.		.587
When I make plans I am almost certain I can make them work.		.617
I am responsible for my own successes.		.574
I am responsible for my own failures.		.659
When I get what I want it is usually because I worked hard for it.		.524
On the whole I am satisfied with myself.		.453
Cronbach's Alpha	.744	.651

Table 11. Factor Loadings for Depression Items

ITEM	FACTOR LOADING
I didn't feel like eating and my appetite was poor.	.567
I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.	.554
I felt depressed.	.748
My sleep was restless.	.504
I felt sad.	.684
I lost interest in doing the things I usually enjoyed.	.521
I felt suspicious and distrustful of people.	.450
I had serious thoughts of suicide.	.673
I attempted suicide.	.632
I really didn't care much what happened to me.	.538
Cronbach's Alpha:	.791

Table 12. Factor Loadings for Antisocial Behavior Items

ITEM	FACTOR1	FACTOR2
When breaking a rule I feel sorry.	.918	
When breaking a law I feel guilty.	.913	
It's OK to cheat on school tests.	---	---
In the past 12 months before coming to OJA:		
Did the juvenile bet money or participate in dogfighting?		.821
Did the juvenile bet money or participate in cockfighting?		.809

Table 13. Demographic Variables by Groups (Sex Offenders and Other Violent Offenders)

	Sex Offenders N=47				Violent Non-Sex Offenders N=193			
	Mean	**SD**	**n**	**%**	**Mean**	**SD**	**n**	**%**
Age	16.47	1.5			16.56	1.3		
Race								
Anglo, Caucasian			27	57.4			87	44.8
Other			20	42.6			107	55.2
Reduced cost/free lunches			35	77.8*			95	51.1

*p<.001

Table 14. Mean Numbers for Strain Variables by Offense Categories (Sex Offenders and Violent Non-Sex Offenders)

	Sex Offenders		**Violent Non-Sex Offenders**	
Strain Measures	**Mean**	**Std. Dev.**	**Mean**	**Std. Dev.**
Negative Life Events Parents (NLEP)	2.20	1.21	1.90	1.40
Negative Life Events Drugs (NLED)	2.38	3.03	3.32	3.78
Academic Problems	9.80	2.74	9.33	2.80
Peer Hassles	5.68	2.22	6.73	2.36
Maltreatment 1 (MAL1)	3.09	.84	2.47	.74
Maltreatment 2 (MAL2)	8.44	3.07	7.18	2.90
Parental Fighting	8.02	3.00	7.03	2.90
Negative Relations With Adults	9.86	3.88	10.03	3.20
Personal Resources/Social Support	7.52*	3.10	7.97	2.67
Self-Efficacy/Mastery	22.27	6.79	24.49	6.24
Self-Esteem	31.24	3.48	31.38	3.47
Depression	23.30	5.61	22.85	5.66
Antisocial Behavior (ANT1)	7.67	2.74	6.83	2.56
Antisocial Behavior (ANT2)	2.28*	.62	2.47	.65

*$p \leq .05$

Table 15. Logistic Regression: Strain Measures and Control Variables. Sex Offenders (1) versus Violent Offenders (0). Odds ratios in parentheses ( ).

Independent Variables	**I**
Age	.010 (1.010)
Race	-.100 (.904)
Lunches	1.570* (4.805)
Negative Life Events/Parents	.110 (1.116)
Negative Life Events/Drugs	-.113 (.230)
Academic Problems	.065 (1.067)
Peer Hassles	-.432* (.649)
Maltreatment1	.877* (2.404)
Maltreatment2	.038 (1.039)
Parental Fighting	.128 (1.137)
Negative Relations with Adults	-.130 (.878)
Antisocial1	.140 (1.150)
Antisocial2	.372 (1.451)
2 Log likelihood	82.94
Nagelkerke R Square	.396

*p<.05,
**p<.01,
***p<.001

Table 16. Logistic Regression: Strain Measures, Control Variables, and Mediating Variables. Sex Offenders (1) versus Violent Offenders (0). Odds ratios in Parentheses ( ).

Independent Variables	**I**	**II**	**III**	**IV**
Age	.046	.041	.012	.009
	(.955)	(1.042)	(1.013)	(1.009)
Race	-.130	-.086	-.076	-.078
	(.878)	(.918)	(.927)	(.925)
Lunches	1.617 *	1.733 *	1.563 *	1.805 *
	(5.036)	(5.660)	(4.774)	(6.080)
Negative Life Events/Parents	.087	.129	.108	.096
	(1.091)	(1.137)	(1.114)	(1.101)
Negative Life Events/Drugs	-.105	-.102	-.142	-.119
	(.900)	(.903)	(.868)	(.888)
Academic Problems	.071	.034	.113	.092
	(1.074)	(1.035)	(1.119)	(1.097)
Peer Hassles	-.459 *	-.421 *	-.442	-.440 *
	(.632)	(.657)	(.643)	(.644)
Maltreatment 1	.872 *	.873 *	.964 *	1.021 *
	(2.393)	(2.395)	(2.623)	(2.776)
Maltreatment 2	.047	.001	.073	.042
	(1.048)	(1.001)	(1.076)	(1.043)
Parental Fighting	.135	.127	.129	.114
	(1.144)	(1.136)	(1.137)	(1.121)
Negative Relations with Adults	-.121	-.157	-.081	-.100
	(.886)	(.855)	(.922)	(.905)
Antisocial 1	.129	.137	.127	.114
	(1.138)	(1.147)	(1.135)	(1.120)
Antisocial 2	.489	.301	.432	.436
	(1.631)	(1.351)	(1.540)	(1.546)
Anger	-.266			-.202
	(.472)			(.817)
Anxiety		.398		.582
		(1.489)		(1.790)
Depression			-.073	-.094
			(.929)	(.910)
-2 Log likelihood	84.42	81.58	81.206	78.512
Nagelkerke R Square	.402	.410	.411	.438

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 17. Logistic Regression: Strain Measures, Control Variables, Mediating Variables, and Coping Mechanisms. Sex Offenders (1) versus Violent Offenders (0). Odds ratios in Parentheses ( ).

Independent Variables	**I**	**II**	**III**	**IV**
Age	.094	.188	.215	.098
	(1.098)	(1.206)	(1.240)	(1.103
Race	-.322	-.137	-.214	-.424
	(.725)	(.872)	(.807)	(.654)
Lunches	2.445**	2.165**	2.207**	2.567**
	(11.531)	(8.717)	(9.088)	(13.030)
Negative Life Events/Parents	-.036	.056	.041	-.015
	(.965)	(1.057)	(1.041)	(.985)
Negative Life Events/Drugs	-.033	-.078	-.104	-.053
	(.968)	(.925)	(.901)	(.949)
Academic Problems	.144	.079	.198	.203
	(1.155)	(1.083)	(1.219)	(1.225)
Peer Hassles	-.656**	-.522**	-.612**	-.676**
	(.519)	(.594)	(.542)	(.509)
Maltreatment 1	1.082*	.976*	1.277**	1.248**
	(2.951)	(2.654)	(3.587)	(3.485)
Maltreatment 2	.107	.055	.129	.132
	(1.113)	(1.056)	(1.137)	(1.141)
Parental Fighting	.041	.052	-.004	.008
	(1.042)	(1.053)	(.996)	(1.008)
Negative Relations with Adults	-.367*	-.328*	-.277*	-.329*
	(.693)	(.720)	(.758)	(.720)
Antisocial 1	.128	.146	.096	.062
	(1.137)	(1.158)	(1.100)	(1.064)
Antisocial 2	.983	.596	.795	.929
	(2.671)	(1.815)	(2.215)	(2.532)
Anger	-.766			-.631
	(.465)			(.532)
Anxiety		.230		.425
		(1.259)		(1.530)
Depression			-.133	-.122
			(.875)	(.885)
Social Support	-.465*	-.330*	-.395*	-.432*
	(.628)	(.719)	(.674)	(.649)
Mastery	-.054	-.044	-.078	-.079
	(.948)	(.957)	(.925)	(.924)
Self-Esteem	.216	.212	.213	.200
	(1.241)	(1.237)	(1.238)	(1.221)
-2 Log likelihood	68.069	70.490	67.601	65.177
Nagelkerke R Square	.508	.485	.511	.534

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001