

LCC: BF692-692.5  
UDC: 343.913

## ASSESSMENT OF SEXUALLY OFFENDING YOUTH IN A STATE DETENTION FACILITY

Philip A. Ikomi<sup>a\*</sup>, Camille Gibson<sup>a</sup>, Lorraine Samuels<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Prairie View A & M University

<sup>b</sup> Huston-Tillotson University (USA)

### ABSTRACT

Archived responses on the Multiphasic Sex Inventory-Adolescent Form (MSI-J) of 174 youth in a Southwestern state's juvenile sex offender residential facilities were analyzed. The juveniles whose responses indicated possible sexual offender tendencies were identified and compared to those that did not appear to have sexual offender tendencies. The responses of the juveniles to the Buss-Durkee (1957) Guilt and Hostility Inventory (Buss-Durkee), the Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI), and the Nowicki and Strickland Locus of Control Inventory (LOC) were then subjected to independent  $t$  tests. The results indicated statistically significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) between the two groups in the guilt and indirect hostility sub-scales of the Buss-Durkee, the fantasy and personal distress sub-scales of the IRI, and four items of the LOC. However, there were no significant correlations between sexual offender tendencies and race/ethnicity. Limitations of the study and implications for treatment are discussed.

**Key words:** Juvenile Sex Offenders, Pedophilia, Race, Assessment

### 1. INTRODUCTION

While much is known about adult sex offenders, the literature on juveniles who commit sexual offenses is far less voluminous and the etiology and life course of juvenile sex offending is far less lucid. Nevertheless, juvenile sex offending is a substantial occurrence such that juveniles are responsible for 40% of sexual assaults against minors who are under six years of age; 39% of victimizations for juveniles six to 11 years of age; and 27% of victimizations of older juveniles and 4% of adult sexual victimizations (Righthand & Welch, 2004; Snyder & Sickmund, 2000). In their review of the literature on young people who sexually abuse, Epps and Fisher (2004) stated that a number of studies have reported a high level of conduct disorder and delinquency in adolescent sexual offenders. Thus juvenile sex offenders also commit other offenses (van Wijk, Vermeiren, Loeber, Hart-Kerkhoffs, Doreleijers, & Bullens, 2006).

Of course, to properly treat a condition its etiology must be well understood. Thus far, the knowledge in the area includes a comprehension that about half of all adult sex offenders initiated their sex offending behavior as juveniles (Saleh & Vincent, 2004) often between the ages of six and nine years although earlier onset is possible (Araji, 1997). Retrospective studies of adult sex offenders reveal that their earliest deviant sexual acts began as juveniles with behaviors such as exhibitionism and voyeurism then progressing to sexual contact (Gerardin & Thibaut, 2004). Studies suggest however, that most juveniles with sexual behavior problems desist before adulthood (National Center on Sexual Behavior of Youth, 2003).

Utilizing data on institutionalized juveniles who committed sexual offenses in a southwestern state we explored the question of the extent to which those committed to the youth commission for juvenile sex offending may be there as a result of sexual offender tendencies or non-sexual offender tendencies and how these two subgroups might differ. The study is limited to the circumstances of male juveniles who committed sexual offenses since the majority of such offenders in the state are males.

### 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

#### *Youth with Sexual Offender Characteristics*

Children who commit sexual offences have been described as a heterogeneous group (Becker, 1990; Becker, 1998; Bourke & Donohue, 1996; Knight & Prentky, 1993; Righthand & Welch, 2001; van Wijk, Vermeiren, Loeber, Hart-Kerkhoffs, Doreleijers, & Bullens, 2006; Veneziano & Veneziano, 2002). In fact, there seems to be a lack of agreement on how to describe this group of miscreants. Moore, Franey and Geffner (2004) have suggested that there is difficulty in defining the population pointing out that some authors use the legal term "juvenile sex offender"; but they contend that this term, borrowed from the adult model, labels them based on their crime. Some researchers on the other hand, target the behavior by labeling the offenders "adolescents with sexually abusive behaviors." Still, according to Moore et al., there are those researchers who prefer to call them "sexually reactive youth" which is an acknowledgement of the youth's

\* Corresponding Author. E-mail: [paikomi@pvamu.edu](mailto:paikomi@pvamu.edu)

abuse history rather than their offensive behavior. Besides, they argued, this appellation does not take into consideration the youth that have no abuse history but are abusive. Finally they adopted the most recent suggestion that these are "youth who sexually abuse" because according to them, it has "fewer negative connotations while still dealing with the main issues" (p.3). In view of the foregoing arguments, this paper will refer to the group as "youth who sexually abuse."

From the labels in the previous paragraph it is obvious that these individuals have certain distinctive characteristics. These characteristics include, but are not limited to, their sexually abusive behaviors, which range from non contact offenses to sexual contact offenses, including rape, and pedophilic offenses (Righthand & Welch, 2001), child maltreatment histories, that is, their history of being sexually, physically, and emotionally abused in childhood (Becker, 1998; Hunter, 2000; Johnson, 1989), family instability, disorganization and violence, separation from family (Kahn & Chambers as cited in Righthand & Welch, 2001; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Smith & Israel as cited in Righthand & Welch, 2001; Veneziano & Veneziano, 2002), deficits in social competence (Becker, 1990; Knight & Prentky, 1993), inadequate social skills, poor peer relationships, and social isolation (Ferenbach et al., as cited in Veneziano & Veneziano, 2002; Katz, as cited in Veneziano & Veneziano, 2002; Miner & Crimmins, as cited in Veneziano & Veneziano, 2002). Other characteristics include prior consenting sexual experiences exceeding those of non-sexually offending youth, prior experience of sexual dysfunction such as sexual impotence or premature ejaculation (Righthand & Welch, 2001). Additional characteristics include exposure to sexually explicit material such as pornographic magazines (Ford & Linney, 1995; Wieckowski, Hartsoe, Mayer, & Shortz, 1998), deviant sexual arousal (Kahn & Chambers, 1991; Schram, Milloy, & Rowe, 1991; Wieckowski et al), academic difficulties, neurological impairment, cognitive distortions, such as blaming the victim (Kahn & Chambers, 1991), impulse control problems (Veneziano & Veneziano, 2002), conduct disorder and antisocial traits (Kavoussi, Kaplan, & Becker, 1988) higher rates of depression than the general juvenile population (Becker, Kaplan, & Tenke, 1992). These youths have also been described as having less empathy for others and more difficulty in identifying emotions in others (Knight & Prentky, 1993)

### ***Youth without Sexual Offender Characteristics***

Juveniles without sexual offender characteristics may sexually offend for a wide variety of reasons ranging from fairly innocent sexual exploration to more deeply internalized rationales. In some cases the offense might be the result of a culturally or subculturally prescribed socialization different from that of mainstream United States' culture. For example, in many Latin American cultures marriage by age 16 years is often associated with economic benefits and is quite common (Russell & Lee, 2004). Indeed, Russell and Lee further suggest that the older the man involved, the more desirable the union, as older men are commonly believed to represent stability. Perhaps because of this apparently liberal attitude towards sex, 44% - 66% of Latin American men have had sex by age 16 years (McClanahan, McLaughlin & Sharp, 2005). This cultural and subcultural consideration might be very significant for juvenile detention facilities in places with large immigrant populations, such as parts of the southwestern United States.

On the other hand, minority youth who did not commit sexual offense may find themselves in trouble with the juvenile justice system for sexual offenses they did not commit. This could result simply from the overrepresentation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system (Hsia, et al., 2004; Hsia & Hamparian, 1998; Ikomi, Ross, Troy, & Rodney, in press; Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, 2005). Aside from the label ascribed to them as youth who have committed sexual offense by the juvenile justice system, there is no distinguishing characteristic that could differentiate such youth from the general population of normal youth. Thus in this paper, they are described as youth without sexual offender characteristics.

### ***The Present Study***

The residential facilities of the youth commission contain several juveniles who have been committed for a variety of sexual offenses. Our conjecture is that some of these resident offenders might have been brought there as a result of sexual offenses that the juvenile offenders and perhaps even their parents or guardians might not have considered sexual offenses given some socialization that is at odds with that of mainstream society. That is, some of these offenders are members of the group of youths without sexual offense characteristics as described above, but have found themselves being brought into the youth commission facilities for sexual offenses that they and their parents do not feel are sexual offenses in the first place.

The data from the youth commission included the self-report measures using the Buss-Durkee Hostility inventory (Buss & Durkee, 1957). This inventory contains eight subscales measuring different aspects of hostility including assault, indirect hostility, irritability, negativism, resentment, suspicion, verbal hostility, and guilt. The scale items are pertinent to some of the characteristics usually associated with people diagnosed with sexual offender characteristics. For instance, one item on the assault scale is "Once in a while, I cannot control my urge to harm others." This item is reminiscent of the characteristic of sexual offenders which describes them as having an irresistible tendency to engage in sexual activity with a prepubescent child. An item on the verbal hostility scale states "I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me." This item is suggestive of a lack of self-control that is characteristic of sexual offenders who engage in sexual activity with minors. Thus as a result of the presence of such items in the Buss-Durkee Hostility and Guilt inventory, we hypothesized that youth with sexual offender characteristics and those without such characteristics could be differentiated on the basis of their responses to the inventory. The following hypothesis was accordingly proposed:

**Hypothesis 1.** Juveniles in the youth commission who have sexual offender characteristics compared to those who do not will have significantly different responses to items of the Buss-Durkee Hostility and Guilt inventory such that those with sexual offender characteristics will feel more unable to control their sexual and other urges than those without sexual offender characteristics.

The youth commission data also contained the juveniles' responses to the Davis (1983) Interpersonal Reactivity Index. This index measures individual differences in empathy. One subscale that may be quite useful in differentiating juveniles with sex offender characteristics from those without such characteristics is the fantasy subscale. This subscale measures the "tendency to become deeply involved in the fictitious world of books, movies, and plays" (Davis, 1983, p. 115). Youth with sexual offender characteristics who are normally characterized by intense sexually arousing fantasies would be expected to score higher than juveniles without those traits. Another subscale on which youth with sexual offender characteristics and those without sexual offender characteristics may be expected to differ is the personal distress subscale. The personal distress subscale measures the extent of a person's distress, anxiety, or feeling of unease in an intense interpersonal situation. Youth with sexual offender characteristics by definition are people who are already suffering from clinical levels of anxiety and distress and so should score higher on this measure than youth without sexual offender characteristics. Thus we proposed the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 2.** Youth in the youth commission who have sexual offender characteristics compared to those who do not will have significantly different responses to items of the IRI such that those with sexual offender characteristics will be more deeply involved in the fictitious world of books, movies and plays and be subjected to more intense sexually arousing fantasies than those without sex offender characteristics.

The youth commission data also contained sex offender responses to items of the Nowicki and Strickland Locus of Control Scale for children (1973). This scale measures the extent to which children feel that events are contingent on their behavior and the extent they feel events are controlled externally. We feel that children with sexual offender characteristics will exhibit a greater tendency to feel that events are controlled externally since they are consumed by fantasies of sexual activity that they seem powerless to control. As a consequence, we proposed the following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 3.** Juvenile sex offenders in the youth commission who have sexual offender characteristics compared to those who do not will have significantly different responses to items of the Locus of Control Inventory such that those with sexual offender characteristics will tend to have an external locus of control while those without sexual offender characteristics will tend to have an internal locus of control.

The data also contained information on the race/ethnicity of the juveniles from which the ratio of those with sexual offender characteristics to those without sexual offender characteristics could be determined. Based on research on disproportionate minority contact, we believed that there would be more minority juveniles than non-minority juveniles in the data set (DeComo (as cited in Hsia & Hamparian (1998)); Hsia et al., 2004; Hsia & Hamparian 1998). However, although there are more minority individuals in the data set, we expected that there would be fewer of them with sexual offender characteristics because possibly, most of them were being held for sexual offenses that they did not consider sexual offenses in their culture. On the other hand, more White juveniles would be found to have sexual offender characteristics in the data set. We therefore proposed the following hypothesis based on the dichotomy of sexual offender characteristics and non-sexual offender characteristics of the youth in the data set.

**Hypothesis 4.** There is a correlation between race/ethnicity and whether or not a youth has or does not have sexual offender characteristics.

### 3. METHOD

#### *Participants*

Although the data used in this study was archival, we obtained prior approval from the Institutional Human Participants Research Review Board at our institution before commencing the study. This was made known to the authorities at the state juvenile detention center. The data we obtained had no names or other personal identifications on them. Of a total of 856 adjudicated juvenile sexual offenders in the state-run youth residential facilities 174 had fairly complete data files. These files included responses on the Multiphasic Sex Inventory, Adolescent form (MSI-J), and other instruments of interest analyzed for this study. The mean age of the youth was 18.38 years (range = 15 – 20, SD = 1.42 ). One hundred and forty-eight of the youth had the classifying offense of aggravated sexual assault, thirteen had sexual assault, and thirteen had indecency with a child. All of the subjects were male.

#### *Instruments*

Within two weeks of admission to the state-run residential facilities, the staff administers the Multiphasic Sex Inventory Adolescent form (MSI-J), the MMPI-A, the Buss-Durkee Guilt and Hostility Inventory, the Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index, and the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale to the youth. Based on their MSI-J scores, the youth were divided into those with sexual offender characteristics and those without. This instrument has 300 items to measure sexual activity, thoughts and problems. The specific items of the MSI-J used, based on relevance to sexual offender characteristics judged by a team of three including the first two authors and a clinical psychologist, are included in the following categorization. Using the DSMIV-TR criteria of pedophilia and other sexual offender characteristics, relevant MSI-J items were divided into six categories: MSI-J items 23, 83 and 138 were classified as "actions", 120, 167, 263, 285, 288, classified as "touching", 60, 62, 66, and 72 classified as "turn on", 203, classified as "caught", 22, 41, 91, 94, 110, 155, 185, 193, 251, 255, 279, 286, 300 classified as "intrusive thoughts", and 132, 188, 207, 230, 265, 266, 283, and 292 classified as "excuses". According to Nichols and Molinder Assessment, Incorporated (2005) the MSI-J can be used for a sex deviance evaluation and to measure the progress of treatment. (These may well be the reasons it was used by the state-run facilities). Thus this should be considered an adapted use of the instrument. The test-retest reliability of the instrument was reported to be .89 but time period between tests was not given (Nichols & Molinder Assessment, Inc., 2005). For the items we used, exclusive of the "excuses" items, the percent agreements were: 42%

between the first two authors, 27% between the clinical psychologist and the first author and 23% between the clinical psychologist and the second author. Both first and second authors are not clinicians.

Data on the duration of possible sexual offender characteristic symptoms of the youth were unavailable, but it is likely safe to assume that given the length of juvenile justice processing (usually months), conditions described in the responses existed for at least six months as required by the DSM-IV-TR. Youth were identified as having sexual offender characteristics if they checked two items from at least two different groups of criteria (whether - actions, touching, turn on, caught, or intrusive thoughts) of sexual activity with minors. The "excuses" group was not utilized because those MSI-J items were less indicative of the DSM-IV-TR criteria. Next, to ascertain any cultural or subcultural socialization to offend, race/ethnicity items throughout the entire dataset were examined.

The responses of the youth to the Buss-Durkee inventory were analyzed. The Buss-Durkee Guilt and Hostility instrument (Buss & Durkee, 1957) has 40 items requiring a response of "true" or "false." Its eight subscales measure seven manifestations of hostility: A tendency to use violence or assault; indirect hostility (for example, malicious gossip); irritability, such as being quick-tempered in response to minor provocations; negativism, such as oppositional behavior usually to an authority figure; resentment, such as jealousy, hate and anger in response to imagined maltreatment; suspicion, involving hostility towards others and a belief that others are plotting to harm the individual; verbal hostility and, guilt. Baggio, Supplee, and Curtis (1981) obtained the following test-retest reliabilities for the subscales: assault, .78, indirect hostility, .68, irritability, .64, negativism, .64, resentment, .66, suspicion, .68, verbal hostility, .77, and guilt, .72. The overall reliability they got for their study which used 60 students was .82.

We also examined scores from Davis' (1980) Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI). This index has 28 items to assess empathy. The index's four subscales indicate:

1) "perspective taking" (PT), the ability to appreciate the views of others. PT involves anticipating how others will react in various situations. It is an important aspect of non-ego-centric behavior which is important for appropriate social functioning and is often correlated with self-esteem (Davis, 1983). PT scores usually increase with age.

2) "Empathic concern" (EC) which measures sensitivity to others or an ability to have concern for the negative experiences of others.

3) "Fantasy" (FS) which assesses an ability to identify with non-real characters such as those in novels or visual media are related to emotionality and physiological arousal, but not necessarily to empathy (Davis, 1983); and,

4) "Personal distress" (PD) a measure of the individual's own anxiety and discomfort in difficult interpersonal situations. High PD scores have a strong negative relationship with poor social functioning and with low self-esteem (Davis, 1983). These four subscales have reported test-retest reliabilities ranging from .62 to .71 and internal consistency reliabilities (coefficient alpha) in the range .71 to .77 (Davis, cited in Davis 1983.)

Also analyzed were scores from the Nowicki and Strickland's Locus of Control Scale (1973). The scale consists of 40 items requiring a "yes" or "no" response. The instrument has been normalized for males and females of various ages.

## Procedure

*The study was approved by the state's youth commission and by a university Institutional Review Board. Youth with sexual offender characteristics were identified with the MSI-J items outlined above. The rest of the respondents in the dataset were identified as not having sexual offender characteristics by default. Furthermore, the youth with sexual offender characteristics and those without such characteristics were then compared using independent  $t$  tests to see if there were significant differences between their responses on the instruments described above. In addition, a bivariate correlational analysis was carried out to determine if there was a relationship between race/ethnicity and whether or not the youth had or did not have sexual offender characteristics.*

## 4. RESULTS

### **Comparisons of the youth with sexual offender characteristics with youth without sexual offender characteristics**

An ANOVA comparing the two groups on their responses to the MSIJ items used to differentiate the groups revealed that the two groups were significantly different in 20 of the 26 items used (see Appendix 1). A total of 174 cases were analyzed. Of these, 151 youth (86.78%) had sexual offender characteristics while 23 (13.22 %) were without sexual offender characteristics.

With regard to the first three hypotheses,  $t$ -tests were carried out using the Buss-Durkee Hostility and Guilt Inventory, the Nowicki and Strickland Locus of Control Inventory, and the Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index. These analyses compared subscale responses on both the Buss-Durkee and the IRI, and responses to individual items on the LOC for the youth with sexual offender characteristics and the youth without sexual offender characteristics. The two groups were statistically significantly different in two subtests of the Buss-Durkee, the guilt ( $t(166) = 2.28, p = .024$ , Cohen's  $d = .51$ ) and indirect hostility ( $t(172) = 2.53, p = .012$ , Cohen's  $d = .55$ ) subtests. There were four subtests on the IRI, perspective taking, fantasy, emphatic concern, and personal distress. The tests indicated significant differences in two subtests of the IRI, fantasy ( $t(172) = 3.00, p = .003$ , Cohen's  $d = .67$ ) and personal distress ( $t(172) = 2.66, p = .008$ , Cohen's  $d = .63$ ). Of the 40 items of the LOC, in only four were the groups significantly different. The four items were: # 12. "Most of the time do you find it hard to change a friend's (mind) opinion?" ( $t(166) = 2.14, p = .03$ , Cohen's  $d = .53$ ). #21. "If you find a four-leaf clover do you believe it might bring you good luck?" ( $t(166) = 2.40, p = .022$ , Cohen's  $d = .006$ ), #31. "Most of the time do you find it useless to try to get your own way at home?" ( $t(166) = 2.43, p = .02$ , Cohen's  $d = .54$ ) and #39. "Most of the time do you feel you have little say about what your family decides to do?" ( $t(166) = 2.86, p = .007$ , Cohen's  $d = .58$ ).

The fourth hypothesis, a correlational analysis, indicated no significant correlation between race/ethnicity and whether or not the youth had sexual offender characteristics. A look at the data set suggests a skewed race and ethnicity distribution with the number of Whites exceeding those of Blacks or Hispanics among the youth with sexual offender characteristics. In this group, Whites made up 60.93% compared to only 8.70% in the group without sexual offender characteristics. Blacks were 17.88% among the group with sexual offender characteristics while they were as many as 39.13% among the group without sexual offender characteristics. Hispanics were only 21.19% among the sexual offender characteristics group compared to 52.17% among the group without sexual offender characteristics.

### Appendix 1.

#### *ANOVA for items of the MSI-J used in decisions on Youth having or not having Sexual Offender Characteristics*

Source	df	F	p
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Actions 23	1	11.103**	.001
Within Groups			
Error	151	(.24)	
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Actions 83	1	4.166*	.04
Within Groups			
Error	176	(.12)	
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Actions 138	1	30.32**	.00
Within Groups			
Error	175	(.22)	
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Touching 120	1	7.40**	.01
Within Groups			
Error	172	(.16)	
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Touching 167	1	10.29**	.002
Within Groups			
Error	171	(.21)	
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Touching 263	1	5.78*	.02
Within Groups			
Error	125	(.22)	
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Touching 285	1	9.08**	.003
Within Groups			
Error	125	(.23)	
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Touching 288	1	17.04**	.000
Within Groups			
Error	125	(.22)	
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Turn on 60	1	8.56**	.004
Within Groups			
Error	121	(.20)	
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Turn on 62	1	30.36**	.000
Within Groups			
Error	177	(.22)	
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Turn on 66	1	21.48**	.000
Within Groups			
Error	175	(.22)	
<b>Between Groups</b>			
Turn on 72	1	8.26**	.01
Within Groups			
Error	177	(.17)	

Caught 203	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	6.92**	.01
Within Groups				
Error	177		(.15)	
Intrusive 22	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	1.23	.27
Within Groups				
Error	176		(.25)	
Intrusive 41	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	12.64**	.000
Within Groups				
Error	175		(.22)	
Intrusive 91	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	14.99**	.000
Within Groups				
Error	177		(.21)	
Intrusive 94	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	.99	.32
Within Groups				
Error	175		(.19)	
Intrusive 110	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	4.93*	.03
Within Groups				
Error	173		(.24)	
Intrusive 155	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	4.22*	.04
Within Groups				
Error	175		(.22)	
Intrusive 185	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	2.65	.11
Within Groups				
Error	173		(.25)	
Intrusive 193	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	4.22*	.04
Within Groups				
Error	177		(.23)	
Intrusive 251	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	.38	.54
Within Groups				
Error	120		(.11)	
Intrusive 255	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	1.39	.24
Within Groups				
Error	124		(.23)	
Intrusive 279	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	4.81*	.03
Within Groups				
Error	124		(.17)	
Intrusive 286	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	2.42	.12
Within Groups				
Error	125		(.21)	
Intrusive 300	1	<b>Between Groups</b>	5.73*	.02
Within Groups				
Error	125		(.24)	

Note. Values in parenthesis are mean square errors.

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$

**Appendix 2.**

Means and standard deviations of MSIJ items used in decisions on Youth having or not having Sexual Offender Characteristics

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Action 23	.52	.501	154
Molested > 5 Action 83	.13	.342	179
Molested >1 Action 138	.50	.501	178
Touching 120	.22	.413	175
Touching 67	.33	.471	174
Touching 263	.34	.474	128
Touching 285	.41	.494	128
Touching 288	.48	.501	128
Turn on 60	.69	.464	123
Turn on 62	.49	.501	180
Turn on 66	.46	.500	178
Turn on 72	.22	.417	180
Caught 203	.20	.401	180
Intrusive 22	.44	.498	179
Intrusive 41	.37	.483	178
Intrusive 91	.33	.473	180
Intrusive 94	.25	.436	178
Intrusive 110	.53	.500	176
Intrusive 155	.33	.470	178
Intrusive 185	.48	.501	176
Intrusive 193	.36	.480	180
Intrusive 251	.12	.329	123
Intrusive 255	.35	.480	127

  

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Intrusive 279	.23	.421	127
Intrusive 286	.31	.465	128
Intrusive 300	.55	.499	128

**5. DISCUSSION**

Taken together, the findings of the study were consistent with the hypotheses proposed. The first three null hypotheses of a lack of statistically significant differences between the juvenile sexual offenders with pedophilia and those without on items of the Buss-Durkee, the IRI, and LOC, were partially rejected. It is significant that the groups were not statistically different in their total scores on the three instruments, the Buss-Durkee, the IRI, and the LOC used to assess treatment effectiveness in the state-run residential facilities. However, they were different in the Indirect Hostility and Guilt subtests of the Buss-Durkee and the fantasy and personal distress subtests of the IRI. They were also statistically different in four of the items of the 40-item LOC inventory. An examination of the subtests could explain some of the reasons such differences might be expected to exist between the two groups. It is possible that items on these subtests are more useful in the symptomology of individuals with sexual offender characteristics than the other items on which the groups were not significantly different. For instance, Davis (1983) found that personal distress was strongly associated with lower self-esteem, and poor interpersonal functioning, especially shyness and social anxiety. The finding of a significant difference between the sexual offender characteristics group and the group without sex offender characteristics on the Personal Distress Scale in this study is consistent with Eastman's (2004) finding of a difference between her Posttreatment sexual offender subjects and her Pretreatment and Postrelease subjects on the Personal Distress Scale. Eastman found that the Posttreatment subjects had better ability to share the negative feelings of another than either the Pretreatment or the Post-release subjects on the Personal Distress Scale of the IRI. Also, other findings indicate that sexual offenders often lack social skills (Gerardin & Thibaut, 2004; Righthand & Welch, 2001). Fantasy, the other significant subtest of the IRI, is a measure of the depth of involvement in the fictitious world of books, movies and plays. One of the items for instance is "I daydream and fantasize, with some regularity, about things that might happen to me." When this item is viewed with the backdrop that some sexual offenders usually fantasize about sexual activities immediately prior to engaging in such activities, it is not hard to see why this subscale would differentiate between youth with sexual offender characteristics and youth without sexual offender characteristics.

There does not seem to be any link between the characteristics of pedophilia as described in the *DSM-IV-TR* and the subscales Guilt and Indirect Hostility of the Buss-Durkee Hostility and Guilt inventory. However, Lanning (1992) writing on the subheading of multidimensional motivation, opined that pedophiles and other sexual offenders are motivated by anger, rage, hostility, and resentment to act against victims that they consider weak and vulnerable. Thus it can be seen how items on the indirect hostility subscale and the guilt subscale expressing remorse and guilt for various actions taken including concern for forgiveness of sins committed could indicate differences between youth with sexual offender characteristics and youth without sexual offender characteristics. In addition, one of the medications used to treat pedophilia is, selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI). This inhibitor works by lengthening the presence of se-

rotonin in the nerve endings in order to extend its effect. There is evidence suggesting that people with low levels of serotonin turnover have been convicted of arson and other violent crimes (Virkkunen, Nuutila, Goodwin, & Linnoila's 1987 study as cited in Kalat, 2001). It is therefore possible that youth with sexual offender characteristics have anger or hostility problems. The study thus indicates the feasibility of using the four items from both the Buss-Durkee, and the IRI to identify youth with sexual offender characteristics. If confirmed in other studies, the use of these items could reduce the time and money for diagnosis.

### Appendix 3.

Correlation matrix of MSIJ items used in decisions  
on Youth having or not having Sexual Offender Characteristics.

Action23 (1)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
Action 23(1)	1	.20*	.25**	-.08	.02	-.02	.15	.16	.21*	.28**	.27**	.27**	.09	.05	.12	.15	.36**	.12
Action 83(2)		1	.36**	.02	.18*	.04	.07	.15	.14	.24**	.23**	.14	.17*	-.05	.04	.35**	.07	.18
Action 138(3)			1	.04	.25**	.16	.26**	.26**	.11	.31**	.39**	.21**	.28**	.05	.07	.27**	.29**	.06
Touching 67(4)				1	-.02	.12	.07	-.11	.08	.05	-.03	.02	.11	-.09	-.00	-.01	.06	-.09
Touching 120(5)					1	.19*	.17	.18	.29**	.20**	.29**	.28**	.12	.03	.14	.31**	.16*	.14
Touching 263(6)						1	.51**	.28**	.02	.12	.09	.15	.10	.06	.06	.10	.05	.09
Touching 285(7)							1	.34**	.15	.14	.16	.06	.10	-.06	.05	.07	.11	.03
Touching 288(8)								1	.09	.23**	.19*	.17*	.12	-.09	.00	.23**	.25**	.02
Turn on 60(9)									1	.34**	.33**	.32**	.03	.03	.05	.19*	.31**	.05
Turn on 62(10)										1	.70**	.49**	.07	.20**	.03	.49**	.70**	.19*
Turn on 66(11)											1	.48**	.08	.19*	.09	.52**	.61**	.23**
Turn on 72(12)												1	-.03	.13	.12	.40**	.53**	.28**
Caught203(13)													1	-.02	.00	-.00	.08	.00
Intrusive193(14)														1	.53**	.09	.04	.66**
Intrusive22(15)															1	.05	.11	.59**
Intrusive41(16)																1	.37**	.17*
Intrusive 91(17)																	1	.19*
Intrusive94(18)																		1
Intrusive110(19)																		
Intrusive155(20)																		
Intrusive185(21)																		
Intrusive251(22)																		
Intrusive255(23)																		
Intrusive279(24)																		
Intrusive286(25)																		
Intrusive300(26)																		

	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	
Action 23(1)		.31**	.12	.17*	.03	-.01	.11	.05	.24*
Action 83(2)			.07	.18	.08	-.14	.03	.05	.27**
Action 138(3)			.12	.20**	.08	-.03	.04	.20	.25**
Touching 120(4)				.02	.15	.04	.15	.07	.12
Touching 67(5)					.09	.25**	.02	-.04	.11
Touching 263(6)						.13	.07	-.11	.16
Touching 285(7)							.08	-.07	-.01
Touching 288(8)								.02	.01
Turn on 60(9)									-.03
Turn on 62(10)									.01
Turn on 66(11)									.20*
Turn on 72(12)									.13
Caught 203(13)									.36**
Intrusive 193(14)									.29**
Intrusive 22(15)									.14
Intrusive 41(16)									.47**
Intrusive 91(17)									.20*
Intrusive 94(18)									-.03
Intrusive 110(19)									.18*
Intrusive 155(20)									.03
Intrusive 185(21)									-.02
Intrusive 251(22)									.19*
Intrusive 255(23)									.21*
Intrusive 279(24)									.31**
Intrusive 286(25)									.23**
									.11
									.05
									-.08
									.08
									-.02
									.06
									-.04
									.07
									-.03
									.01
									-.03
									.05
									.16
									-.07
									.25*
									.16*
									.27**
									.12
									.03
									.01
									.20*
									.13
									.36**
									.29**
									.14
									.47**
									.20*
									-.03
									.18*
									.21*
									.26**
									.24**
									.19*
									.24**
									.19*
									.27**
									.08
									-.11
									.13
									.14
									.06

\* p < .05 (2-tailed).

\*\* p < .01 (2-tailed)

An examination of the three items of the LOC on which significant differences were found in this study indicates that the items deal with situations where the youthful offender perceives a lack of control on his part when dealing with

either family matters at home or with friends. This result suggests that youth with sexual offender characteristics may not only see themselves as being unable to control aspects of their sexual behavior, but may also see themselves as having no control over matters arising at home with their family or with their friends. The LOC item on which the difference between the groups nearly reached significance was the belief in luck. That this item nearly reached significance suggests that the youth with sexual offender characteristics could, as a group, have external loci of control.

These findings reveal that the majority of the youth were indeed committed for being sexual deviants or possessing sexual offender characteristics. It was not clear why there was no correlation between race/ethnicity and whether or not youth had sexual offender characteristics. A look at the percentages of juvenile sexual offenders of the different races that had sexual offender characteristics indicates a definite skew with most of those with sexual offender characteristics being Whites and those without sexual offender characteristics being Black or Hispanic. That the youth without sexual offender characteristics were relatively few compared to those with sexual offender characteristics suggests that youth brought in to the state-run facilities for sexual offenses are more likely to be sexual offenders than non-sexual offenders. This finding is important as we had a hunch that youth who did not have sexual offender characteristics might have been brought to the youth commission for offenses deemed sexual when indeed, the youths themselves and their parents might not have considered the acts involved to be sexual offenses in their native ethnic group/race, culture, or subculture. As the number of youth without sexual offender characteristics is so small, we assume that the number of youths brought in for non-sexual offenses is miniscule. Further investigation is therefore required for a definitive conclusion on the youth without sexual offender characteristics to emerge.

Overall, the results of this study are encouraging because there are significant findings even with the very low number of youths without sexual offender characteristics. A more robust result could therefore be expected with a larger sample of youths. The statistically significant differences in 20 out of 26 items in the ANOVA of the MSI-J items used to identify youth with sexual offender characteristics suggest at least, that the present researchers' procedures for identifying juveniles with sexual offender characteristics have some validity. This should be confirmed in another study. The low level of agreements in picking the items of the MSI-J between the first author and the clinical psychologist as well as between the second author and the clinical psychologist however, constitute major sources of concern in this study.

As a mere start however, an obvious limitation of this study is that the results will not be widely generalizable given limitations due to non-random sample selection and the need to interpret the results cautiously stemming from the novel use of the MSI-J. Additionally, sexual offender self-reports are problematic in that offenders often minimize their behavior and thoughts out of fear and shame (Witt, Bosley & Hiscox, 2002). Future study in this area involving detailed interviews of the juvenile sexual offenders and family members would help to reveal more details on cultural and subcultural influences on juvenile sex offenders. Still in the formative years of life, many juveniles who have sexually offended in chaotic and highly sexualized homes will abandon any inappropriate sexual behavior if placed in a cohesive environment with clear boundaries (Cavanagh-Johnson, 2000; Cavanagh-Johnson, 1989). First of course, these amenable juveniles must be identified and properly treated. To this end, this study was a preliminary effort to describe juvenile sex offenders in terms of having sexual offender characteristics or not.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors hereby acknowledge and wish to thank Dr. Charles Jeffords and his staff at the Youth Commission for the provision of the data that were analyzed for this study. We would also like to thank Dr. Shawanda Anderson, the Clinical Psychologist for her assistance.

#### REFERENCES

1. **Araji, S.** (1997). *Sexually aggressive children: Coming to understand them*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
2. **Baggio, M. K., Supplee, K., & Curtis, N.** (1981). Reliability and validity of four anger scales. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 45(6), 639-648.
3. **Becker, J. V.** (1990). Treating adolescent sexual offenders. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 21(5), 362-365.
4. **Becker, J. V.** (1998). What we know about the characteristics and treatment of adolescents who have committed sexual offenses. *Child Maltreatment*, 3, 317-329.
5. **Becker, J. V., Kaplan, M. S., & Tenke, C. E.** (1992). The relationship of abuse history, denial and erectile profile of adolescent sexual perpetrators. *Behavior Therapy*, 23(1), 87-97.
6. **Bourke, M. L. & Donohoe, B.** (1996). Assessment and treatment of juvenile sex offenders: An Empirical review. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 5(1), 47-70.
7. **Buss, A. H. & Durkee, A.** (1957). An inventory for assessing different kinds of hostility. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 4, 343-349.
8. **Cavanagh-Johnson, T.** (1989). Female child perpetrators: Children who molest other children. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 13, 571-585.
9. **Cavanagh-Johnson, T.** (2000). Sexualized children and children who molest. SIECUS Report, 29, 35-39. Center for Sex Offender Management (1999). *Understanding Juvenile Sex Behavior: Research, Treatment Approaches and Management Practices*. Retrieved September 23, 2005 from <http://www.csom.org/pubs/juvbrf10.html>
10. **Davis, M. H.** (1980). A Multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85.
11. **Davis, M. H.** (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 113-126.

12. **Epps, K. & Fisher, D.** (2004). A review of the research literature on young people who sexually Abuse. In G. O'Reilly, W. L. Marshall, A. Carr, & R. C. Beckett (Eds.), *The Handbook of Clinical Intervention with young people who sexually abuse (62-102)*. New York: Psychology Press.
13. **Fahrenbach, P. A., Smith, W., Monastersky, C., & Deisher, R. W.** (1986). Adolescent sexual Offenders: Offender and offense characteristics. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 56, 225-233.
14. **Ford, M. E. & Linney, J. A.** (1995). Comparative analysis of juvenile sexual offenders, violent nonsexual offenders, and status offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10(1), 56-70.
15. **Gerardin, P. & Thibaut, F.** (2004). Epidemiology and treatment of juvenile sexual offending. *Pediatric Drugs*, 6, 79-91.
16. **Hsia, H. M.** (1998). Disproportionate minority confinement: A 1997 Update. Retrieved February 14, 2006, from <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/jjbulletin/9809/intro.html>
17. **Hunter, J. A.** (2000). *Understanding juvenile sex offenders: Research findings and guidelines for effective management and treatment*. Juvenile Forensic Evaluation Resource Center. Retrieved February 19, 2004 from, [http://www.ilppp.virginia.edu/Juvenile\\_Forensic\\_Fact\\_Sheets/UndJuvSexOff.htm](http://www.ilppp.virginia.edu/Juvenile_Forensic_Fact_Sheets/UndJuvSexOff.htm)
18. **Hsia, H. M., Bridges, G. S., & McHale, R.** (2004). Disproportionate minority Confinement: A 2002 update. U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Washington, D.C: OJJDP. Retrieved October 12, 2007 from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/201240.pdf>
19. **Hsia, H. M.** (1998). Disproportionate minority confinement: A 1997 Update. Retrieved February 14, 2006 from <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/jjbulletin/9809/intro.html>
20. **Ikomi, P. A., Ross, A., Troy, L., & Rodney, H. E.** (in press). Male juveniles with sexual Behavior problems: Are there differences in racial groups. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*.
21. **Johnson, T. C.** (1988). Child perpetrators- Children who molest other children: Preliminary findings. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 12, 219-229.
22. **Kahn, T. J. & Chambers, H. J.** (1991). Assessing reoffense risk with juvenile sexual offenders. *Child Welfare*, 70 (3), 333-345.
23. **Kalat, J. W.** (2001). *Biological Psychology* (7<sup>th</sup>ed.). Stamford, CT: Wadsworth.
24. **Langstrom, N. & Grann, M.** (2000). Risk for criminal recidivism among young sex offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15, 855-871.
25. **Kavoussi, R. J., Kaplan, M., & Becker, J. V.** (1988). Psychiatric diagnoses in adolescent sex offender. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 27, 241-243.
26. **Knight, R. A. & Prentky, R.** (1993). Exploring characteristics for classifying juvenile sex offenders. In Howard E. Barbaree, William L. Marshall, and Stephen M. Hudson (Eds.). *The Juvenile Sex Offender*. New York: The Guilford Press.
27. **Lanning, K. V.** (1992, Jan.). Investigator's guide to allegations of "ritual" child abuse Behavioral Science Unit, National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crimes. FBI Academy, Quantico, VA. Retrieved February 5, 2007, from <http://www.balanone.info/lanning.9201.html#dynamics>
28. **McClanahan, K., McLaughlin, R. & Sharp, R.** (2005, July). What is normal sexuality for adolescent males? Paper presented at the meeting of the Sex Offender Treatment Council, Austin, TX.
29. **Moore, T., Franey, K. C., & Geffner, R.** (2004). Introduction: Assessment and treatment of Youth who sexually offend: An Overview. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 13(3/4), 1-13.
30. **National Center on Sexual Behavior of Youth** (2003, July). What research shows about adolescent sex offenders. Retrieved March 9, 2007, from <http://www.ncsby.org/pages/publications.htm>
31. **Nichols & Molinder Assessments, Inc.** (2005). Original MSI-J Adolescent male form. Retrieved August 18, 2005 from, [http://www.nicholsandmolinder.com/msi\\_jm.html](http://www.nicholsandmolinder.com/msi_jm.html)
32. **Nowicki, S. & Strickland, B. R.** (1973). A locus of control scale for children. *Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology*, 40, 148-154.
33. **Righthand, S. & Welch, C.** (2001). *Juveniles who have sexually offended: A review of the Professional literature*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
34. **Righthand, S. & Welch, C.** (2004). Characteristics of youth who sexually offend. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 13, 15-32.
35. **Russell, S.T. & Lee, F.C.H.** (2004). Practitioners' perspectives on effective practices for Hispanic teenage pregnancy prevention. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 36, 142-150.
36. **Saleh, F. M. & Vincent, G. M.** (2004). Juveniles who commit sex crimes. *Adolescent Psychiatry: The Annals of the American Society of Adolescent Psychiatry*, 28, 183-208.
37. **Schram, D. D., Milloy, C. D., & Rowe, W. E.** (1991). Juvenile sex offenders: A follow-up study of reoffense behavior. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Urban Policy Research and Cambie Group International.
38. **Snyder, H. & Sickmund.** (2000). *Juvenile sex offenders and victims: 1999 National Report*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
39. **Texas Juvenile Probation Commission.** (2005). The state of juvenile probation activity In Texas: Statistical and other data on the juvenile justice system in Texas For calendar year 2003. (Report Number RPT-STAT-2003). Austin, TX: Author. Available from [www.tjpc.state.tx.us](http://www.tjpc.state.tx.us)
40. **Van Wijk, A., Vermeiren, R., Loeber, R., Hart-Kerkhoffs, L., Doreleijers, T., & Bullens, R.** (2006). Juvenile sex offenders compared to non-sex offenders: A review of the literature 1995-2005. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 7, 227-243.
41. **Veneziano, C. & Veneziano, L.** (2002). Adolescent sex offenders: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 3(4), 247-260.
42. **Wieckowski, E. Hartsoe, P., Mayer, A., & Shortz, J.** (1998). Deviant sexual behavior in children and young adolescents: Frequency and patterns. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 10(4), 293-304.
43. **Witt, P. H., Bosley, J. T., & Hiscox, S. P.** (2002). Evaluation of juvenile sex offenders. *Journal of Psychiatry and Law*, 30, 569-592.