

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1991

Comparing the Perceptions of Family and Parenting Between Juvenile Sexual Offenders and Juveniles With No History of Sexual Offending

Iva W. Trottier
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Trottier, Iva W., "Comparing the Perceptions of Family and Parenting Between Juvenile Sexual Offenders and Juveniles With No History of Sexual Offending" (1991). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 6033.
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/6033>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



COMPARING THE PERCEPTIONS OF FAMILY AND PARENTING BETWEEN
JUVENILE SEXUAL OFFENDERS AND JUVENILES WITH NO
HISTORY OF SEXUAL OFFENDING

by

Iva W. Trottier

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1991

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

At many times throughout this process, my dissertation seemed to be a lonely project, but truly I have been surrounded with support. I have many people to thank for the completion of my dissertation.

My committee gave me guidance and useful feedback. My advisor, Carolyn Barcus, and chairperson, Elwin Nielsen, gave me encouragement and support beyond the call of duty, meeting with me even during the holidays.

On the practical side of getting this job done, I must thank my two typists, Alice Dalton and Marsha Harman, for their tireless work on my revisions. My research assistant, Darci Johnson, helped by always being prepared and ready to go. The ISAT organization has been very good to me, in particular Ed Bingham, who was always positive even when I was not, and Jill Morgan, who helped me gain cooperation when it was most needed.

My friends, classmates, fellow interns, and staff at my internship site gave me emotional support and provided me with invaluable critiques, feedback, and advice. To all of those people who eased my panic and provided me with reality checks, I thank you.

Most of all I want to thank my family and friends who have continuously expressed confidence in me and who would not let me quit. Without my family behind me I could not have returned to school and maintained two households for four years. Thank you all for the love and support I am surrounded with. Thank you especially to my husband of many years. I love you all.

Iva W. Trottier

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
DEFINITIONS	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	2
Purpose and Significance in Study	3
Research Hypotheses	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Focus on Both Juvenile Sexual Offenders and Nonoffending Youth	6
Sexual Offender Family of Origin	6
Summary	10
III. METHODOLOGY	12
Sample	12
Instruments	12
Data Collection	14
IV. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	16
Reliability	17
Psychometric Instruments	18
Post Hoc Analyses	18
Offender Group Coding	18
Phase One Analyses of Variance	21
Phase Two Analyses of Variance	23
Discriminant Function Analysis	30
Offenders versus Nonoffenders	32

TABLE OF CONTENTS, continued

	Page
V. DISCUSSION	45
Age Effect	45
Inappropriate Expectations	46
Lack of Empathy	47
Biographical Inventory	49
Summary	53
Educational and Counseling Implications	53
Possible Implications for Future Use of a Biographical Inventory	54
Limitations and Recommendations	60
REFERENCES	62
APPENDICES	69
Appendix A ISAT Letter of Support	70
Appendix B Consent Form & Agreement	72
Appendix C Consent Agreement	74
Appendix D Biographical Inventory	76
VITA	91

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the Nine Psychometric Subscales	17
2. Construction of Psychometric Subscales	20
3. Frequencies of Subjects in the Four Offender Categories by Age	21
4. ANOVA Results on Offender and Age Categories	22
5. ANOVAS of the Effect of Age on Four Psychometric Subscales	22
6. Subscale Means of Dependent Variables	23
7. Comparisons of Self-Reports Among Three Offender Categories	25
8. Responses to the Construct: Level of Inappropriate Expectations for Three Offender Groups Victims Variable	26
9. Responses to the Construct: Lack of Empathy for Three Offender Categories	26
10. Effect of Incest Offenders Versus Outside the Family Offenders and of Age on Nine Dependent Variables	27
11. Effect of Offenders with a Single Victim Versus Offenders With Multiple Victims and of Age on Nine Dependent Variables	28
12. Effect of Violent Offenders Versus Nonviolent Offenders and of Age on Nine Dependent Variables	29
13. Demographic Factors on the Sample	34
14. Summary of the Seventeen Independent Variables and the Resulting Eight Discriminating Biographical Items Used to Classify Offenders versus Nonoffenders	36
15. Resulting Eight Biographical Items Used to Classify Offenders Versus Nonoffenders	37
16. Summary Table of the Stepwise Analysis of Items that Define the Offender-Nonoffender Classification	39
17. Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients for Offender-Nonoffender Classification	41
18. Classification Results of Difference Combinations of Offender Categories as Defined by the Biographical Items	43

DEFINITIONS

The following terminology was employed for this study:

Cohesion. The emotional bonding that family members have toward one another.

Adaptability. The ability of the family system to change its power structure and role relationships in response to stress.

Expressiveness. The extent to which family members were encouraged to act openly.

Cohesiveness. The degree of commitment, help, and support family members provide for one another.

Conflict. The amount of openly expressed anger and discord among family members.

Inappropriate expectations. When a child is expected to perform in a manner incongruent for his/ her developmental stage.

Lack of empathic awareness. The inability to be understanding of a younger child's state of mind.

Strong belief in the value of punishment. When physical punishment is considered a proper disciplinary measure and the right to use physical force is strongly defended.

Role reversal. When the child is expected to be sensitive and responsible for satisfying an older person's emotional needs.

ABSTRACT

Comparing the Perceptions of Family and Parenting Between
Juvenile Sexual Offenders and Juveniles With No
History of Sexual Offending

by

Iva W. Trottier, Doctor of Philosophy
Utah State University, 1991

Major Professor: Dr. Elwin C. Nielsen
Department: Psychology

Juvenile sexual offenders and a matched sample of nonoffending youth were compared on the Family Environment Scale (FES), the Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES III), the Adult Adolescent Parent Inventory (AAPI), and a biographical inventory. The purpose was to determine whether or not juvenile sexual offenders and nonoffenders would prove to have different perceptions of family characteristics and whether the biographical inventory could distinguish between the two groups. The sample consisted of 95 participants (46 offenders, 49 nonoffenders) in the northern Utah area. The offending population were in outpatient treatment for their sexual offending.

When the participants were categorized as offender/ nonoffender and 12-15 year olds/ 16-19 year olds, only an age effect was found to be significant on the variables cohesiveness, cohesion, and conflict. Offender group membership did not have any effect. Younger adolescents viewed their family environment as more cohesive and felt more freedom to express anger and dissent.

Significant differences were found between offenders with multiple victims and all other groups on two AAPI variables: inappropriate developmental expectations of children and lack of empathic awareness of children.

The discriminant function analysis of the biographical inventory items yielded a 90% correct classification rate on participants coded as either offender or nonoffender. Only eight biographical items were used in this procedure. It is clear that, of the four instruments used in this study, the biographical inventory provided the best descriptive profile of the juvenile sexual offenders.

Offenders reported more instability in their home-life and lack of positive emotional relationships with their caretakers. The perception of diminished humanness in relationships went hand in hand with victimizing others. One can conclude that family environment remains an important factor to consider in the development and treatment of sexually abusive behavior.

(105 pages)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Recently increasing concern and interest have been focused on juvenile sexual offenders. Official reports of sexual abuse have mushroomed during the last decade (Bera, 1985). In Utah alone, reported child sexual abuse cases have increased 343% over the past five years. A large portion of these sexual crimes are being committed by juveniles (The Utah Report, 1989).

Recent arrest statistics and victim surveys indicate 30 to 50% of all cases of child sexual abuse can be attributed to adolescent offenders (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987). In Utah, 1707 identified juvenile sexual offenders were referred to the legal system between 1983 and 1987, and in 1988, 78% of all first and second degree felonies against persons by juveniles were sexual in nature (The Utah Report, 1989).

Despite the prevalence of juvenile sexual offending, research to discern family characteristics that distinguish juvenile sexual offenders from nonoffending youth is lacking. Even with lengthy searching, it is difficult to find studies that look at both groups concurrently. The question has not been answered as to why some individuals from the same type of family situations choose to offend sexually and others do not. Until recently, little attention has been devoted to understanding the etiology of adolescent sexual offending, and there is a dearth of clinical and data-based research on this population (Weiks & Lehker, 1988).

Most of the research on sexual offenders has been with incarcerated or hospitalized individuals (Kavoussi, Kaplan, & Becker, 1988). We know nothing about the majority of sexual offenders, the ones who got away (Finklehor, 1984), and research on outpatient sexual offenders is scarce (Kavoussi et al, 1988).

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to examine family characteristics of the juvenile male sexual offender, in outpatient treatment for sexual offending, in order to provide a profile of the family organization and functioning of this population. Responses to variables that may distinguish juvenile sexual offenders from nonoffending youth were examined. The present study considered the following questions:

1. Is there a relation between family cohesion and juvenile sexual offending?
2. Is there a relation between family adaptability and juvenile sexual offending?
3. Is there a relation between family expressiveness and juvenile sexual offending?
4. Is there a relation between family cohesiveness and juvenile sexual offending?
5. Is there a relation between family conflict and juvenile sexual offending?
6. Is there a relation between inappropriate parental expectations and juvenile sexual offending?
7. Is there a relation between inability to be empathically aware of the child's needs and juvenile sexual offending?
8. Is there a relation between strong parental belief in the value of punishment and juvenile sexual offending?
9. Is there a relation between role reversal in the family and juvenile sexual offending?

Purpose and Significance in Study

The overall aim of this research was to increase knowledge that may be used in early diagnosis and treatment of juvenile sexual offenders.

Research Hypotheses

1. Juvenile sexual offenders will differ from nonoffending youth on their perceptions of family cohesion.
2. Juvenile sexual offenders will differ from nonoffending youth on their perceptions of family adaptability.
3. Juvenile sexual offenders will differ from nonoffending youth on their perceptions of family expressiveness.
4. Juvenile sexual offenders will differ from nonoffending youth on their perceptions of family cohesiveness.
5. Juvenile sexual offenders will differ from nonoffending youth on their perceptions of family conflict.
6. Juvenile sexual offenders will differ from nonoffending youth on their perceptions of inappropriate parental expectations.
7. Juvenile sexual offenders will differ from nonoffending youth on their perceptions of inability to be empathically aware of the child's needs.
8. Juvenile sexual offenders will differ from nonoffending youth on their perceptions of strong parental belief in the value of punishment.
9. Juvenile sexual offenders will differ from nonoffending youth on their perceptions of role reversal in the family.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The histories of both juvenile and adult sexual offenders reveal that their deviant sexual interest patterns, as well as their first sexual offense, occurred soon after puberty (Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kaplan, 1986). Although this does not mean the majority of adolescent offenders continue committing sexual offenses into adulthood, enough obviously do to warrant serious concern (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987). In a recent study by the FBI, the offense behaviors of 41 adult serial rapists were examined and it was found that:

1. These 41 rapists had been responsible for over 1200 sexual assaults as adults (in addition to over 100 as adolescents).
2. Fifty-six percent of the rapists had been victims of sexual assaults. Another 12% had witnessed significant sexual acts (e.g., a rape of a parent).
3. Sixty-eight percent of these rapists had histories of voyeurism as adolescents (Providing a Continuum, 1987).

Authors of several studies of adolescents have found that the adolescents had committed multiple sexual offenses, indicating that this type of behavior is neither transient nor insignificant (Deisher, Wenet, Paperny, Clark, & Fehrenbach, 1982; Smith & Monastersky, 1986; Shoor, Speed, & Bartlet, 1965; Lewis, Shankok, & Pincus, 1979). Studies have also made apparent the seriousness of hands-off sexual offending (i.e., peeping-voyeurism, flashing-exhibiting, obscene calls). These nontouching sexual behaviors are to be considered serious components on the continuum of sexual offending that may precede or coexist with more assaultive behaviors (National Adolescent Perpetrator Network, 1988).

Although great strides are being made in changing perceptions of the seriousness of juvenile sexual offending by overcoming myths such as "boys will be boys" or "it's only curiosity or experimentation," it is widely acknowledged by law enforcement agencies, as well as others, that only 10 to 40% of all sexual crimes are reported to the police (Earls, 1983). Obviously, the number of reported offenses for juvenile sexual offenders does not correspond with the actual rates of these behaviors.

Forceful teenage offenders frequently have other sexual partners available to them who are willing, nevertheless they still sexually victimize others. Their sexual acting out, rather than reflecting sexual needs, reflects serious conflicts concerning ability to express anger and need to establish personal power (Deisher et al., 1982). The sexual aspects of offending are always in the service of other needs, such as affection humiliation, retaliation, or confirmation of masculinity. Reasons why offenders choose sexual forms of expression rather than non-sexual acts, such as burglary, need to be considered (Finklehor, 1984; James & Nasjlehi, 1983).

There is a serious need to examine the variables that might predict the potential for sexually abusive behavior. A delineation of factors that may distinguish offenders from nonoffenders could provide information for planning preventive interventions as well as remediation. To that end, searches of psychological and sociological literature specifically focusing on offender assessment and offender family of origin perceptions resulted in a number of articles pertinent to the purposes and objectives of this research. Additionally, bibliographies were perused to obtain further sources.

Initially, the rationale for focusing on both juvenile sexual offenders and nonoffending youth will be presented. Finally, an overview will be given on the current research on the contribution that the family of origin makes to the sexual offender.

Focus on Both Juvenile Sexual Offenders and Non-Offending Youth

Participants in the first national conference on adolescent perpetrators in 1986 (Ryan, 1986a) identified many areas of concern for future research. Answers were sought to questions such as: What are the sources of sexually abusive behavior? How does the sexual offender develop? What are the disinhibitors which enable sexual offenders to violate norms and taboos? What familial factors contribute to disinhibition? Gilgun (1988) argued that to understand the possible associations between sexual offending and family relationships, both the juvenile offender and his nonoffending counterparts need to be studied. Developing this understanding can be facilitated by an assessment process that utilizes a multi-modal approach which looks at individual as well as family characteristics. Use of this process may help researchers discover the factors associated with becoming a sexual offender and which factors are associated with abstaining from sexual abuse.

In summary, little research was available on characteristics of juvenile sexual offenders in comparison with a matched group of nonoffending youth. Even with lengthy searching, it was difficult to find studies that looked at both groups concurrently. This conclusion is confirmed by Weiks and Lehker (1988) who claimed, that until recently, little research attention has been dedicated to understanding the etiology of adolescent sexual offending and there is a dearth of clinical and data-based research on this population.

Sexual Offender Family of Origin

The literature available strongly suggests that adolescent male sexual offenders develop repetitive behavior patterns (Fehrenbach & Monastersky, 1988; Groth, 1977; Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kaplan, 1986). Ryan, Lane, Davis, and Isaac (1987)

found out that sexually abusive behaviors develop steadily over time. Therefore, early intervention is clearly indicated, both for the prevention of multiple victimizations and to interrupt the reinforcing nature of the behaviors. Longo and Groth (1983) support the position that a significant number of offenders, at least one out of three, show some evidence of progression from non-violent sex crimes during adolescence to more serious sexual assaults as adults.

Stenson and Anderson (1987) reported that researchers are beginning to understand that the disturbance that results in the dysfunctional sexual behavior has its roots in childhood problems that were not confronted or treated. Similarly, Sefarbi (1987) reported that when adolescents are referred for treatment of their sexual deviancy, clinicians are finding the offenders have additional problems beyond the sexual problem, including serious school problems in both academics and behavior, and a lack of social skills.

Comparing molesters with rapists, Tingle, Barnard, Robbins, Newman, and Hutchinson (1986) found that molesters and almost 86% of the rapists reported having had no or few friends while growing up and that rapists displayed significantly higher levels of aggression than the child molesters in all facets of their lives. The investigators reported that the rapists seemed to have difficulties beginning in elementary school and continuing until they are out of school. This includes the progression from nuisance sex offenses (e.g., voyeurism, exhibitionism) to hands-on offenses, such as rape. Over half of the rapists and about 25% of the child molesters reported having had trouble getting along with their teachers. Lewis et al. (1979) also found serious aberrant behavior since early childhood.

Researchers of several studies have reported that sexual offenders had been sexually victimized as children, suggesting a cyclical pattern in sexual abuse (Ryan,

1986b; Longo, 1982; Becker, Kaplan, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kavoussi, 1986). Mayer (1988) cited a study that indicated perhaps as many as 80% of pedophiles (child lovers) had been sexually abused as children. Gilgun (1988) reported that the multi-generational cycle of sexual abuse is perpetuated by victims becoming offenders, yet, many victims do not become offenders. It is not clear why some victims choose to sexually abuse and others do not. It is important to explore why some individuals avoid becoming sexual offenders of children, and why others from similar backgrounds go on to sexually offend children. Additionally, Longo (1982) reported that beyond being victimized themselves, a significant number of offenders reported being introduced to adult sex prematurely, in most cases prior to the onset of puberty (Longo, 1982).

Violence in the home of origin was also reported to be a contributing factor in sexual offending (Sack & Mason, 1980; Mio, Nanjundappa, Verleur, & de Rios, 1986; Paperny & Deisher, 1983; Saunders, Awad, & White, 1986). In a study by Lewis et al. (1979), the researchers found that in an incarcerated sample of adolescents, 75% of those who had committed a sexual offense or a violent nonsexual offense had been physically abused. This frequency was compared with 29% of other delinquents. In addition, 79% of the adolescent sex offenders had observed intra-family violence, as opposed to 20% of the non-violent delinquent comparison group.

Burgess, Hartman, and McCormack (1987) reported that the sexually abused subjects, who were later delinquent, were less likely than their controls to have family members who were supportive, and they perceived their families as openly expressing anger, aggression, and conflict. Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, and Kaplan (1986) in their article on adolescent sex offenders concluded that one area in which future research needs to be concentrated is assessing the family's involvement in the development and maintenance of deviant sexual-interest patterns.

Bera (1985), in his study of familial relationships, emphasized that it was estimated that parents directly or indirectly contribute to over 70% of all cases of sexual abuse. Bera concluded that there is a strong family component that contributes to adolescent sexual offending. Ryan et al. (1987) noted that a betrayal of trust or losses in nurturing or parenting relationships during infancy or early childhood may also be a factor.

Several studies are reported by Salter (1988) in which family dysfunction was identified as either causal or correlates of intrafamilial child sexual abuse. Some of these studies, however, were based on clinical impressions. Deisher et al. (1982) noted the adolescent offenders experienced scapegoating within their families. In two studies with control groups, the adolescent offenders were less likely than the comparison groups to have family members who were supportive and they perceived their families as openly expressing anger, aggression, and conflict (Burgess et al., 1987; Friedrich & Luecke, 1988).

Bera (1985), from his exhaustive review of literature from family theory and family therapy, identified three primary dimensions of family behavior, cohesion, adaptability, and communication. Bera suggested that these factors provide family stability that may make sexual offending unlikely. Family cohesion was defined as the degree to which family members are separated from or connected to their family. Family adaptability is the extent to which the family system is flexible and able to change. Family communication facilitates movement on the other two dimensions.

Caretaker history, up to age 18, was also studied by Prentky et al. (in press) and results suggested that the quality of early interpersonal attachments and the experience of sexual abuse as a child may be significant in understanding sexual aggression. Bavolek, Kline, McLaughlin, and Publicover (1979), in their study identifying adolescents at high-risk for physically abusive behavior, found that each of the four parenting

constructs they used could effectively be used to discriminate between abused and non-identified abused adolescents. Furthermore, the construct named "inability of the parent to be empathically aware of the child's needs," had the greatest discriminatory capability. O'Brien (1989) studied adolescent incest offenders and noted family-system dynamics probably played an important role in the development and maintenance of the sexual abuse. Halperin (1981) reported that both abused and non-abused children from abusive families have more feelings of ambivalence toward their parents than children from non-abusive homes.

Summary

In summary, the literature reviewed suggests the need to recognize the progressive nature of sexual offending. It is inaccurate and misleading to examine the sexual offender in isolation. Family dynamics must be considered if we are to better understand the pattern that sexual abuse follows. Moreover, research is lacking regarding the possible differences in perception between youth who offend sexually and those who do not regarding their families of origin. Identifying unique or common patterns of responses between juvenile sexual offenders and nonoffending juveniles may offer clinicians and researchers insights into the cyclical pattern of sexual offending and suggest treatment implications. Gathering data on perceived family relationships in families where there is a history of sexual offending and in families where there has not been a history of offending may serve to increase the knowledge base of the characteristics of nonoffending juveniles versus juvenile sexual offenders. The literature suggests several issues associated with sexual offending, that is, lack of empathic parenting, conflict, cohesion, expressiveness, inappropriate developmental expectations of children, strong belief in punishment, and role reversal. However, none of these factors has been demonstrated as predictive of sexual abuse in adolescence.

The literature reviewed suggests that research focusing on the perception of factors in family of origin relationships for both juvenile sexual offenders and a nonoffending matched group appears to be needed. Such a study may provide information for planning preventive interventions as well as treatment interventions and will be a contribution to the literature on juvenile sexual offending.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The sample consisted of outpatient juvenile male sexual offenders, provided by Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment (ISAT) in Utah, who consented to participate in this study. The majority of participants were in treatment due to court action and ranged in age from 12 to 19 years of age.

The sexual offending sample was matched with nonoffending juveniles from families where sexual abuse had not been reported. They attended high schools in the same geographical area as the sexual offenders sample and were matched with the offender group as to sex and grade in school. Consent forms were obtained for all participating youth.

The sample of juvenile sexual offenders with a reading ability equal to or greater than fifth grade level, as determined by the WRAT-2(R) were included. The matched group also had a comparable reading ability as determined by their school performance or WRAT-2(R). Ninety percent of the subjects in this study were Caucasian, and 86% identified themselves as being of the Mormon religion. The total sample will consist of 46 juvenile sexual offenders and 49 nonoffending youth.

Instruments

The investigation utilized four instruments: Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES III), Family Environment Scale (FES), Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory (APPI), and a biographical inventory. Each will now be discussed.

The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES III) measures

perceptions of family adaptability and cohesion and was selected for this study because of its previous use with adolescent sexual offenders. Developed by Olson, Portner, and Lavee (1985), it can provide a comprehensive therapeutic picture of the family by gathering information not only on how the subject perceives his family now, but also how he would like his family to be ideally. Bera (1985) employed the instrument in the assessment, research, and treatment of adolescent sexual offenders and their family systems. The instrument is a 20-item questionnaire which appears to have strong stability (Cronbach Alpha .80 to .84), internal consistency (.68), and good construct validity (Olson et al., 1985).

The Family Environment Scale (FES) developed by Moos and Moos (1986) measures perceptions of expressiveness, cohesiveness, and conflict management. The FES is a true/false self-report inventory that represents the domain of family relationships. It has been used in well over 150 studies of normal and dysfunctional families since its inception in 1974. Fuhr and Engleman (1988) encouraged the utilization of the FES in research on sexually abusive populations because it examines relationships in the family that appear to be problem areas for sexual offenders. Therefore, it was selected for this study. Burgess et al. (1987) and Moos, Clayton, and Max (1979) judged the FES subscales to possess adequate internal consistency and test-retest reliability, ranging between .68 and .86.

The Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory (AAPI) was developed by Bavolek, Kline, McLaughlin, and Publicover (1978) to "assess child rearing and parenting attitudes of adolescents and identify those adolescents who are high risk" (p. 4), that is, adolescents in need of acquiring appropriate child rearing and parenting skills. According to Bavolek et al., the AAPI has substantial content validity, internal consistency, construct validity, and stability over time (total test-retest reliability correlation .76). The AAPI assesses current parenting beliefs and has been used

successfully in several studies identifying high risk individuals (Bavolek, Kline, McLaughlin, & Publicover, 1989).

The biographical inventory was modified from a more extensive inventory and developed to provide demographic information regarding participants. After reviewing the literature on juvenile sexual offenders, the original inventory of 100 items was modified by rewording items, removing seemingly irrelevant items, adding items, and retaining those items appropriate for this investigation, resulting in a 97-item biographical inventory. This inventory was a self-constructed instrument consisting of different types of questions (i.e., forced choice, multiple choice, open blank). The biographical inventory was constructed initially to gather general descriptive data on the participants.

Data Collection

The ISAT organization gave consent and support to use their facilities (see Appendix A). Consent forms (see Appendix B and C) were completed by those sexual offenders who are willing to participate in this study. The nonoffending youth who were willing to participate in this study did so after the schools reviewed the procedures and purpose and approved the project. The files of the sexual offenders were reviewed to determine the reading level of the subjects and their offense histories. All subjects completed a biographical inventory to help assess other aspects of their lives (see Appendix D).

Consent forms were distributed and collected during the Fall and Winter of 1989. Data collection began during the Fall of 1989, and was completed by May 15, 1990.

A research assistant administered the FES, the AAPI, the FACES-III Test, and the biographical inventory to the consenting sexual offender group, and reviewed the self-report data and noted any discrepancies on the self-report. This data collection

procedure was conducted in the ISAT office during group therapy hours. The nonoffending group completed the instruments in a conference room during their core classes. The same research assistant administered the instruments to the matched group of nonoffending youth in the schools. The instruments were scanned for completeness before the participants were provided incentives.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSES AND RESULTS

The data from the FACES-III, AAPI, and the FES for the juvenile offenders and the matched group of nonoffending youth were analyzed by the univariate analysis of variance method (ANOVA) and the multi-variant analysis of variance method (MANOVA). The independent variable was group membership with two levels:

1. Juvenile sexual offenders.
2. Nonoffending youth with no history of sexual offending.

There are nine dependent variables that were constructs on the various instruments:

1. Cohesion (FACES-III)
2. Adaptability (FACES-III)
3. Expressiveness (FES)
4. Cohesiveness (FES)
5. Conflict (FES)
6. Inappropriate Parental Expectations (AAPI)
7. Lack of Empathic Awareness (AAPI)
8. Strong Parental Belief in the Value of Punishment (AAPI)
9. Role Reversal (AAPI)

In the nine proposed univariate analyses, there were no significant differences between offender and nonoffender groups.

The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), resulted in no significant differences between independent and dependent variables ($F = .96534$, $df = 9.83$, $p = .475$).

Reliability

Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients were computed for each set of psychometric subscale items, with resulting alpha values ranging from .331 to .862. These were consistent with established reliabilities for the same subscales on these instruments except for the FES subscale Expressiveness which had a Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of .69 opposed to the .331 found in this study. Table 1 below lists this study's computed reliabilities for each psychometric subscale.

Table 1

Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the Nine Psychometric Subscales

<u>Instrument</u>	<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Number of Items</u>	<u>Reliability</u>	<u>Sample Size</u>
AAPI	Lack Empathy	8	.7481	95
	Punishment	10	.8059	95
	Role Reversal	8	.8619	91
	Inappropriate Expectations	6	.5510	95
FACES III	Cohesion	10	.8489	95
	Adaptability	10	.6472	94
FES	Expressiveness	9	.331	96
	Cohesiveness	9	.753	96
	Conflict	9	.763	96
Overall:				
FACES III	FACES III	20	.824	95
FES	FES	27	.260	96
AAPI	AAPI	32	.871	92

Psychometric Instruments

The psychometric properties and computational methodologies of the three instruments were well established prior to the present study. In this study, therefore, no factor analyses or other data reduction procedures were employed. Rather, the method used for computation of subscales followed exactly the coding instructions published with the instruments themselves. Table 2 summarizes the construction of each subscale, where a simple summation of the appropriate items created the subscale score.

The FACES III assumes a curvilinear relationship on the dimensions of cohesion and adaptability. Too little or too much cohesion or adaptability is seen as dysfunctional. Middle scores tend to indicate a healthier family balance (Olson et al., 1985). The scorable responses on the FES vary, sometimes true responses, in other instances false responses are counted through the scoring template. The higher the FES subscale score the greater manifestation of that trait. The higher scoring the responses on the AAPI are the less abusive or more nurturing are the respondent's attitudes. Sample means and standard deviations are also shown.

Post Hoc Analyses

Offender Group Coding

The post hoc inferential analyses were done in two phases. For the first phase, the focal independent variable was Offender Category, coded with Offender Category 1, at two levels: Offender and Nonoffender. The chronological age of the subject was included as the second focal independent variable, to be used in analysis of variance, along with the offender group variable. Age was recoded into a dichotomous variable so that 13-15 year-olds were in Group 1 and 16-18 year-olds were in Group 2. The groups were divided thus for two reasons. The first reason was substantive, that is, when a person reaches 16 years of age, typically a driver's license is obtained, possibly

an income-producing job is acquired, and the person has significantly more freedom and therefore a greater opportunity to commit an offense. The second reason was analytical, that is, splitting the sample at 15/ 16 resulted in a more balance grouping for statistical purposes.

The post hoc phase of analyses recoded offender category in different ways, based on three criteria for degree of severity of sexual offense. These criteria resulting in offender categories 2-4 were: Offender category 2) whether or not all of the offender's victims were within the family; offender category 3) whether the number of victims was one or greater than one; and lastly, offender category 4) whether or not physical violence, or the threat of same, was used on the victim(s).

The sample frequencies for each of these offender categories are shown below in Table 3, which also shows the sample frequencies when this dichotomized age variable is cross-tabulated with offender group, as determined by each of four offender categories.

Table 2

Construction of Psychometric Subscales

<u>Instrument</u>	<u>Subscale</u>	<u>Range of Values on Individual Items</u>	<u>Number of Items</u>	<u>Range of Values on Subscale Score</u>	<u>Sample Size</u>	<u>Sample Mean</u>	<u>Sample Standard Deviation</u>
AAPI	Lack of Empathy	1-5	8	8-40	95	28.1263	5.2415
	Punishment	1-5	10	10-50	95	35.1474	6.7161
	Role Reversal	1-5	8	8-40	91	20.8842	6.0738
	Inappropriate Expectations	1-5	6	6-30	95	23.2632	3.1121
FACES III	Cohesion	1-5	10	10-50	95	33.1789	7.7638
	Adaptability	1-5	10	10-50	94	26.5684	6.0787
FES	Expressiveness	0-1	9	1-9	96	4.2211	1.7515
	Cohesiveness	0-1	9	1-9	96	6.0000	2.3835
	Conflict	0-1	9	1-9	96	4.2737	2.5576

Table 3

Frequencies of Subjects in the Four Offender Categories by Age

<u>Offender Category</u>	<u>13-15 year-olds</u>	<u>16-19 year-olds</u>
1 Nonoffender	21	28
Offender	21	24
2 Nonoffender	21	28
Offender, family only	17	14
Offender, outside family	4	10
3 Nonoffender	21	28
Offender, one victim	11	9
Offender, multiple victims	10	15
4 Nonoffender	21	28
Offender, without violence	19	20
Offender, with violence	2	4

Of the latter three offender categories, the one based on single versus multiple victims yields the most balanced two-way table when cross-tabulated with age.

Phase One Analyses of Variance

The dichotomous offender category, offender versus nonoffender and the dichotomous age variable were used as the two main effects in a series of 2 x 2 factorial analyses of variance. The dependent variables analyzed were the nine psychometric subscales.

A Pillais multivariate F test was computed for each of the effects, and the results are shown in Table 4 below. These findings suggested that none of the nine dependent variables were affected by the offender group main effect, nor by the two-way interaction effect, but only by the age effect. Nevertheless, since offender group status was the primary focus of the present study, the nine univariate analyses of variance were performed.

Table 4

ANOVA Results on Offender and Age Categories

<u>Effect</u>	<u>F (9,82)</u>	<u>Sig. of F</u>
Offender Group	.93	.503
Age Group	2.55	.012
Offender X Age	1.09	.377

In the nine univariate analyses, indeed, only the age variable was found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. The age effect was significant for only three of the nine analyses. Table 5 displays the observed significance levels for those dependent variables with a significant age effect. An additional dependent variable whose p-value for the age effect was very close to .05 is also shown.

Table 5

ANOVAS of The Effect of Age on Four Psychometric Subscales

<u>Dependent Variable</u>	<u>p-Value for Age Effect</u>
Cohesion	.016
Cohesiveness	.001
Conflict	.004
Expressiveness	.051

In three out of four of these analyses, it was the younger group of subjects who had a higher mean score than the older group. This indicates they perceived a higher degree of emotional bonding within the family, felt encouraged to act openly and express their feelings directly, and more openly expressed anger, aggression, and conflict among family members. These results are summarized in Table 6 below. Bear in mind that only the age effect means are shown here to save space, but each analysis was a two-way factorial ANOVA. Also, as each

mean is studied, one should refer back to Table 2 to maintain the proper perspective with regard to the "practical significance" of the difference between any pair of means versus the statistical significance alone. It should be kept in mind the range of possible values on each subscale when deciding if these differences are meaningful.

Table 6

Subscale Means of Dependent Variables

<u>Dependent Variable</u>	<u>13-15 Year-Olds</u>	<u>16-19 Year-Olds</u>
Cohesion	35.2	31.5
Cohesiveness	6.9	5.3
Conflict	3.5	4.9
Expressiveness	4.6	3.9

Phase Two Analyses of Variance

Since the offender group variable, when coded dichotomously in the above analyses, did not significantly affect any of the nine dependent variables, it was decided that a sharper differentiation was needed in classifying offenders and nonoffenders. To this end, the three additional offender categories (see Table 3) were employed as the main effect for offender group in subsequent analyses. For ease of discussion, these three variables will be referred to as 1) incest/ outside family distinguishing those offenders who did not have victims outside the family from those who did; 2) single victim/ multiple victims referring to the number of victims; and, 3) nonviolent/ violent referring to the presence of either physical violence or the threat thereof.

The first analyses performed were a set of nine (one for each dependent variable) univariate one-way analyses of variance, with accompanying multivariate F test, repeated for the incest/ outside family variable, the single victim/ multiple victims variable, and the nonviolent/ violent variable. Table 7 displays the observed significance levels of the F tests, both

for the multivariate and univariate tests. All three sets of multivariate F tests were non-significant.

Of the 27 one-way ANOVA F tests, only two were significant at the .05 level of significance. However, these significant tests were from the same offender category, namely single victim/ multiple victims. The two dependent variables were inappropriate expectations and lack of empathy.

In the analysis of inappropriate expectations dependent variable, the nonoffenders and the offenders with only one victim were not significantly different, but were each in turn significantly different from the offenders who had multiple victims. The means and standard deviations are shown below in Table 8.

A similar pattern was found in the analysis of the lack of empathy dependent variable. Namely, the single-victim offenders were not significantly different from the nonoffenders. However, the multiple-victim offenders were significantly different from the single-victim offenders. Table 9 shows these results.

The next set of analyses included the dichotomous age variable as a second main effect, and three sets of two-way analyses of variances were performed, each set having nine univariate analyses and one multivariate analysis. The results of these analyses are reported in Tables 10, 11, and 12.

As is evident from Table 10, only the age effect was found to be statistically significant.

Table 11 contains the analysis of variance results for the single victim/ multiple victims variable. As was found in the previously reported one-way analyses, the two dependent variables with significant effect due to offender group were inappropriate expectations and lack of empathy.

Table 12 contains the analysis of variance results for the nonviolent/ violent offender group variable. No significant effects due to group were found. The sample size of the violent offenders precludes any further analysis for this study.

Table 7

Comparisons of Self-Reports Among Three Offender Categories

<u>Offender Category</u>	<u>MANOVA</u>	<u>Cohesion</u> (FACESIII)	<u>Adaptability</u> (FACESIII)	<u>Cohesiveness</u> (FES)	<u>Expressiveness</u> (FES)	<u>Conflict</u> (FES)	<u>Inappropriate Expectations</u> (AAPI)	<u>Lack of Empathy</u> (AAPI)	<u>Punishment</u> (AAPI)	<u>Role Reversal</u> (AAPI)
Incest/ Outside Family	.874	.2621	.47	.33	.515	.337	.226	.85	.33	.683
Single Victim/ Multiple Victims	.155	.18	.51	.35	.61	.42	.004	.027	.12	.274
Non-Violent/ Violent	.779	.419	.518	.327	.251	.26	.201	.63	.235	.529

Table 8

Responses to the Construct: Level of Inappropriate Expectations for Three OffenderGroups Victims Variable

<u>Offender Category</u>	<u>Size</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
NonOffender	49	22.8	3.1
Single Victim	21	22.4	3.0
Multiple Victims	25	25.0	2.7

Table 9

Responses to the Construct: Lack of Empathy for Three Offender Categories

<u>Offender Category</u>	<u>Size</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Nonoffender	49	27.8	4.7
Single Victim	21	26.2	5.8
Multiple Victims	25	30.3	5.3

Table 10

Effect of Incest Offenders Versus Outside the Family Offenders and of Age on Nine Dependent Variables

<u>Offender Category</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MANOVA</u>	<u>Cohesion (FACESIII)</u>	<u>Adaptability (FACESIII)</u>	<u>Cohesiveness (FES)</u>	<u>Expressiveness (FES)</u>	<u>Conflict (FES)</u>	<u>Inappropriate Expectations (AAPI)</u>	<u>Lack of Empathy (AAPI)</u>	<u>Punishment (AAPI)</u>	<u>Role Reversal (AAPI)</u>
Incest/Outside Victim Group	2	.739	.736	.104	.497	.101	.383	.141	.295	.727	.312
Age	1	.008	.202	.008	.937	.000	.035	.002	.646	.061	.355
Incest/Outside Victim Group	2	.311	.134	.478	.175	.339	.731	.447	.708	.487	.474

Table 11

Effect of Offenders With a Single Victim Versus Offenders With Multiple Victims and of Age on Nine Dependent Variables

<u>Offender Category</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MANOVA</u>	<u>Cohesion (FACESIII)</u>	<u>Adaptability (FACESIII)</u>	<u>Cohesiveness (FES)</u>	<u>Expressiveness (FES)</u>	<u>Conflict (FES)</u>	<u>Inappropriate Expectations (AAPI)</u>	<u>Lack of Empathy (AAPI)</u>	<u>Punishment (AAPI)</u>	<u>Role Reversal (AAPI)</u>
Single/Multiple Victim Group	2	.095	.077	.539	.182	.579	.256	.002	.048	.134	.242
Age	1	.014	.009	.991	.000	.045	.003	.946	.091	.406	.242
Single/Multiple Group X Age 2	2	.597	.422	.317	.926	.574	.306	.469	.197	.421	.129

Table 12

Effect of Violent Offenders Versus Nonviolent Offenders and of Age on Nine Dependent Variables

<u>Offender Category</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MANOVA</u>	<u>Cohesion (FACESIII)</u>	<u>Adaptability (FACESIII)</u>	<u>Cohesiveness (FES)</u>	<u>Expressiveness (FES)</u>	<u>Conflict (FES)</u>	<u>Inappropriate Expectations (AAPI)</u>	<u>Lack of Empathy (AAPI)</u>	<u>Punishment (AAPI)</u>	<u>Role Reversal (AAPI)</u>
Single/Multiple Victim Group	2	.919	.376	.542	.352	.254	.255	.238	.630	.221	.547
Age	1	.027	.019	.999	.001	.065	.005	.741	.066	.360	.196
Single/Multiple Group X Age	2	.324	.540	.185	.602	.855	.735	.337	.107	.165	.015

Discriminant Function Analysis

Additional analyses were performed to determine the relationship between offender category status and the biographical inventory variables. Discriminant function analysis was used with Wilks' stepwise procedure for inclusion of biographical inventory variables. Using Wilks' Lambda as a stepwise criterion ensures that the independent variable entered at each step improves the functions' separation of cases into groups and, additionally, increases cohesiveness, or similarity of cases within groups. For this and all computer analyses the SPSS-S (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) package, Version 3.1, was used, on a VAX/VMS system.

Discriminant analysis was used to determine whether a set of biographical variables can distinguish between juveniles who were sexual offenders and those who were not. If juveniles who are at greater risk of becoming sexual offenders can be identified early, monitoring and/or intervention may be introduced for them, to prevent their first offense. It is also of interest to determine which variables from a biographical inventory contribute most to the separation of juveniles who have been identified as sexual offenders and juveniles who have not sexually offended.

In order to determine a manageable subset of variables from this study's biographical inventory to use in a discriminant analysis, the offender category variable was crosstabulated with each biographical variable. Inferential tests, such as the chi-square test, were not performed at this stage because of the high probability, considering the number of tests performed of some significant findings being due to chance alone. Rather, the crosstabulations on every biographical item were inspected for what appeared to be nonrandom patterns of dependence. A set of nineteen biographical variables that appeared to differentiate categories was compiled to use as the independent variable set in

the discriminant analysis. Two of these variables were removed because of missing data, leaving seventeen biographical variables.

It should be noted that since the independent variable set was not chosen on a purely a priori basis but by visual inspection of patterns in the data, the significance levels in the discriminant analyses may not be accurate. That is, the generalizability of these findings is compromised. Had it been possible to acquire a larger sample, half of the cases could have been used in the crosstabulations to determine a set of independent variables, then the second half of the cases could have been used in the discriminant analyses. This was not possible, due to great difficulties encountered in acquiring subjects in such a sensitive topic area. These analyses then are of necessity, exploratory in nature. The usefulness of the findings in this study, therefore, is in narrowing down the list of biographical parameters one might find useful to study in future research on juvenile sexual offenders. Future research could use the final independent variable set in this study's analyses as the a priori set in a confirmatory study. A sample of the demographic information provided by the biographical inventory is presented in Table 13.

As was done in the analyses of variance discussed earlier, the discriminant analyses were run using different categories for the offender group variable. First the dichotomous offender/nonoffender variable was used. Then, the three alternative categories were used to determine how well the discriminant function could differentiate nonoffenders and different types of offenders.

Three sets of tables will be included for each of the four discriminant analyses. These include a summary table of the stepwise analysis, a standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients table, and finally a classification results table.

In order to facilitate interpretation of relationships between the independent variables and the offender category dependent variable, several of the independent variables were recoded. A summary of the 17 independent variables appears in Table 14 below and Table 15 lists the resulting eight biographical items used to classify offenders versus nonoffenders. Note that all independent variables were coded so that a larger value implies a feasibly more negative influence.

Offenders versus Nonoffenders

Of the seventeen independent variables used in the analysis, only eight were included with the Wilks' lambda stepwise procedure for the offender-nonoffender classification. Ten items fell out for the incest offender classification, and nine items made up the one-multiple victim classification. Table 15 gives a summary of the variables which were included and the order of inclusion. It also shows the Wilks' lambda value and corresponding significance value for each independent variable. The Wilks' Lambda Value (ranging from 0 to 1) can be interpreted as follows--large values indicate that the group means of that variable do not appear to be different, while small values indicate that groups do appear to be different. All variables have a significant Wilks' lambda value, of course, because the stepwise procedure would not otherwise have included them. The variable having the smallest value makes the best discrimination. The variable going into the equation last is most powerful because to be included it must show a significant increase in discrimination over the previously included variables.

The standardized discriminant function coefficients shown in Table 16 demonstrate that for seven of the eight independent variables, a direct relationship exists with the dependent variable (shown in a positive sign). That is, larger values of the independent variable result in an increase in the function value, or in other words, are

more highly associated with offenders than with nonoffenders. Only the independent variable FASFAV, which indicates the presence of the respondent's perception that his father had a favorite child other than himself, has an inverse relationship

Table 13

Demographic Factors on the Sample

<u>% of Offenders Who The Factor Positively</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>% of NonOffenders Responded to Who Responded to The Factor Positively</u>
47%	13-15 years of age	43%
53%	16-19 years of age	57%
83%	Caucasian	96%
11%	Hispanic	0%
2%	American Indian	0%
48%	Average family income	63%
50%	Have \leq 2 sisters	69%
43%	Have \geq 3 sisters	22%
54%	Oldest in Birthorder	37%
61%	Up to 13 years of age lived with both parents	90%
22%	Often sick in first few years of life	10%
33%	Felt fairly happy at home but it could have been improved	10%
23%	Positive impression of parents' marital happiness	92%
72%	A great deal of disagreement with father figure	0%
56%	Father critical some to most of time	31%
24%	Father whipped/ spanked	10%
47%	Father often ordered son to do things	22%

(table continues)

<u>% of Offenders Who Responded to The Factor Positively</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>% of NonOffenders Who Responded to The Factor Positively</u>
46%	Mother let son do most anything	63%
26%	Mother's discipline was hard	16%
52%	Mother spoiled her son	57%
20%	Parents were source of sex education	45%
24%	First exposed to sex \leq 5 years old	0%
52%	First exposed to sex 6-12 years old	42%
78%	Religion important	90%
47%	GPA C or less from 7th grade on	24%
52%	Describe self as very curious	39%
65%	Important to be popular	61%
43%	Became moody and cross when things don't go right	31%
63%	One arrest for a sexual offense	0%
35%	No sexual offense arrests	100%

Table 14

Summary of the Seventeen Independent Variables and the Resulting Eight
Discriminating Biographical Items Used to Classify Offenders versus Nonoffenders

<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Description</u>
BirthOrd	Birth Order Position
Caretaks	Who were your childhood caretakers
Careloss	Was loss of caretaker experienced
# Resids	Number of times you changed residences
Felhome	How you feel about home raised in
Probfe	Frequency of disagreement with female caretaker
Probmale	Frequency of disagreement with male caretaker
Descrfa	Description of your father figure
Facrit	How much father criticized you
Fadiscip	How hard was your father's discipline
Farules	How often did your father explain his rules
Moprotcv	Was your mother protective
Fapunsh	Violence of father's punishment
Fasfav	Perception of father's favorite child
Famsa	Presence of sexual abuse in family
Sxedsorc	Source of sex education
Lifgoal	Life goals

Table 15

Resulting Eight Biographical Items Used to Classify Offenders versus Nonoffenders

1. If you have experienced the death of a parent(s) or divorce or separation of your parents, how old were you when it occurred?

2. Up to the time you were 18, how many times did you change residences?

a. None	d. Three times
b. Once	e. Four times
c. Twice	f. Five or more times
3. How much disagreement or trouble have you had with the female who raised you? (Mother, step-mother, grandmother, guardian, etc.)

a. None	c. Considerable
b. Some	d. A great deal
4. Which one of the following words would best describe the male who raised you?

a. Considerate (toward you)
b. Tolerant (toward you)
c. Forceful (toward you)
d. Stern (toward you)
e. Understanding (toward you)
f. Patient (toward you)
5. How hard on you was your father when he disciplined you for doing something wrong?

a. Fair and reasonable
b. Mild, fair most of the time
c. Unpredictable
d. Very severe and unreasonable
6. Your father's favorite child was

a. Your brother
b. Your sister
c. Yourself
d. He didn't have a favorite child
e. (You were an only child)
7. Has there been any sexual abuse in the family you grew up in? _____ If yes, who was the victim?

a. Myself	d. Sister
b. Mother	e. Brother
c. Father	f. More than one victim

shown by a negative sign. So, the presence of this perception is more highly associated with nonoffenders.

There are two functions computed to aid in the classification of subjects. However, only the discriminant function coefficients for the first function are reported because the percent of variance explained by the first function exceeded 91% in all cases.

Table 17 contains the classification results. Each case has its group membership predicted, using the discriminant results and the set of values on the independent variable set belonging to that case. The case is then placed in the table for its true group, based on whether it was correctly classified or not. The percentage of cases correctly classified is taken as an index of the effectiveness of the discriminant function.

In this study, the subjects when categorized dichotomously as offender or nonoffender are correctly classified 90% of the time, while the correct classification rates for the other three coding schemes for offender group are close to 75%, that is, a better job of predicting group membership is done when the coding scheme is not as refined. For use in the "real world," the 75% rate is probably not high enough to be of practical significance.

In this analysis, we see that the overall correct classification rate is about 90%, while 46 (or 94%) of the nonoffenders were correctly classified, 35 of the 41 offenders (or 85%) were correctly classified as offenders. A total of 90 cases were used in this analysis. These results suggest that if the eight biographical variables in this analysis are known for another subject, the group membership for that subject could be predicted, and it would have a good chance of being correct, assuming the representativeness of this sample.

Table 16

Summary Table of the Stepwise Analysis Of Items that Define the Offender-
Nonoffender Classification

<u>Step</u>	<u>Action</u>		<u>Vars In</u>	<u>Wilks' Lambda</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
	<u>Entered</u>	<u>Removed</u>			
1	FAMSA		1	.81193	.0000
2	CARELOSS		2	.68480	.0000
3	NRRESIDS		3	.58758	.0000
4	FADISCIP		4	.53757	.0000
5	FASFAV		5	.51328	.0000
6	DESCRBFA		6	.50260	.0000
7	PROBFE		7	.49439	.0000
8	LIFGOAL		8	.48590	.0000

The Items that Defined the Incest Offender-Outside Family Offender -

Nonoffender Classifications

<u>Step</u>	<u>Action</u>		<u>Vars In</u>	<u>Wilks' Lambda</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
	<u>Entered</u>	<u>Removed</u>			
1	FAMSA		1	.72066	.0000
2	CARELOSS		2	.55394	.0000
3	NRRESIDS		3	.47412	.0000
4	FADISCIP		4	.43003	.0000
5	FASFAV		5	.40596	.0000
6	CARETAKS		6	.38907	.0000
7	DESCRBFA		7	.37384	.0000
8	FACRIT		8	.36144	.0000
9	MOPROTCV		9	.34904	.0000
10	BIRTHORD		10	.33841	.0000

(table continues)

Items that Defined the Offender With One Victim-Offenders - With Two or More

Victims - Nonoffender Classification

<u>Step</u>	<u>Action</u> <u>Entered Removed</u>	<u>Vars</u> <u>In</u>	<u>Wilks'</u> <u>Lambda</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
1	FAMSA	1	.77612	.0000
2	NRRESIDS	2	.65434	.0000
3	CARELOSS	3	.54062	.0000
4	FADISCIP	4	.49437	.0000
5	LIFGOAL	5	.46111	.0000
6	FASFAV	6	.43127	.0000
7	PROBFE	7	.41681	.0000
8	SXEDSORC	8	.40201	.0000
9	MOPROVTCV	9	.39126	.0000

Items that Defined the Nonviolent Offender - Violent Offender -

Nonoffender Classifications

<u>Step</u>	<u>Action</u> <u>Entered Removed</u>	<u>Vars</u> <u>In</u>	<u>Wilks'</u> <u>Lambda</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
1	FAMSA	1	.80371	.0001
2	CARELOSS	2	.67134	.0000
3	NRRESIDS	3	.56180	.0000
4	FADISCIP	4	.47446	.0000
5	FASFAV	5	.44663	.0000
6	MORPOTCV	6	.42573	.0000
7	LIFGOAL	7	.41514	.0000
8	PROBMALE	8	.40402	.0000

Table 17

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients for Offender-Nonoffender
Classification

	<u>FUNC 1</u>
CARELOSS	0.68468
NRRESIDS	0.55571
PROBFE	0.19304
DESCRBFA	0.23564
FADISCP	0.33026
FASFAV	-0.38027
FAMSA	0.77952
LIFGOAL	0.18371

For Offender with One Victim - Offenders with Two or More Victims -

Nonoffenders Classifications

	<u>FUNC 1</u>
BIRTHORD	0.05197
CARETAKS	0.25012
CARELOSS	0.66745
NRRESIDS	0.48885
DESCRBFA	0.35732
FACRIT	-0.13287
FADISCIP	0.22845
MOPROTCV	0.19802
FASFAV	-0.36292
FAMSA	0.90347

For Offender with One Victim - Offenders with Two or More Victims -

Nonoffender Classifications

	<u>FUNC 1</u>
CARELOSS	0.58420
NRRESIDS	0.63238
PROBFE	0.08751
FADISCIP	0.42383
MOPROTCV	-0.01863
FASFAV	0.82100
SXEDSOURC	0.18724
LIFGOAL	0.05247

(table continues)

Nonviolent Offender-Violent Offender - Nonoffender Classification

	<u>FUNC 1</u>
CARELOSS	0.63450
NRRESIDS	0.60876
PROBMALE	0.02848
FADISCIP	0.47334
MOPROTCV	0.05972
FASFAV	-0.31007
FAMSA	0.77131
LIFGOAL	0.17414

Table 18

Classification Results of Difference Combinations of Offender Categories as Defined by the Biographical Items

<u>Offender Category</u>	<u>No. of Cases</u>	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>	
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Group 1 Nonoffender	49	46 93.9%	3 6.1%
Group 2 Offenders	41	6 14.6%	35 85.4%

Percent of "Grouped" cases correctly classified: 90%

<u>Actual Group</u>	<u>No. of Cases</u>	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>		
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Group 1 Offender-Family Only Victim(s)	26	20 76.9%	5 19.2%	1 3.8%
Group 2 Offender-Outside Family Victim(s)	15	2 13.3%	8 53.3%	5 33.3%
Group 3 Nonoffender	49	1 2.0%	9 18.4%	39 79.6%

Percent of "Grouped" cases correctly classified: 74.44%

<u>Actual Group</u>	<u>No. of Cases</u>	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>		
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Group 1 Offender-One Victim	17	9 52.9%	4 23.5%	4 23.5%
Group 2 Offender-Two or More Victims	26	6 23.1%	18 69.2%	2 7.7%

(table continues)

Group 3	49	4	3	42
Nonoffender		8.2%	6.1%	85.7%

Percent of "Grouped" cases correctly classified: 75.00%

<u>Actual Group</u>	<u>No. of Cases</u>	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>		
		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Group 1 Offender-Non-Violent	34	21 61.8%	6 17.6%	7 20.6%
Group 2 Offender-Violent	8	1 12.5%	7 87.5%	0 0.0%
Group 3 Nonoffender	49	3 6.1%	6 12.2%	40 81.6%

Percent of "Grouped" cases correctly classified: 74.73%

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Age Effect

In the initial analyses, where subjects were divided into offender/ nonoffender groups and groups of 12-15 year olds and 16-19 year olds, only an age effect was found. Offender group membership had no impact on any of the dependent variables. It is worth noting that offenders and nonoffenders perceived their families similarly at certain ages.

The age effect was significant on three subscales: Cohesiveness and cohesion, which are correlated ($r = .648$), and conflict. A fourth subscale approaching significance ($p = .051$) was expressiveness. The older boys had lower mean subscale scores except on conflict. It seems younger boys view their world more ideally. They indicated a higher degree of emotional bonding within the family and felt encouraged to more openly express their feelings including anger. This may be a developmental phenomenon. The younger boys may be entering puberty and just be encountering the beginning of common adolescent conflicts. The older boys are probably in the midst of physical changes and striving for independence. These boys are in the developmental process of separating from their parents and typically experience an increasing attachment to peers.

On the other hand, another contributing factor for the younger boys' responses may be the strong L.D.S./Mormon Church influence. Most (86%) of the subjects in this study were Mormon. The L.D.S. religious training goes beyond the Church, particularly in Utah, to the school campuses and the media. Even non-Mormons of this region are exposed to the L.D.S. messages about appropriate family interactions through written literature, radio, and television. The younger boys, through their well-organized religious training, may have been giving the answers they perceived as being socially

acceptable rather than answers that truly reflected their home life. The older boys may have felt less inhibition or social restriction when responding to questions regarding their families.

For the next analysis, the significant variables will be discussed and educational counseling implications will be provided.

Inappropriate Expectations

In the second phase of analyses, offenders with more than one victim clearly differed from all other groups on two variables consisting of having inappropriate developmental expectations of children and lacking empathic awareness of children.

The first significant variable, inappropriate expectations, will be discussed focusing on both the social implications and age appropriate aspects of those expectations. Deisher et al. (1982) and Ferenbach and Monastersky (1988) found that juvenile sexual offenders typically have long histories of underdeveloped peer relationships and social isolation. It is often thought that because offenders lack self-esteem and social skills, they turn to children for comfort and social interaction. Thus, having inappropriate expectations of children socially is commonplace among offenders. Children are far less threatening and demanding than peers or adults. Accordingly, children who developmentally are naturally compliant tend to be sought out and easily victimized.

Lacking the necessary understanding of children's development and appropriate roles for children leaves the offenders with unrealistic expectations of what others can give them. Furthermore, inaccurately perceiving the developmental skills and abilities of children in all likelihood contributes to the victimization of children by these adolescent offenders.

Consequently, teaching social skills, from conversational skills to respecting the boundaries of others, could be helpful in a comprehensive treatment plan for juvenile

sexual offenders. Appropriate expression of intimacy and nurturing can be taught as part of relationship building skills. Particularly stressing age-appropriate relationships in this education component might prove beneficial.

In the counseling realm, parallel processing of the counselor helping the offender examine inappropriate expectations of himself throughout his history as well as the offender's inappropriate expectations of his victims might prove enlightening. Accordingly, setting clear behavioral expectations and limits as part of the treatment plan can provide an example of appropriate expectations for the offenders in counseling. This can also expedite treatment of offenders by clarifying expectations so that success is easily monitored and measured. Additionally, this type of treatment plan provides a model of appropriate expectations for children (i.e., it is not appropriate for adolescents to ask children to have sex with them; and even if children agree to have sex with adolescents, it is not an appropriate activity for children).

Lack of Empathy

The second significant variable was lack of empathic awareness. In 1969, Melnick and Hurley (cited in Halperin, 1981) found that physically abusive mothers were unable to empathize with their children. Davis and Leitenberg in 1987 found that sexual offenders frequently have a long history of being physically abused. Furthermore, Bavolek et al. (1979) noted that the lack of empathic awareness was the most critical indicator of potential for physical abusiveness. Lack of empathy also appears to be a key indicator for sexually abusive behavior among juvenile offenders with multiple victims, as evidenced by this study.

The ability of the juvenile sexual offenders to experience and express their own internal states is restricted. That is, they are out of touch with their feelings. Perhaps, they have not personally experienced empathic awareness modeled by others.

Therefore, they have great difficulty recognizing and understanding the internal feeling states of others.

Clinicians agree and research has supported the notion that offenders profit from learning to recognize their feelings and to appropriately express those feelings before they can empathize with victims. This study's finding regarding offenders with multiple victims having significantly less empathic awareness of children parallels the previous research and clinical experience with physically abusive offenders (Bavolek et al., 1979; Halperin, 1981; Ross & Loss; 1988, Ryan et al., 1987). However, it does not explain why offenders with single victims do not score differently from nonoffenders, but do score differently from offenders with multiple victims. One possibility is that lack of empathy is not the critical variable in allowing offenders to begin to hurt others, but that as they offend repeatedly they lose empathy. Another possibility is that the offenders with a multiple number of victims lacked empathy for children prior to their first offense. A third possibility is that the results were spurious.

In the counseling setting, offenders experience genuine empathy, perhaps for the first time in their lives, from the counselor. The counselor models empathy while exploring deficits in the offender's personal history as well as when helping the offender assume responsibility for his offending behavior. The counselor helps the offender increase his repertoire of appropriate ways to express affection and create an appropriate outlet for sexual behavior.

There may be greater hope in working with an adolescent offender population than an older offender population because many of the adolescents' calloused behavior patterns are not yet ingrained. The opportunities to alter insensitive offender attitudes and improve their empathic skills related to interacting with children are prime at this

point in their offending. The end result of early intervention with juvenile sexual offenders is that the potential for repeating abusive behaviors may be diminished.

Biographical Inventory

To reiterate, in the last analysis, eight biographical inventory items appeared to be answered differently by offenders and nonoffenders. Those items were:

1. Was the loss of a caretaker experienced?
2. What was the number of times you have changed residences?
3. What was the frequency of disagreement you had with your female caretaker?
4. How hard was your father's discipline?
5. Describe your father figure.
6. What was your perception of your father's favorite child?
7. Was there sexual abuse in your family?
8. What are your life goals?

Using these eight biographical inventory items, the discriminant function analysis resulted in a 90% correct classification rate on subjects coded as either "offender" or "nonoffender."

A summary of the eight items will be discussed. This will be followed by educational and counseling implications.

1. It appears that offenders are more likely to have experienced the loss of a caretaker (i.e., a significant adult who raised them) through death, divorce, or separation (48% of the offender group versus 14% of the nonoffender group). In our society it has usually been the father to leave the home. The father figure serves as the same sex role model in identity development. Other influences fill the void of the absent father and too often they are not positive or realistic (e.g., the media - movies, video, television,

popular magazines). It is not surprising that consequences of the father's absence include a decrease in the development of ego strength and an increase in unrealistic expectations of self and others (i.e., idealizing roles of authority and power or identifying with highly visible sexualized figures). Furthermore, in psychoanalytic theory, the father figure is the inhibiting force in the sexual development for male children; with the father being absent, constraint is removed. These offenders develop cognitive distortions regarding acceptable sexual behavior and unhealthy perceptions of sex roles.

2. Offenders in this study also reported moving more than the nonoffenders, resulting in a higher number of residence changes (70% of the offender group reported moving three or more times versus 37% of the nonoffender group). These losses in nurturing and parenting are consistent with the findings of Burgess et al. (1987), and Ryan et al. (1987) in their studies of juvenile sexual offenders. Burgess et al. (1987) and Ryan et al. (1987) found adolescent offenders were less likely than comparison groups to have supportive families and the adolescent offenders also perceived more disruption in their families.

This instability may result in contributing to previously identified findings that juvenile sexual offenders have more behavior and academic school problems and lack friends. Their school and home environments did not provide success experiences according to the 1988 findings of Ferenbach et al. Repeated changes in residence appear to result in a fundamental stress where the juvenile's basic needs for stability and security are not being met. Deep and lasting friendships are not experienced and this may result in perceptions of isolation and dehumanization of self which generalize to others.

The perception of diminished humanness of relationships goes hand in hand with victimizing others. True intimacy is not known and a sexual release may be substituted for the unknown warmth of genuine intimacy.

3. Moreover, offenders perceived considerable conflict with their female caretakers (33% of the offender group versus 16% of the nonoffender group). During the process of establishing independence from family, most adolescents experience conflict. With the offenders in this study, having experienced more instability through moving and losses in parenting through divorce, death, or separation, the female caretaker may be the most available parent. For the female caretaker, this may mean being both the disciplinarian and the nurturer. These offenders may have no other caretaker with which to have conflict. Furthermore, this conflict with the female caretaker may reveal itself in hostility toward females in general.

4. Many offenders described their father's discipline ranging from unpredictable to very severe (37% of the offender group versus 18% of the nonoffender group). On the other hand, the nonoffending group typically described their father's discipline as fair and reasonable to mild and fair. The way a father disciplines does appear important. Teaching appropriate means of child rearing and discipline to both offenders and their parents may reduce the incidence of child sexual abuse as it has been proven to reduce child physical abuse previously. Children learn behavior that is considered acceptable in their home through modeling, especially the modeling of their parents. An aspect of overcoming child sexual abuse may require diminishing the modeling of aggression in the home. Another apparent means to breaking the cycle of child sexual abuse is implementing consistent and reasonable discipline in the home.

Burgess et al. (1987) found that a family history of instability and violence suggests a parental role model for criminality. Additionally, the parent who is also physically abusive in the family may predispose the child to feelings of anger and resentment. In turn, these emotions foster retaliative feelings and fantasy. This goes hand in hand with the sense of powerlessness. The cumulative effect of these elements may result in the

release of aggression through sexually inappropriate outlets.

5. In this study, the majority of offenders described their father figures negatively (74% of the offender group versus 67% of the nonoffender group). It would seem that their father figures were disappointing to them, not meeting their needs of safety and belongingness. This finding and the previous two findings that offenders perceive considerable conflict with female caretakers and that offenders describe their fathers' discipline ranging from unpredictable to very severe confirm Deisher et al. (1982) finding that juvenile sexual offenders lack positive emotional relationships with their caretakers.

6. In contrast, in this study nonoffenders most often answered that they perceived their fathers had no "favorite" child (59%) and offenders answered they perceived they were their father's favorite (39%). If this response is linked to the previous findings regarding caretaker loss and negative descriptions of their father figures, it may be that the offenders may be acting out with younger children some of the inappropriate modeling they received from their father figures. The offenders' basic need for identification/same sex role model is being met, unfortunately, in a negative vein. Perhaps this finding is an artifact, on the other hand.

7. Offenders reported the presence of sexual abuse in their families more often than the nonoffenders (63% of the offender group versus 6% of the nonoffender group). This finding has been evidence many times in the research (Longo, 1982; Ryan, 1986b). Sexual abuse is considered by many to be a learned behavior. Whether or not the sexual abuse focuses on the offender exclusively seems to matter little. The atmosphere in the home regarding sexual behavior would seem to have a greater impact. Of the offending respondents, 17 reported more than one person in their family had been sexually victimized. Only four of the offenders reported they were victimized exclusively. In this study, there was a large amount of missing data, particularly in the

nonoffender group. None of the nonoffending respondents acknowledged any sexual abuse in their families. It seems unlikely that there was no sexual abuse history in any of the nonoffenders' families. Rather than acknowledging abuse, perhaps some did not respond at all.

8. Many offenders had life goals that were externally based (e.g., success) (48%). Nonoffender life goals were primarily internally based (e.g., finding self-satisfaction) (63%). This is not surprising considering offenders are often unaware of their own internal states and feelings. It seems logical that they would turn toward external evidence of success. This may extend to hypothesizing that offenders acknowledge an external locus of control.

Summary

The biographical inventory findings demonstrate once again the importance of individual history, noting life events and circumstances in the growth of human beings. Although the FACES III and FES only evidenced differences between older adolescents and younger adolescents and not between offenders and nonoffenders, this may indicate the need to clarify which specific aspects of early interpersonal experiences with caretakers are critical. From the results of this study, using the AAPI one can conclude family environment remains an important factor to consider in the development of sexually abusive behavior. It is clear, of the four instruments used in this study, the biographical inventory provided the best descriptive profile of the juvenile sexual offenders.

Educational and Counseling Implications

Many skills that may break the cyclical pattern of child sexual abuse can be taught to the juvenile sexual offender. Some of those skills are effective problem solving,

parenting education, and social skills training. Intervention with juvenile sexual offenders is not a simple educational process. Singularly, teaching skills is not enough.

Linked with skill building is the essential component of the therapeutic environment and counselor interaction. The counselor may provide the first example of consistency and clear expectations for the juvenile sexual offender. The therapeutic environment can provide safety and security as the offender discovers similarities in his abusive history and the manner in which he has chosen to abuse others. Visually, only in this counseling setting can the offender sort through the maze of emotion and develop the insight that may reverse his offending behavior. Both the educational and counseling components are necessary for adequate intervention.

Likewise, a single therapeutic orientation cannot adequately address the complexity of sexual offending. A family systems approach, for example, appropriately addresses the entire family's contribution yet may not adequately require the offender to assume the majority of the responsibility for his behavior. A strictly behavioral approach may systematically provide the structure an offender may require but neglect the affective domain. Similarly, a cognitive orientation may address the cognitive distortions but may not attend to the profound emotional ramifications nor provide the structure necessary to monitor the offender's progress and behavior. In addressing the complexity of offending behavior, a holistic approach appears to be parsimonious.

Possible Implications for Future Use of a Biographical Inventory

The biographical inventory samples a wide variety of human experiences and feeling useful in studying the human personality. Even without being a highly constructed inventory, the biographical inventory appeared to be the most useful of the tests used in this study. The use of biographical inventory resembled a clinical

interaction. Consequently, it had clinical relevance, not necessarily measurement relevance.

It was a valuable tool because it kept pace with the intuitive clinical sense. The results of this study implied that the less structured-subjective instrument may provide the most useful information. The present writer had assumed that the FACES, the FES, and the AAPI, developed on careful theoretical foundations, and with constructs that made sense in terms of trying to understand the population under question would prove to be the most useful. However, at least at the present time, the biographical items appear to show more promise, perhaps because of the notions suggested above. If it holds up in further study, the biographical inventory could be used for a variety of purposes such as describing a sample or for providing information about the types of environment and experiential relationships that may help to develop or are related to the behavior of sexual offending. Developmental history and other factors in the juvenile sexual offenders' background that may contribute to their current attitudes and behaviors could possibly be identified.

Demographic information may be helpful in explaining and understanding the current functioning of offenders. In addition to using the biographical inventory items from this study in a confirmatory study, the biographical inventory could be expanded to collect other information for research. Given this suggestion of the potential value of the use of biographical questions, it may be worth exploring those possibilities further.

There are both theoretical and experimental bases for the notion that properly constructed biographical inventories can predict highly complex human behavior more adequately than many other single predictive instruments. The ideas behind such a notion are, briefly, that historical circumstances are important determiners of present and future constitution and that biographical items can be made to cover an extremely wide range of factors relevant to human behavior. In contrast, many predictive and

assessment instruments apparently have been based upon the idea that a few factors explained behavior.

It is interesting to note that in spite of the extensive use of inventories, scales, application blanks, and other instruments with personal history information as their prime component, structured biographical inventories are still not widely used in attempts to understand and predict behavior. In most cases, people using biographical information do not have solid evidence that it works any better than chance, yet they must intuitively believe in it. For example, persons providing professional help make extensive, though often unsystematic use of biographical information. Krapelin (Avieti, 1959) paid attention to personal history in the diagnoses of various types of emotional adjustment, and others since then look seriously at case history material, but little has been done in a formal way to systematically understand and predict this kind of behavior using biographical inventories. However, at various times and in different applications, biographical inventories, or biographical items have proven useful.

A biographical information blank was developed by the military in World War II to predict successful Army officers (Adjutant General's Office (AGO), Report 704, 1946). A split-half reliability study yielded a reliability of .78. The instrument was also keyed to predict success in officer candidate schools. In one school, for two successive classes with Ns of 40-50 (AGO, Report 711) it yielded validities of .45 and .55. Biographical information inventories were used from 1946 on to select regular Army officers. The Air Force has also done considerable work in developing and using such instruments (Taylor, Ghiselin, Wolfer, Loy, & Bourne, 1963).

Cowles and Daley (1949), in writing of the possible value of biographical information, stated that multiple choice inventories of biographical data might be useful

in selecting and training military officers because they measured relevant experience. He further stated that these tests have demonstrated increased utility and flexibility in combination with aptitude tests in classification batteries.

Roe (1953) studied a small group of eminent scientists and reported a greater than chance number of first-born among these men. She also found that the majority came from middle or upper class backgrounds. Their parents were of higher than average educations and had many professional degrees. Many of these men had factors in their histories which suggested an inability to feel a great deal of personal warmth toward others. They expressed rather late development of heterosexual interests, had childhood feelings of isolation, a pattern of general avoidance of intimate personal contacts, and in adult life, had a preference for a limited social life.

Ellison (1960) constructed a 527-item biographical inventory in a study of successful scientists. His detailed analysis of the results on validation suggests that success in science can be predicted on the basis of biographical information, although his study contained no cross validation. Follow-up studies by Taylor and Ellison (1962), however, predicted the creative ratings of scientists on the job with cross validation Pearson correlations of .48 through .59 for a particular research center. They also predicted the number of publications with a cross validation score of .60. When they attempt to predict scientists in a particular research center with an instrument validated on similar scientists in a different research center, the validities still remain as high as .48. These are statistically significant figures. Although no validity coefficients are reported, MacCurdy (1956) and Stein (1956) reported success in using biographical information to predict successful science students and creative scientists, respectively.

Trollinger (1958) noted several biographical factors which differentiated highly creative musicians. Lemkau (1984) developed a biographical questionnaire which showed that people in atypical professions showed specific different background factors

from those who chose more typical professions. Lemkau concluded that these data have extensive value for determining career type and sex typing. Musil (1983) reported on the development of a biographical information inventory that defines motivational, intellectual, sociophysiological and other personality prerequisites of talent. This inventory also distinguishes between scientifically and artistically talented individuals. Musil advocates use of biographical information for the guidance counseling of talented students.

Anastasi, Meade and Scheiders (1960) developed a scoring key from an analysis of 303 biographical items on a sample of 50 students in each of three criterion groups at Fordham in 1958. Analysis of their biographical inventory along with other aptitude, achievement, personality and interest tests indicated that the biographical inventory differentiated more effectively than other predictors.

Glenn and Shelton (1983) related pre-adult background variables and divorce and found that several background factors correlated highly with the likelihood of divorce. Stein and Kleinman (1984) explored the use of a self report family data form for use in developing treatment of distressed families and found many important demographic, historical, and genealogical factors to be important. Although they did not use a biographical questionnaire, Slarney and McHugh (1984) did note many specific and meaningful connections between psychic events and behavior, thus supporting the use of biographical information in understanding and predicting behavior.

Kipnowski and Kipnowski (1981) attempted to discover whether there were biographical and psychological variables of patients with chronically recurrent and chronically continuous forms of colitis ulcerosea. They found high correlation between the course of the disease and alexithymic characteristics.

Schwartz (1982) studies the relationship between life history data and severity of obsessive compulsive and depressive neurosis and outcome of therapy in 36 subjects re-

examined two or more years later. Some data concerning education, professional capacity for work and sexuality correlated with both favorable and unfavorable outcomes. The data also showed that longer treatments resulted in better outcomes.

The above studies support the idea that biographical information is potentially valuable in understanding the characteristics of successful people in many occupational groups as well as the characteristics of people in other kinds of groups, since it can provide information about the types of environment and experiential relationships that help to develop or are related to these characteristics. More specifically this kind of data has been shown to have utilization in predicting and understanding people with emotional and adjustment problems.

As was previously suggested, one reason that biographical information inventories appear to be useful tools is that they sample a very wide variety of human experiences and, therefore, they get at many more facets of a subject's life than is the case with more restricted material such as a vocabulary test or tests of personality, aptitude or intelligence. In fact, biographical questions can probably be devised to cover a very wide range of human experience and feeling. Furthermore, the nature of biographical questions is such that validity and reliability can be computed with ease, thus making it possible to determine the objective value of an instrument with considerable precision.

However, it is difficult to organize all the material which a biographical information inventory can cover into meaningful patterns, and thus much significant information escapes the observer who fails to order or arrange his data carefully. For example, what does 200 bits of information, gained from a like number of biographical questions, add to our knowledge of all people? In fact, it really does not tell us much about classes of people unless we can somehow organize the information into groups of the size and quality that we can handle. Such organization is the essence of science as

Thurstone (1947) described it:

It is the faith of all science that an unlimited number of phenomena can be comprehended in terms of a limited number of concepts or ideal constructs The constructs in terms of which natural phenomena are comprehended are man-made inventions. To discover that a man-made scheme serves to unify and thereby simplify, comprehension of a certain class of natural phenomena

The criterion by which a new ideal construct in science is accepted or rejected is the degree to which it facilitates the comprehension of a class of phenomena which can be thought of as examples of a single construct rather than as individualized events. (44-45)

Thurstone's statement, still valid after 50 years later lends support for the notion that organizing and collecting large quantities of biographical data might provide an accurate way of predicting human behavior and might also be useful in studying the human personality. Many studies of this type are being done, but they are principally concerned with a single or a small number of behaviors or personality interests. Given the large number of studies that have used this kind of information, it is puzzling that there appear to have been no studies which attempted to use a formal biographical information inventory to further our understanding of many different behavior and personality factors that are involved in a wide variety of self-defeating or neurotic behavior, particularly of this important and complex phenomena of child sexual abuse. While the present study is very much tentative and exploratory, it appears to support the value of further explorations of the systematic analysis of biographical items or inventories in our attempts to understand and predict these kinds of behaviors.

Limitations and Recommendations

A limitation of this study is the use of a self-report technique. The assumption is made that the respondents will give an accurate report of their perceptions. Also to be considered is the retrospective nature of their reports. Another limitation of this study may be the homogeneous population studied, i.e., being predominantly caucasian and

L.D.S. The generalizability of the findings would seem to be limited.

These analyses were exploratory in nature. Therefore, future research on juvenile sexual offenders may use the biographical inventory items in a confirmatory study. Because sexual offending is multi-determined and most research is done on incarcerated populations, further research is critically needed on outpatient populations, particularly focusing on both the offenders and their families. Another study would be to see how those offenders who answered 'myself' as the sexual abuse victim in their family of origin answered the other items.

The educational component needs to begin as part of a regular curriculum to proactively address the prevention of child sexual abuse. Skill building can be addressed in the school system to teach social skills and appropriate developmental expectations of others.

REFERENCES

- Adjutant General's Office. (1946). Validation of a program for the selection of officers for retention in the peace time army. (Report No. 704). Washington, DC: Personnel Research Section, War Department.
- Adjutant General's Office. (1946). Prediction of leadership qualifications of officer candidates in the signal corps. (Report No. 711). Washington, DC: Personnel Research Section, War Department.
- Anastasi, A., Meade, J. J., & Scheiders, A. A. (1960). The validation of a biographical inventory as a predictor of college success. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Avieti, S. (1959). American handbook of psychiatry. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bavolek, S. J., Kline, D. F., McLaughlin, P., & Publicover, R. (1978). The development of the adolescent parenting inventory (API): Identification of high risk adolescents prior to parenthood. Logan: Utah State University, Department of Special Education.
- Bavolek, S. J., Kline, D. F., McLaughlin, J. A., & Publicover, P. R. (1979). Primary prevention of child abuse and neglect: Identification of high-risk adolescents. Child Abuse and Neglect, 3, 1071-1080.
- Bavolek, S. J., Kline, D. F., McLaughlin, P., & Publicover, R. (1989). Assessing and treating high risk parenting attitudes. In J. T. Pardeck, (Ed.), Child abuse and neglect: Theory, research, and practice (pp. 97-110). New York: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.
- Becker, J. V., Cunningham-Rathner, J., & Kaplan, M. S. (1986). Adolescent

sexual offenders demographics, criminal and sexual histories, and recommendations for reducing further offenses. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1, 431-445.

- Becker, J. V., Kaplan, M. S., Cunningham-Rathner, J., & Kavoussi, R. (1986). Characteristics of adolescent incest sexual perpetrators: Preliminary findings. Journal of Family Violence, 1(1), 85-97.
- Bera, W. H. (1985). A preliminary investigation of a typology of adolescent sex offenders and their family systems. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Burgess, A. W., Hartman, C. R., & McCormack, A. (1987). Abused to abuser: Antecedents of socially deviant behaviors. Psychiatry, 144, 1431-1436.
- Cowles, J. T., & Daley, J. T. (1949). The utility of biographical inventories in classification test batteries. American Psychologist, 51, 43-46.
- Davis, G. E., & Leitenberg, H. (1987). Adolescent sex offenders. Psychological Bulletin, 101, 417-427.
- Deisher, R. W., Wenet, G. A., Paperny, D. M., Clark, T. F., & Fehrenbach, P. A. (1982). Adolescent sexual offense behavior: The role of the physician. Journal of Adolescent Health Care, 2, 279-286.
- Earls, C. M. (1983). Some issues in the assessment of sexual deviance. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 6(3-4), 431-441.
- Ellison, R. L. (1960). The relationship of certain biographical information to success in science. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.
- Ferenbach, P. A., & Monastersky, C. (1988). Characteristics of female adolescent sexual offenders. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 58(1), 148-151.

- Finklehor, D. (1984). Child sexual abuse new theory and research. New York: The Free Press.
- Friedrich, W. N., & Luecke, W. J. (1988). Young school-age sexually aggressive children. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, *19*, 155-164.
- Fuhr, R., & Engleman, S. R. (1988). Use of the Family Environment Scale to elucidate child abuse dynamics. Unpublished manuscript.
- Gilgun, J. F. (1988, October). Factors which block the development of sexually abusive behavior in adults abused and neglected as children. Paper presented at the National Conference on Male Victims and Offenders: Controversies in Treatment, Minneapolis, MN.
- Glenn, N. D., & Shelton, B. A. (1983). Pre-adult background variables and divorce: A note of caution about over reliance on explained variance. Journal of Marriage and the Family, *45*, 405-410.
- Groth, A. N. (1977). The adolescent sexual offender and his prey. International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology, *21*, 249-254.
- Halperin, S. L. (1981). Abused and non-abused children's perceptions of their mothers, fathers, and siblings: Implications for a comprehensive family treatment plan. Family Relations, *30*, 89-96.
- James, B., & Nasjlehi, M. (1983). Treating sexually abused children and their families. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Kavoussi, R. J., Kaplan, M., & Becker, J. V. (1988). Psychiatric diagnoses in adolescent sex offenders. Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, *27*, 241-243.
- Kipnowski, J., & Kipnowski, A. (1981). Psychosomatic contribution to the etiopathogenesis of colitis ulcerosa. Aeitschrift fur Psychosomatice Medizin un and Psychoanalyse, *27*, 372-380.

- Lemkau, J. P. (1984). Men in female-dominated professions: Distinguishing personality and background features. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 24(1), 110-122.
- Lewis, D. O., Shankok, S. S., & Pincus, J. H. (1979). Juvenile male sexual assaulters. American Journal of Psychiatry, 136, 1194-1196.
- Longo, R. E. (1982). Sexual learning and experience among adolescent sexual offenders. International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology, 26(3), 235-241.
- Longo, R. E., & Groth, A. N. (1983). Juvenile sexual offenses in the histories of adult rapists and child molesters. International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology, 27(2), 150-155.
- MacCurdy, R. D. (1956). Characteristics of superior science students and source factors that were found in their backgrounds. In C. W. Taylor (Ed.), The 1955 University of Utah Research Conference on the Identification of Creative Scientific Talent. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.
- Mayer, A. (1988). Sex offenders. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc.
- Mio, J. S., Nanjundappa, G., Verleur, D. E., & de Rios, M. D. (1986). Drug abuse and the adolescent sex offender: A preliminary analysis. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 18(1), 65-72.
- Moos, R., Clayton, J., & Max, W. (1979). The Social Climate Scales (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Moos, R., & Moos, B. (1986). Family Environment Scale (b) manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Musil, M. (1983). Biographical approach to searching out talents. Ceskoslovenskan Psychologie, 27(2), 138-141.

- National Adolescent Perpetrator Network (1988). Preliminary Report from the National Task Force on juvenile sexual offending, 1988. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 39(2), 1-49.
- O'Brien, M. J. (1989). Characteristics of male adolescent sibling incest offenders: Preliminary findings. Orwell, VT: The Safer Society Press.
- Olson, D. H., Portner, J., & Lavee, Y. (1985). FACES III Test Manual. St. Paul, MN: Family Social Science, University of Minnesota.
- Paperny, D. M., & Deisher, R. W. (1983). Maltreatment of adolescents: The relationship to a predisposition toward violent behavior and delinquency. Adolescence, 18, 499-506.
- Prentky, R. A., Knight, R. A., Straus, H., Rokous, F., Cerce, O., & Sims-Knight, J. E. (in press). Developmental antecedents of sexual aggression. Development and Psychopathology.
- Providing a continuum of care for the adolescent sex offender (1987). Sacramento, CA: Department of the Youth Authority Office of Criminal Justice Planning.
- Roe, A. (1953). A psychological study of eminent psychologists and anthropologists, and a comparison with biological and physical scientists. Psychology Monograph, 67(2).
- Ross, J. E., & Loss, P. (1988). Risk assessment, interviewing protocol for adolescent sex offenders. Paper presented at the Adolescent Sex Offender Symposium, Wellsville, UT.
- Ryan, G. (1986a, June). Treating the juvenile sexual abuse perpetrator. Interchange, 5-7.
- Ryan, G. (1986b). Annotated bibliography: Adolescent perpetrators of sexual molestation of children. Child Abuse and Neglect, 10, 125-131.
- Ryan, G., Lane, S., Davis, J., & Isaac, C. (1987). Juvenile sex offenders:

- Development and correction. Child Abuse and Neglect, 11, 385-395.
- Sack, W. H., & Mason, R. (1980). Child abuse and conviction of sexual crimes: A preliminary finding. Law and Human Behavior, 4, 211-215.
- Salter, A. C. (1988) Treating child sex offenders and victims: A practical guide. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Saunders, E., Awad, G. A., & White, G. (1986). Male adolescent sexual offenders: The offender and the offense. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 31, 542-549.
- Schwartz, F. (1982). Prognostic factors in neurotic-depressive and obsessive-compulsive in patients treated with analytic group psychotherapy. Zeitschrift für Psychosomatische Medizin und Psychoanalyse, 28(1), 30-51.
- Sfarbi, R. (1987). Adolescent sexual offenders: A descriptive study of family characteristics and intergenerational communication about sexuality. Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 10-A. (University Microfilms No. 8703274)
- Shoor, M., Speed, M. H., & Bartlet, C. (1965, May). Syndrome of the adolescent child molester. Paper presented at the 121st Annual Meeting of American Psychiatric Association, New York, NY.
- Slarney, P. R., & McHugh, P. R. (1984). Life stories and meaningful connections. Reflections on a clinical method in psychiatry and medicine. Perspectives in Biology and Medicine, 27, 279-288.
- Smith, W. R., & Monastersky, C. (1986). Assessing juvenile sexual offenders' risk for reoffending. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 13(2), 115-140.
- Stein, A., & Kleinman, J. (1984). A self report family data form for family therapy. Journal of Family Therapy, 6(1), 63-67.
- Stein, M. I. (1956). A transactional approach to creativity. In C. W. Taylor

- (Ed.), The 1955 University of Utah Research Conference on the Identification of Creative Scientific Talent. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.
- Stenson, P., & Anderson, C. (1987). Treating juvenile sex offenders and preventing the cycle of abuse. Journal of Child Care, 3(2), 91-102.
- Taylor, C. W., Ghiselin, B., Wolfer, J. A., Loy, L., & Bourne, L. E., Jr. (1963). Development of a theory of education from psychological and other basic research findings. Mimeographed report.
- Thurstone, L. L. (1947). Multiple factor analysis. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Tingle, D., Barnard, G. W., Robbins, L., Newman, G., & Hutchinson, D. (1986). Childhood and adolescent characteristics of pedophiles and rapists. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 9(1), 103-116.
- Trollinger, L. M. (1958). Interests, activities, and hobbies of high and low creative women musicians during childhood, adolescent, and college years. Gifted Child Quarterly, 27(2), 94-97.
- The Utah report on juvenile sex offenders. (1989). (Report for U.S. Dept. of Justice Grant No. 87-JF-CX-0049). Price, UT: Utah Network on Juveniles Offending Sexually.
- Weiks, J. C., & Lehker, D. (1988). Specialized treatment of adolescent sex offenders in a juvenile court setting. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 39(1), 29-35.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
ISAT Letter of Support

I.S.A.T. CENTERS

71

INTERMOUNTAIN SEXUAL ABUSE TREATMENT CENTER

C.Y. ROBY, Ph.D.
Clinical Psychologist
Executive Director

May 30, 1988

Dr. Elwin Nielsen, Chairperson
Ivan Trottier Dissertation Committee
Department of Psychology
Utah State University, Utah

Dear Dr. Nielsen:

The Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment Center is aware that Iva Trottier is interested in studying juvenile and adult sex offenders. We are supportive of this endeavor and will allow her to have access to our facilities and access to the client files of consenting subjects.

It is I.S.A.T.'s policy to encourage research on sexual abuse, and we are pleased that Iva is taking on such a project. Please let us know if we can be of any help or answer any questions.

Sincerely,



Becky Valcarce, M. S.
I.S.A.T. Clinical Director

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Nicholas G. Smith, President
Ed Bingham, Vice President
Valerie Mercer, Secretary-Treasurer
T.H. Bell
Wendover Brown
Lindy Burton
Lynne Foulger
JoAnn Frost
Craig F. Huntington
Nancy Nissalka
Lorin Pugh
Warren Pugh
Marion Smith
Douglas Sonntag
Phyllis Southwick
Olene Walker
Minna F. Work



INTERMOUNTAIN SEXUAL ABUSE TREATMENT CENTERS
1800 SOUTH WEST TEMPLE, SUITE 421, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84115 / (801) 486-9805
ISAT: UTAH VALLEY REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER, PROVO, UTAH 84603 (801) 379-7337
95 WEST 100 SOUTH, SUITE #230, LOGAN, UTAH 84321-1204 (801) 753-5411
23 SOUTH CARBON AVENUE, SUITE #9, PRICE, UTAH 84501 (801) 637-5635
520 SOUTH MAIN, SUITE C, CEDAR CITY, UTAH 84720 (801) 586-5966
FUNDED IN PART BY UNITED WAY AND UTAH STATE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Appendix B
Consent Form & Agreement
Utah State University
Local Research Project

Consent Form & Agreement

Utah State University

Local Research Project

Principal Investigator: Elwin Nielsen, Ph.D.

Informed Consent

Name:

Date:

Description of the Project

This research project is designed to study people's perceptions of their family relationships.

If you decide to voluntarily participate in this project, your reading level will be determined from a very brief reading screen, Wide Range Achievement Test-2 Revised, WRAT-2R, you will be asked to complete a Family Environment Scale, FES, Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales, FACES-III, and Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory, AAPI, and a brief self-report. The FES and FACES III offer subjects a brief way of describing their families. The AAPI is a report on a subject's beliefs about parenting and the self-report asks general information about the subject's values and family history. In total, these questionnaires should take about an hour to complete.

By participating in this research, you will be assisting in the development of new knowledge, that may provide for a better understanding of family dynamics. This knowledge may be of help to you and to others in the future.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. The information obtained during the study will be kept strictly confidential and used for research purposes only.

If you have any questions about this project, you may contact the following:

Iva W. Trottier, Ph.D. Student 753-5411

Elwin Nielsen, Ph.D., Principal Investigator 750-1463

Appendix C
Consent Agreement

Consent Agreement

I understand the nature of this study and hereby agree voluntarily to participate in it. I understand that I can withdraw from the Project at any time, that I will not be penalized or suffer any other harm because of such withdrawal, and that my participation will have no effect on my class grade or treatment. I understand that the research records will be treated in strict confidence by the investigators and no one will be able to identify me from any material written or presented.

Signature

Date

Parent/ Guardian

Date

Witness

Date

Under Utah State Law, any report of abuse must be reported to the Utah Division of Family Services.

Appendix D
Biographical Inventory

Biographical Inventory

Caretaker means the main adult or adults who raised you. A caretaker could be parent(s), step-parent(s), grandparent(s), foster parent(s), adoptive parent(s), other relatives, etc. Father/mother are sometimes used in this inventory to mean caretaker.

1. Please state your age. _____
2. Of what ethnic origin are you?

a. White/Caucasian	d. Asian
b. Black	e. American Indian
c. Hispanic	f. Other
3. How many sisters do you have? _____
4. How many brothers do you have? _____
5. What was your position in order of birth? (This means were you the youngest, oldest, etc.)
 - a. First
 - b. Second
 - c. Third
 - d. Fourth
 - e. Fifth child or more
 - f. Don't know/wasn't told
6. Was your birth planned?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know/was never told
7. Have you been adopted? _____
8. During most of your childhood up to age 13, you were living with:
 - a. both parents (adopted or biological).
 - b. one parent (adopted or biological).
 - c. parent with step-parent.
 - d. legal guardian.
 - e. grandparent(s).
 - f. other (please indicate) _____
9. Since your birth, how many caretakers have you lived with?

10. If you have experienced the death of a parent(s) or divorce or separation of your parents, how old were you when it occurred?
-
11. Up to the time you were 18, how many times did you change residences?
- a. None
 - b. Once
 - c. Twice
 - d. Three times
 - e. Four times
 - f. Five or more times
12. As a small child (under 3 years of age) were you happy and active?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Average
 - d. Don't know/was never told
13. From what you have been told, were you sick very often in the first few years of your life?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know/was never told
14. Who has influenced you the most as to what you do with your spare time?
- a. My parents.
 - b. My brothers or sisters.
 - c. My teachers or other adults.
 - d. My friends.
 - e. Myself.
15. The feelings toward each other among those in your family were
- a. quite warm and loving.
 - b. somewhat warm.
 - c. somewhat cold.
 - d. quite cold.
 - e. neither warm nor cold.
16. Throughout most of your life, what kind of friends have you made? (Close friend is someone you can comfortably tell secrets to.)
- a. I had no close friends.
 - b. I had one close friend.
 - c. I had a few close friends.
 - d. I had many close friends.

17. Which of the following best describes your feeling toward small children?
- Dislike them very much.
 - They annoy me, but I tolerate them.
 - They don't affect me much one way or another.
 - I understand and enjoy them.
18. How did you feel about the home you were raised in?
- I was very happy and could see practically no way of improving the situation.
 - I was happy but there were ways in which it could have been improved.
 - I was fairly happy but there were many ways in which it could have be improved.
 - I was rather unhappy with my home because so many things were wrong.
 - I was very unhappy with my home and I found little satisfaction there.
19. Which of the following best describes your present relationship with your mother?
- A very warm relationship.
 - A somewhat warm relationship.
 - An indifferent relationship.
 - A cold relationship.
 - Does not apply.
20. How much disagreement or trouble have you had with the female who raised you? (Mother, step-mother, grandmother, guardian, etc.)
- None
 - Some
 - Considerable
 - A great deal
21. How much disagreement have you had with the male who raised you? (Father, step-father, grandfather, guardian, etc.)
- None
 - Some
 - Considerable
 - A great deal.
22. When you were in high school, which of the following statements best describes how you felt towards your parents (or guardian)?
- I was very much afraid of one or both.
 - I was somewhat afraid of one or both.
 - I was mildly afraid of one or both.
 - I was not at all afraid of either one.
23. What is your impression of the marital happiness of the parents or guardians that raised you?
- Very happy
 - Fairly happy
 - Fairly unhappy

- d. Very unhappy
 - e. Neither happy nor unhappy
 - f. Don't know
24. About how old was your father when you were born?
- a. Under 20
 - b. 21 to 25
 - c. 26 to 30
 - d. 31 to 35
 - e. Over 35
 - f. Don't know
25. About how old was your mother when you were born?
- a. Under 20
 - b. 21 to 25
 - c. 26 to 30
 - d. 31 to 35
 - e. Over 35
 - f. Don't know
26. Which one of the following words would best describe the male who raised you?
- a. Considerate (toward you)
 - b. Tolerant (toward you)
 - c. Forceful (toward you)
 - d. Stern (toward you)
 - e. Understanding (toward you)
 - f. Patient (toward you)
27. Which of the following best describes your present relationship with your male caretaker?
- a. Very warm relationship.
 - b. A somewhat warm relationship.
 - c. An indifferent relationship.
 - d. A cold relationship.
 - e. Does not apply.
28. During your early teens, who made decisions about your activities and restrictions?
- a. Generally my father.
 - b. Generally my mother.
 - c. About equally by my mother and father.
 - d. Generally left up to me.
 - e. Usually someone other than me or my parents.

29. How protective was your father?
- Let me do most things and stopped me only when there was real danger.
 - Encouraged me to take risks.
 - Wouldn't let me do a lot of things because he was afraid I might get hurt.
 - Let me do anything I wanted and never interfered.
 - Pushed me into doing things that I was afraid of.
30. How much did your father criticize you?
- Never
 - Very little
 - Some
 - Often
 - Most of the time
31. How hard on you was your father when he disciplined you for doing something wrong?
- Fair and reasonable.
 - Mild, fair most of the time.
 - Unpredictable.
 - Very severe and unreasonable.
32. How often did your father explain his rules for you instead of just ordering you what to do?
- Almost always explained them to me.
 - More often explained them to me rather than ordered me.
 - More often ordered me what to do rather than explained them to me.
 - Almost always ordered me what to do.
33. How protective was your mother?
- Wouldn't let me do a lot of things because she was afraid I might get hurt.
 - Let me do most things and stopped me only when there was real danger.
 - Encouraged me to take risks.
 - Pushed me into doing things that I was afraid of.
34. How affectionate was your mother?
- Very unaffectionate
 - Rather unaffectionate
 - Rather affectionate
 - Very affectionate

35. How hard on you was your mother when she punished you?
- Very easy
 - Somewhat easy
 - Rather hard
 - Severe
36. How much do you think your father "spoiled" you?
- Very much
 - Somewhat
 - Very little
 - Never spoiled me
37. How much do you think your mother "spoiled" you?
- Very much
 - Somewhat
 - Very little
 - Never spoiled me
38. How did your mother punish you when you were a child?
- Most often spanked or whipped me.
 - Yelled at me.
 - Sometimes spanked me and sometimes just talked to me.
 - Most often just talked to me.
 - Grounded or restricted me.
 - Other ways than above.
39. How did your father punish you when you were a child?
- Most often spanked or whipped me.
 - Yelled at me.
 - Sometimes spanked me and sometimes just talked to me.
 - Most often just talked to me.
 - Grounded or restricted me.
 - Other ways than above.
40. Your mother's favorite child was
- your brother.
 - your sister.
 - yourself.
 - she didn't have a favorite.
 - (you were an only child).

41. Your father's favorite child was
- your brother.
 - your sister.
 - yourself.
 - he didn't have a favorite.
 - (you were an only child).
42. Regardless of your family's (the family who raised you) true income, what do you remember their income level to be?
- Lower than average.
 - Average/ middle income.
 - Higher than average.
 - Don't know or don't remember.
43. Has there been any sexual abuse in the family you grew up in? _____ If yes, who was the victim?
- | | |
|-----------|-------------------------|
| a. Myself | d. Sister |
| b. Mother | e. Brother |
| c. Father | f. More than one victim |
44. If there has been sexual abuse in the family you grew up in, who was the offender?
- Mother
 - Father
 - Sister
 - Brother
 - Other family member living in your home
 - Other
 - Myself
 - More than one offender
 - Friend of the family
 - Don't know
45. What was your main source of sex education?
- Parent(s)
 - Siblings
 - Friends
 - School
 - Media (magazines, movies, videos, t.v.)
 - Church
 - Other
46. About how old were you when you were first exposed to sex (saw someone having sexual contact or had some sexual contact yourself)?

47. When you see someone else make a mistake, what do you usually do?
- I always tell him right away.
 - I usually make an effort to tell him.
 - I tell him if it will keep him out of trouble.
 - I wait until he asks me about it.
 - I let him worry about his own mistakes.
48. I feel that the most important goal in life is to
- win friends.
 - be successful.
 - achieve happiness.
 - take whatever comes.
 - find self-satisfaction.
49. How often do you feel self-conscious?
- Very frequently
 - Quite often
 - Occasionally
 - Rarely
 - Never
50. When dating, have you usually dated just one person steadily?
- Yes
 - No, I date different boys/ girls fairly often.
 - I date too rarely to say.
51. What do/ did your teachers think of you?
- Able to get things done easily.
 - A hard worker.
 - Work only hard enough to get by.
 - Not interested in school subjects.
52. How have you felt about school?
- Liked it very much.
 - Liked it most of the time.
 - Just accepted it as necessary.
 - Often a little unhappy with it.
 - Disliked it and will be glad to finish.
53. Generally, how do you most often solve a problem?
- Studying it out alone.
 - Discussing it with others.
 - Both of the above about equally.

54. How well have you been able to concentrate on work, studies, or other important matters?
- a. No trouble.
 - b. A little trouble.
 - c. Quite a bit of trouble.
 - d. A great deal of trouble.
55. How often do you use alcohol/ drugs?
- a. Never
 - b. Seldom (one to three times a year)
 - c. Occasionally (four to ten times a year)
 - d. Regularly (two to three times a month)
 - e. Often (more than once a week)
56. How important is it to you that your peers admire or recognize your work?
- a. Very important
 - b. Important
 - c. Not too important
 - d. Not important at all
57. What was your grade average from 7th grade on? (A+ , A, A-, B+ , B, B-, C+ , C, C-, D+ , D, D-, F) _____
58. Where have you gained the most knowledge about life?
- a. School.
 - b. From my family and home environment.
 - c. Reading on my own, outside of school work.
 - d. My own observations.
 - e. Church.
59. What religion are you? _____
60. How important is your religion to you?
- a. Not at all important.
 - b. Somewhat important.
 - c. Considerable important.
 - d. Very much important.
 - e. Don't have a religion.
61. How much do you apply yourself to your work or school work?
- a. To a great extent.
 - b. To a some extent.
 - c. To a small extent.

62. How do you feel when someone points out a mistake you made?
- a. Greatly resent it.
 - b. Tend to resent it.
 - c. No particular reaction.
 - d. Can accept it well.
63. How curious are you?
- a. Very curious about many things.
 - b. About average in curiosity.
 - c. Probably less curious than average.
64. What is your ability to look at things from new and different point of view?
- a. Excellent
 - b. Somewhat above average.
 - c. About average/ good.
 - d. Somewhat below average.
65. Which are you most likely to be?
- a. Forward and rather outspoken.
 - b. Rather quiet and reserved.
66. Compared with most of your peers, how easily do you make friends?
- a. Much easier.
 - b. A little easier.
 - c. With the same effort.
 - d. A little harder.
 - e. A great deal harder.
67. Compared with your friends, how well are you able to understand things before they are fully explained?
- a. Excellent
 - b. Somewhat above average
 - c. About average.
 - d. Somewhat below average.
68. How often do you try to please other people?
- a. Always.
 - b. Most of the time.
 - c. Sometimes.
 - d. Seldom or never.
69. How important is it to you to be popular with other people?
- a. A matter of extreme importance.
 - b. Somewhat important in life.
 - c. Something which concerns me very slightly.
 - d. Something to be ignored.

70. Do you have or have you had someone you could tell your deep inner feelings to?
- Yes
 - No
71. How have you felt when you made a mistake on a test or an important task at work?
- Very unhappy.
 - Doesn't bother me too much.
 - Doesn't bother me at all.
72. How good is your memory?
- Excellent
 - Good
 - Below average
73. Compared to your friends, how sensitive are you to criticism?
- Quite sensitive.
 - Rather sensitive.
 - Insensitive.
74. What do you do when your opinions differ from others?
- Generally keep them to yourself.
 - Usually express them only to friends.
 - Usually express them to anyone.
75. When you have a rather humiliating experience, how long do you worry about it?
- It doesn't bother me at all.
 - It bothers me for a little while but not for long.
 - I occasionally worry about it for a long time.
 - I quite often worry about it for a long time.
76. How do you behave when things do not go right?
- Tend to become moody and cross.
 - Don't let it bother me; manage to remain cheerful and good natured.
 - It bothers me but I don't take it out on other people.
77. How would you describe yourself?
- A doer.
 - A thinker.

78. When things get tough for you, do you
- feel like fighting back.
 - feel like forgetting the whole situation.
 - talk to someone.
 - feel like running away.
79. Do you think you are most often regarded as
- very sensitive.
 - over-confident ("cocky").
 - independent and different.
 - physically lazy (but not mentally lazy).
 - shy.
80. Which one of these characteristics bothers you most in people you meet?
- Bragging.
 - Lack of initiative.
 - Trying to get something for nothing.
 - Being very competitive.
 - Lack of imagination.
 - Being inconsiderate of others.
81. How well do you understand what makes other people 'tick'?
- Extremely well.
 - Very well but sometimes wrong.
 - Have a hard time figuring people out.
82. How often do you have a desire to be alone with your own thoughts and interests?
- Frequently
 - Sometimes
 - Rarely
 - Almost never
83. How important is it to you to be independent?
- Very important
 - Not very important
 - Not important
 - Don't know
84. How important is it to you to be financially successful?
- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| a. Very important | c. Not important |
| b. Not very important | d. Don't know |

- c. Not important
 - d. Don't know
85. How well can you think under pressure?
- a. Very well.
 - b. About average.
 - c. Get a little rattled under pressure.
86. Which one of the following is the most important to you?
- a. Money
 - b. People
 - c. Ideas
 - d. Things
 - e. Don't know
87. In daily work situations, which one of the following would be most important to you?
- a. Profit.
 - b. Fame.
 - c. Power.
 - d. Security.
 - e. Self-expression.
88. Which one of the following best describes you?
- a. Want to be successful in order to make my family proud of me.
 - b. Want to be successful in order to help others.
 - c. Want to be successful to please myself.
 - d. Don't know or does not apply.
89. How do you compare with all other people in popularity?
- a. I am above average.
 - b. I am about average.
 - c. I am below average.
90. How do you compare with all people in creativity and imagination?
- a. I am above average.
 - b. I am about average.
 - c. I am below average.
91. When you have a difficult task to perform, what do you usually do?
- a. Ask someone else to do it for me.
 - b. Ask someone else to show me or help me.
 - c. Look up methods in a book or manual.
 - d. Try to work it out alone.
 - e. Look for some other approach.
92. How often do you have difficulty expressing your feelings in words?
- a. Often
 - b. Occasionally
 - c. Rarely

93. About how long have you been in counseling/ therapy? _____
94. Number of arrests you've had for any offense? _____
95. Number of arrests you've had for sexual offenses? _____
96. How many times have you been in detention? _____
97. How do you feel about filling in a questionnaire such as this one?
- a. I enjoyed it.
 - b. I found it interesting, I didn't mind doing it.
 - c. It was a pain; I resented it.

VITA

IVA W. TROTTIER

Residence:

105 Grant Chamberlain Drive
Apt. 1-E
Bozeman, Montana 59715
(406) 586-6873

Work:

Counseling & Psychological Services
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59717
(406) 974-4531

Education: Doctoral Student in Professional-Scientific Psychology, (Clinical Emphasis, APA Approved)
Projected Completion Date: September, 1991
Utah State University, Logan, Utah

MA Special Education, June 1977
University of South Dakota, Vermillion, South Dakota

BS Rehabilitation & Related Services, June 1976
Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana

Clinical Experience:**Inter, pre-doctoral**

Counseling & Psychological Services
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana

Supervisors: Kathleen O'Malley, Ph.D.
Michael Waldo, Ph.D.
Cheryl Blank, Ph.D.

September 1990 to present

(43 hours per week)

Responsibilities: Provide individual, couples, family, and group therapy. The focus of group work is on support for a group of minority females on campus and therapy for a group of adult children of alcoholics. Assertiveness training for Native Americans, an Empowerment Workshop for Native American Women, and presentations on Native American Mental Health Issues are also a priority use of time. Psychological and chemical dependency evaluations are completed. On-going meetings on research projects, assessments, and psychopharmacology are attended as well as in-service training meetings on current concerns. Individual and group supervision is provided.

Mental Health Specialist
USPHS Indian Health Service
Ft. Washakie, Wyoming

Supervisor: Bruce Jones, Ed.D.

June 1990 to August 1990 (40 hours per week)

Responsibilities: Worked primarily on special inter-agency projects gathering data, entering it into a computer, and providing a summary of the data. The topic areas were "suicide" and "child abuse." Provided crisis intervention and individual therapy. Most frequently encountered issues were child abuse and alcohol-related crises. Provided community presentations on child abuse.

Therapist
Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment Center
Logan, Utah

Supervisors: Carolyn Barcus, Ed.D.
Jill Morgan, L.C.S.W.
Becky Valcarce, S.S.W.

May 1988 to May 1990 (15 hours per week)

Responsibilities: Provide individual, group and family therapy in the context of "family focused" treatment which supports family members with the required services and provides the necessary support for the abuse victim. Work with male and female child victims and female adolescent victims of sexual abuse, child and adolescent sexual offenders, siblings of abuse victims, parents of abuse victims, and adults who were molested as children. Use theoretical orientation of multi-modal therapy implementing play therapy, art therapy, rededication therapy, behavior modification, and other approaches such as family systems work, transactional analysis, and rational emotive therapy when indicated. Lead time limited focused therapy groups for preschool, young female, pre-adolescent female, and adolescent female victim groups. Co-lead an on-going therapy group for young female adolescent victims.

Practicum Therapist (Counseling Psychology)
Utah State University Counseling Center
Utah State University, Logan, Utah

Supervisors: Shirley Hervey, Ph.D.
Dave Bush, Ph.D.

September 1989 to present (12 hours per week)

Responsibilities: Provide individual psychotherapy. Individual client work includes eating disorders, marital and interpersonal problems. Conduct intake interviews with new clients and present cases to staff.

Utah State University Psychology Department
Community Clinic, Utah State University, Logan, Utah

Supervisors: Joan Klienke, Ed.D.
Jay Skidmore, Ph.D.

January 1989 to August 1989 (12 hours per week)

Responsibilities: Provided individual, marital, and family therapy. Conducted intake interview. Conducted psychological assessments including interviewing, administration of objective and projective tests, test interpretation and report writing. Psychotherapy with adult clients with a variety of presenting problems and diagnoses, including depression, personality disorders, bereavement issues, interpersonal difficulties, adjustment to adult life changes, and marital problems. Presented cases to practicum group, including videotape samples of work.

Practicum Intern (School Psychology)
Developmental Center for Handicapped Persons
Utah State University, Logan, Utah

Supervisors: Phyllis Cole, Ph.D.
Carolyn Barcus, Ed.D.

June 1988 to December 1988 (12 hours per week)

Responsibilities: Served as team member of multidisciplinary team. Conducted psychological assessments including: parent and child interviews, administration of intellectual, projective, and achievement tests, and assistance in report writing.

Mental Health Specialist

USPHS Indian Health Service

Poplar, Montana (5 years 5 months) (Crow Agency 2 years 2 months)

Supervisors: Christine Peterson, M.S.W.
Victor Guarino, Ph.D.January 1978 to June 1987 (about a one and a half year break in service)
(43 hours per week)

Provided individual, group, marital, and family therapy. Conducted intake interviews and presented cases for review. Worked with clients with a variety of diagnoses, ranging from situational stress to chemical dependency to personality disorders. Used theoretical orientation of multi-modal therapy primarily, but included other approaches, such as rational emotive therapy and rededication relaxation training and family systems work. Lead focused therapy groups on sexual abuse and parenting. Provided workshops for community meetings and in-service training for staff on children of alcoholics and sexual abuse.

Professional Presentations:

- Trottier, I. (1989, September). Physical and Sexual Abuse of Children. Presentation for the Indian Health Service, Wind River, Wyoming.
- Trottier, I. (1989, August). Juvenile Sexual Offenders. Presentation at the Second Annual Convention of North American Indian/ Native Psychologists and Psychology Graduate Students, Logan, Utah.
- Trottier, I. (1989, July). Interviewing Sexually Abused Children. Presentation at the national conference, Working Together for American Indian/ Alaskan Native Youth, Denver, Colorado.
- DeBruyn, L. & Trottier, I. (1989, June). Effective Community Intervention. Presentation at the national conference, Promoting Child Protection in Indian Country, Green Bay, Wisconsin.
- Trottier, I. (1988, March). Juvenile Sexual Offenders. Presentation at Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota.
- Trottier, I. & DeBruyn, L. (1987, November). And Justice for All, Even the Victims. Presentation at the Ninth National Indian/ Alaska Native Health Conference, Indian Health-Consumer Challenges, Seattle, Washington.
- Trottier, I. (1987, June). Victims Becoming Offenders. Presentation at a seminar at Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana.
- Trottier, I. (1987, May). Abuse of Children in Indian Country. Presentation for the Indian Education Meeting, Great Falls, Montana.

- Trottier, I. (1987, May). Sexual Abuse of Children. Presentation at National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA) Conference, Scottsdale, Arizona.
- Trottier, I. (1987, April). Child Sexual Abuse in Indian Communities. Presentation at the National Indian Health Board's Area Representatives Meeting in Nashville, Tennessee.
- Trottier, I. (1987, March). Generations of Abuse in Indian Country. Presentation at NOVA Training, Washington, D.C.
- Trottier, I. (1986, December). Child Abuse and Neglect. Presentation at Crow Tribe HeadStart, Crow Agency, Montana.
- Trottier, Iva (1986, October). Sexual Offenders Can be Juveniles: Identification and Treatment. Presentation at the Eighth Annual National Indian and Alaska Native Health Conference, Rapid City, South Dakota.
- Trottier, Iva (1986, September). Child Sexual Abuse. Presentation at St. Labre Cheyenne Home, Ashland, Montana.
- Trottier, I. (1986, May). Therapy for Sexually Abused Children Ages 5-12. Presentation at the 4th Annual National American Indian Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect, Denver, Colorado.

Numerous other in-service presentations and presentations to communities, school districts, HeadStarts, and Indian tribes, primarily in Montana, from 1984 to 1987.

Papers and Publications:

- Trottier, I. (1989, February). Prevention of child sexual abuse requires increased awareness, education. National Indian Health Board Reporter, 4(13).
- Trottier, I. (1986-1987). A newspaper series (nine articles) entitled: What Triggers Family Violence? in the Wotanin, Poplar, Montana.
- Trottier, I. (1986). Ways parents can build a child's self-esteem. Wotanin, Poplar, Montana.
- Trottier, I. (1986). Written testimony in U.S. Senate on Sexual Abuse of Children in Indian Country, S1818, which later became PL 99-303.

Additional Training Experiences and Workshops

The National Training Conference on the Treatment of Juvenile Sex Offenders
Attended one day in Salt Lake City, Utah, October, 1989.

Off the Beaten Path. . . Putting an End to Child Abuse & Neglect

The Eighth National Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect
Attended three days of workshops and presentations in Salt Lake City, Utah,
October, 1989.

Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment Conference

Attended one day of presentations in Logan, Utah, September, 1989.

Gestalt Therapy Techniques with Children and Adolescents

Violet Oaklander, Ph.D.

One day workshop presented at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, February,
1989.

Working with Children of Alcoholics

National Training attended two days in Phoenix, Arizona, March, 1989.

Treating Victims of Sexual Child Abuse

Nancy Parsons-Kraft, Ph.D.

Half-day workshop presented at Utah State University, Logan, Utah, December,
1988.

Therapy with Children Who Have Been Sexually Abused

Gerry Hanni, D.S.W.

One day workshop presented for the Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment
Center, Logan, Utah, July 1988.

National Conference on Children of Alcoholics

Attended three days in New Orleans, Louisiana, March, 1988.

Regional Conference on Children of Alcoholics

Attended three days in Portland, Oregon, March, 1986.

Sexual Assault of Children and Adolescents

Attended three days in Billings, Montana, June, 1985.

National Conference on Child Sexual Abuse

Attended three days in San Francisco, California, April, 1985

National American Indian Court Judges Association Training

Attended three days in Billings, Montana, September, 1984.

Drug Information Workshop

Presented by Hazelden for one day in Fort Peck, Montana, March, 1984.

Child Protection Team Training

A week long training at the C. Henry Kempe Center in Denver, Colorado,
August, 1979.

Honors:

Selected as one of Eastern Montana College's Outstanding Indian Alumni, 1987.

Given three awards from the Federal Government for outstanding work, these included monetary benefit.

Given a plaque award from the American Indian Institute for my commitment and exemplary service to Indian Children and their families, 1987.

Given an award by the National Indian Health Board for recognition of my efforts to improve the health care status of American Indians/ Alaska Natives, 1987.

Selected as a consultant for the National Organization for Victim assistance, NOVA, to specifically address victimization of minority populations.

Outside Activities:

I enjoy writing letters, reading, and beadwork. In my free time I have done volunteer work with Asian refugees who have difficulty expressing affect, while in Logan, Utah.

While in Montana my outside the home activities included volunteer work for a child advocacy organization, Voices for Children, Girl Scout Leader, 4-H Leader, taught religious class, and was President for the Indian Women's Home Demonstration Club.

References:

Dr. Elwin Nielsen, Utah State University Psychology Department, (801) 750-1463

Dr. Carolyn Barcus, Utah State University Psychology Department, (801) 750-1465

Edwin Bingham, Director, Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment Center (801)
753-5411

Dr. Michael Waldo, Montana State University, Department of Health and Human
Development, (406) 994-5789