

1-1-2010

# Ethnic Differences Among Incarcerated Sex Offenders

Alejandro Leguizamo

*Roger Williams University*, [aleguizamo@rwu.edu](mailto:aleguizamo@rwu.edu)

Brooke Peltzman

Nicolas Carrasco

Michelle Nosal

*Roger Williams University*

Leslie Woods

*Roger Williams University*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://docs.rwu.edu/fcas\\_fp](http://docs.rwu.edu/fcas_fp)



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Leguizamo, Alejandro, Brooke Peltzman, Nicolas Carrasco, Michelle Nosal and Leslie Woods. 2010. "Ethnic Differences Among Incarcerated Sex Offenders." 2010.

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Feinstein College of Arts and Sciences at DOCS@RWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Feinstein College of Arts & Sciences Faculty Papers by an authorized administrator of DOCS@RWU. For more information, please contact [mwu@rwu.edu](mailto:mwu@rwu.edu).

# ETHNIC DIFFERENCES AMONG INCARCERATED SEX OFFENDERS

Alejandro Leguizamo, Ph.D.

*Roger Williams University, Bristol, RI*

Brooke Peltzman, Psy.D.

*Massachusetts Treatment Center, Bridgewater, MA*

Nicolas Carrasco, Ph.D.

*Private Practice, Austin, TX*

Michelle Nosal, B.A.

*Roger Williams University*

Leslie Woods, B.A.

*Roger Williams University*

# Introduction

- ① We sought to explore ethnic differences among sexual offenders, which have mainly been ignored in the sex offender literature.
- ① The presentation is comprised of two main studies
  - Offender, victim, and offense characteristics
  - Static-99 comparisons

# Overall Method

## ◎ Participants

- State inmates entering SOTP at the Massachusetts Treatment Center (MTC; N=316).
- Sample was 46.2% White (n=146), 23.7% African American (n=75), and 30.1% Latino (n=95).

## ◎ Measures

- Coding Protocol
- Static-99

## ◎ Procedure

- Assessment reports coded.
- Institutional Static-99 database obtained.

# Offender, Victim, and Offense Characteristics

# Sex Offender Literature

- ◎ Ethnic minorities are underrepresented in the literature on sex offenders.
- ◎ Most studies are limited to comparisons between White and African American sex offenders (e.g., Heilbrun and Cross 1979; Kirk, 1975).

# Studies Comparing White and African American samples

## ◉ Kirk (1975)

- Presented comparative data on 47 black and 47 white sex offenders in terms of the nature of the offense and victim characteristics.
- Results showed differences in offense characteristics, choice of victim, and use of violence.
  - ◉ African American offenders are more likely to :
    - Engage in vaginal rape (42.6% vs. 19.1% for white offenders).
    - Choose adult, female victims (Adult: 34.0% vs. 10.9%, Female: 91.4% vs. 72.9%).
    - Use slightly more violence (36.2% vs. 17.0%).

## ◎ Heilbrun and Cross (1979)

- Characteristics of rapists in the state of Georgia, the victims, and the acts themselves were correlated for African American and White offenders.
- Results showed differences in relationship to the victim and use of violence.
  - White offenders tended to have a closer relationship to the victim.
  - White rapists were more likely to use force with increased familiarity with the victim
  - For African American rapists, the likelihood of using force decreased with familiarity with the victim



# Studies Using Latino Samples

- Only one study was found where a Latino sample was included.
- Carrasco & Garza-Louis (1997)
  - Focused on a comparison of cultural values between White, African American, and Latino sex offenders.
  - Results:
    - Latinos showed greater adherence to traditional values.
    - Latinos also showed more rigid attitudes towards traditional gender roles.
    - Mexican born Latinos had a greater number of offenses against stepdaughters.

# Goals

- ① Provide updated empirical comparisons of ethnically diverse sex offenders in regards to offender, victim, and offense characteristics.
- ① Include a Latino sample in these comparisons.
- ① Provide a base for future studies.

# Offender Characteristics

- Whites were more likely to be divorced.
- African Americans were more likely to be engaged/have girlfriends.
- Whites were significantly older
  - Whites: Mean Age = 43.9*
  - African Americans: Mean Age = 38.02
  - Latinos: Mean Age = 36.48

Sample Sizes: White (n=150), African American (n=76), Latino (n=96).

# Offender Characteristics

- Latinos were significantly less educated
  - Latinos: Mean Years = 8.56*
  - Whites: Mean Years = 10.24
  - African Americans: Mean Years = 10.05
- Latinos were more likely to report having been raised in Low SES households
  - Latinos = 48.8%*
  - Whites = 27.9%
  - African Americans = 23.3%

Sample Sizes: White (n=150), African American (n=76), Latino (n=96).

# Criminal History

- Overall, groups did not differ significantly on *total* number of charges for which they were convicted.

Whites: Mean No. of Charges = 13.62 ( $SD=11.20$ )

African Americans: Mean No. of Charges = 14.20 ( $SD=9.97$ )

Latinos: Mean No. of Charges = 10.77 ( $SD=8.38$ )

- However, there were significant differences on types of charges for which they were convicted...

Sample Sizes: White (n=150), African American (n=76), Latino (n=96).

# Criminal History II

Ethnicity	Convictions for Property Charges $\chi^2 = 16.41, p < .01$		
	0 n (%)	1-4 n (%)	5+ n (%)
Whites n = 150	72 (48)	50 (33.3)	28 (18.7)
African Americans n = 76	20 (26.3)	35 (46.1)	21 (26.7) z = 1.9
Latinos n = 96	50 (52.1)	36 (37.5)	10 (17.6) z = -1.8

# Criminal History III

Ethnicity	Convictions for M/V Charges $\chi^2 = 8.4, p = .076$		
	0 n (%)	1-4 n (%)	5+ n (%)
Whites n = 150	99 (66)	37 (24.7)	14 (9.3)
African Americans n = 75	40 (53.3)	30 (40)	5 (6.7)
Latinos n = 96	68 (70.8)	21 (21.9)	7 (7.3)

# Criminal History IV

Ethnicity	Convictions for Drug Charges $\chi^2 = 8.47, p = .076$		
	0 n (%)	1-4 n (%)	5+ n (%)
Whites n = 150	104 (69.3)	40 (26.7)	6 (4.0)
African Americans n = 76	41 (53.9)	30 (39.5)	5 (6.6)
Latinos n = 96	68 (70.8)	21 (21.9)	7 (7.3)



# Criminal History V

Ethnicity	Convictions for Violent Non-Sexual Charges $\chi^2 = 24.69, p < .001$		
	0 n (%)	1-4 n (%)	5+ n (%)
Whites n = 150	77 (51.3)	52 (34.7)	21 (14)
African Americans n = 76	19 (25) z = -2.3	33 (43.4)	24 (31.6) z = 3.2
Latinos n = 96	41 (42.7)	46 (47.9)	9 (9.4) z = -1.8

# Criminal History VI

Ethnicity	Convictions for Sexual Charges $\chi^2 = 13.05, p < .05$		
	1 n (%)	2-5 n (%)	6+ n (%)
Whites n = 149	23 (15.4)	70 (47.0)	56 (37.6)
African Americans n = 76	25 (32.9) z = 2.4	35 (46.1)	16 (21.1)
Latinos n = 96	18 (18.8)	51 (53.1)	27 (28.1)

# Sex Offenses

- No significant differences found regarding number of sexual offenses for which subjects were charged ( $F = 1.26, p = .258$ ).
- Differences regarding number of sexual offense convictions approached significance ( $F = 2.95, p = .054$ ). There was a trend for Whites to have higher average number of convictions for sex crimes than Latinos (1.77 vs. 1.43, respectively,  $p = 0.08$ ), with African Americans in the middle ( $M = 1.46$ ).
- No significant differences found on rates of number of victims (one, two, three or more).

# Victim Characteristics

Gender	Whites n = 149 n (%)	African Americans n = 76 n (%)	Latinos n = 96 n (%)	$\chi^2$
Male	43 (28.9) z = 3.1	8 (10.5)	7 (7.3)	22.17*
Female	116 (77.9)	71 (93.4)	91 (94.8)	18.43**
Both	10 (6.7)	3 (3.9)	2 (2.1)	2.92

\*  $p < .001$ ; + difference based on those who *did not* have female victims

Age	Whites n = 148 n (%)	African Americans n = 75 n (%)	Latinos n = 92 n (%)	$\chi^2$
Child	80 (54.1)	19 (25.3) z = -.27	47 (51.1)	17.68**
Teen	62 (41.9)	33 (44)	37 (40.2)	0.243
Adult	32 (21.5)	31 (41.3) z = 2.5	21 (22.3)	11.26*
Mixed	26 (17.6)	8 (10.8)	12 (13.0)	2.07

\* $p < .01$ , \*\*  $p < .001$

Relationship to adult victim	Whites n = 31 n (%)	African Americans n = 31 n (%)	Latinos n = 22 n (%)	$\chi^2$
Unknown	12 (38.7)	20 (64.5)	11 (50)	9.31
Known	7 (22.6)	8 (25.8)	5 (22.7)	
Related	10 (32.3)	3 (9.7)	6 (27.3)	
Mixed	2 (6.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	

Relationship to child victim	Whites n = 117 n (%)	African Americans n = 45 n (%)	Latinos n = 75 n (%)	$\chi^2$
Unknown	5 (4.3) z = -2.6	10 (22.2) z = 1.7	16 (21.3) z = 2.0	19.31*
Known	48 (41.0)	18 (40.0)	20 (26.7)	
Related	61 (52.1)	17 (37.8)	38 (50.7)	
Mixed	3 (2.6)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)	

\*  $p < .01$

# Offense Characteristics

Offense Behaviors	Whites n = 150 n (%)	African Americans n = 76 n (%)	Latinos n = 96 n (%)	$\chi^2$
Non-contact	47 (31.3) z = 1.9	10 (13.2) z = -1.9	20 (20.8)	9.87**
Fondling	103 (68.7)	35 (46.1)	52 (54.2)	11.99**
Oral Sex on Victim	58 (38.7) z = 2.0	16 (21.1)	22 (22.9)	10.58**
Penetration	85 (56.7)	53 (69.7)	64 (66.7)	4.59
Sodomy	24 (16.0)	11 (14.5)	17 (17.7)	0.33
Pornography	26 (17.3)	4 (5.3) z = -1.9	13 (13.5)	6.35*

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



Modus Operandi	Whites n = 150 n (%)	African Americans n = 76 n (%)	Latinos n = 96 n (%)	$\chi^2$
Manipulation	84 (56.0)	34 (44.7)	49 (51.0)	2.60
Incapacitation	42 (28.0)	17 (22.4)	22 (22.9)	1.21
Holding	29 (19.3) z = -2.9	31 (40.8) 2.0	32 (33.3)	12.90**
Fear	61 (40.7)	44 (57.9) z = 1.5	44 (45.8)	6.03*
Physical Force	26 (17.3)	26 (34.2) z = 2.0	23 (22.4)	8.07*

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

# Discussion

- Findings suggest a pattern in which Whites exhibit more sexual deviance - number of convictions for sexual charges, victim choice (age, gender, relationship), and offense behaviors (non-contact and role of pornography).
- On the other hand, African Americans were found to have higher rates of involvement in aggression (non-sexual violence and modus operandi).
- Findings for Latinos did not follow these patterns
- Findings underscore the need to study potential cultural factors involved in sexual offending.

# Use of the Static - 99

# Risk Assessment Issues

- Actuarial methods are more predictive of sexual and violent recidivism than structured or unstructured professional judgment (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009).
- Static-99 (Hanson & Thornton, 2000) remains the most studied risk assessment measure and has been found to have good predictive validity (e.g., Barbaree, Seto, Langton, & Peacock, 2001; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009).
- The Static-99 has 10 items, with a highest possible score of 12. Scores on the measure range from 0-10; 0-1 Low, 2-3 Moderate-Low, 4-5 Moderate-High, 6+ High.

# Use of Static-99 with Various Populations

- ◎ The normative sample included Canadian and British subjects (Hanson & Thornton, 2000). It has been validated in many countries, for example:
  - United Kingdom (Soothill, Harman, Francis, & Kirby, 2005)
  - Sweden (Sjöstedt & Långström, 2001)
  - Canada (e.g., Barbaree, Seto, Langton, & Peacock, 2001)

- New Zealand (Skelton, Riley, Wales, & Vess, 2006). Although the sample was 40% Maori and 10% Pacific Islander, no ethnic comparisons were made.
- Australia (Allan, Dawson, & Allan, 2006).
- Japan (Sudo, Sato, Obata, & Yamagami, 2006). Initial look into measure, there was no follow up to assess predictive validity.

# Routine Corrections Samples

<i>Study</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>(SD)</i>	<i>N</i>
Bartosh et al. (2003)	3.2	2.2	90
Bigras (2003)	2.5	1.9	207
Boer (2003)	3.3	2.3	299
Brouillette-Alarie & Proulx (2008)	3.8	2.2	199
Cortoni & Nunes (2007)	3.2	1.9	17
Craissati et al. (2008)	2.3	2.0	200
Eher et al. (2008)	2.3	1.7	151
Endrass et al. (in press)	3.5	1.7	95
Epperson (2003)	2.8	2.2	151
Hanson et al. (2007)	3.1	2.1	31
Långstöm (2004)	2.4	2.0	1278
Langton (2003)	3.3	2.1	226
Ternowski (2004)	2.1	1.9	247

# Static 99 and non-Whites

- ◎ The predictive validity of the Static-99 has been found to be poorer for non-Whites:
  - Långström (2004) – African/Asian sample (overestimation of risk).
  - Allan, Dawson, & Allan (2006) – Indigenous Australian sample. No analysis possible due to small sample size, but advised caution using the measure with this group.
  - Nicholaichuk (2001) reported only moderate predictive validity across ethnicity.



# Aboriginal Samples

<i>Study</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>(SD)</i>	<i>N</i>
Boer (2003)	3.3	2.2	56
Bonta & Yessine (2005)	4.5	1.8	18
Brouillette-Alarie & Proulx (2008)	5.0	0.0	3
Haag (2005)	3.9	1.6	50
Hanson et al. (2007)	2.3	1.5	6
Nicholaichuk (2001)	4.4	1.8	41
Swinburne Romine et al. (2008)	1.7	2.1	3

# Non-White Samples

Study	M	(SD)	N
Boer (2003)	3.3	2.2	56
Bonta & Yessine (2005)	4.7	2.0	24
Brouillette-Alarie & Proulx (2008)	5.1	2.2	7
Haag (2005)	3.8	1.7	55
Hanson et al. (2007)	2.3	1.5	6
Knight & Thornton (2007)	5.6	2.0	33
Swinburne Romine et al. (2008)	2.3	2.1	31

# Non-Aboriginal, Non-white Samples

<i>Study</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>(SD)</i>	<i>N</i>
Bonta & Yessine (2005)	5.2	2.8	6
Brouillette-Alarie & Proulx (2008)	3.7	2.2	4
Haag (2005)	2.4	1.8	5
Hanson et al. (2007)	5.6	2.0	33
Swinburne Romine et al. (2008)	2.4	2.1	28

# Forbes (2007)

- Dissertation in which Whites and African Americans' level of risk was compared using three actuarial measures (Static-99, RRASOR, and MnSOST-R). No follow-up conducted.
- Static-99 findings:
  - African Americans' overall average score was significantly higher than that of Whites' (means = 3.52, SD = 1.8 vs. 2.36, SD = 1.87, respectively)

# Goals

- ④ Assess Static-99 scores across three ethnic groups (Whites, African Americans, and Latinos).
- ④ Assess differences in individual items across ethnic groups
- ④ Replicate previous findings (from Forbes, 2007).
- ④ Assess for ethnic validity.

# Results

- There was an overall significant difference in Static-99 scores between ethnicities ( $F = 5.28, p < .01$ )
- Post-hoc analysis (Tukey HSD) revealed that Latinos' scores were significantly lower than those of African Americans ( $p < .01$ ;  $M = 3.24, SD = 2.02$  and  $M = 4.44, SD = 2.32$ , respectively). Whites did not differ from either group ( $M = 3.69, SD = 2.28$ )

# Static-99 Item Analysis

Static – 99 Item	Present Study n=243	Forbes (2007) n=1265
1. Offender age		African Americans higher
2. Ever lived with partner > two years		
3. Index Non-sexual Offense $X^2 = 9.79$ (2df), $p < .01$	African Americans higher $z=2.2$	African Americans higher
4. Prior Non-sex Offense $X^2 = 18.91$ (2df) $p < .001$	African Americans higher $z=2.5$	African Americans higher
5. Prior Sex Offense Convictions		African Americans higher
6. Prior Sentencing Dates	Trend African Americans higher	African Americans higher
7. Non-contact Sex Offense		
8. Unrelated Victims	Trend African Americans higher Latinos lower	African Americans higher
9. Stranger Victims $X^2 = 12.07$ (2df) $p < .01$	African Americans higher $z=2.6$	African Americans higher
10. Male Victims $X^2 = 21.66$ (2df) $p < .001$	Whites higher, $z=3.2$ Latinos lower, $z=-2.1$	Whites higher

- ⦿ However, groups did not differ significantly on assignment to risk level on the Static-99 ( $X^2 = 9.64, p = .14$ )



# Discussion

- ⦿ Differences suggest that African Americans score higher than other ethnic groups on the overall measure and on items dealing with criminal history and the victimization of strangers.
- ⦿ Whites were found to be more likely to have male victims, while the opposite was true for Latinos.
- ⦿ Latinos' scores tended to be similar to those of Whites, with the above exception.

# Discussion

- ⦿ Findings corroborated, in part, with results found by Forbes (2007).
- ⦿ Given the paucity of research, at the very least caution is strongly suggested when using actuarial risk assessment measures on ethnic minorities in the U.S. and elsewhere. In jurisdictions where they play a significant role in the civil commitment of sex offenders, use cannot be recommended until norms for various ethnic groups have been established.

# CULTURAL EXPLORATION OF THE STATIC - 99

Goals: To Define

- To define or clarify the concept of risk for sexual re-offending for individual from different ethnic/cultural groups (Anglo/Euro American, African Americans, or Latino Americans)
- What elements are associated with varying levels of risk, for individuals from different cultures.

# GOALS

## Goal: to understand

- Discover how available data might be impacted given sociological differences:
  - Nature/Pattern or Relationships
  - Patterns of Criminal Behaviors: Consider how the follow are impacted by culture/ethnicity
    - Arrest rates
    - Criminal charges filed
    - Access to competent legal representation
    - Plea bargaining
    - Conviction rates
    - Victim preference
- Offense Characteristic

# TOPIC OF DISCUSSION

- ◎ Background Information, briefly:
  - Actuarial Risk Assessment
  - Measurement Theory (Scale Construction)
  - Risk as a Construct of Latent Variable (what a scale purports to measure)
  - Internal Consistency of a scale, as evidenced by Cronbach's Alpha
- ◎ Results of data analyses
- ◎ Discussion and comments

# TOPIC OF DISCUSSION

## Caveats

- ◎ PRELIMINARY ANALYSES AND RESULTS.
  - Data analyses will be double and triple checked, before we submit any of the results for publication.
  - Please, do not quote or cite results, without formal permission from the authors.

# Measurement Theory

- Concepts “are created by people who believe that some phenomena have something in common” (Bollen, 1989, p. 180).
- Measurement theory is based on the premise that a concept can be measured (RISK).

# Measurement Theory

- ◎ The first step in measurement theory is “developing a theoretical definition” (Bollen, 1989).
  - This has been one of the major problems in actuarial risk assessment, which is based primarily on the statistical crunching of numbers and vaguely, if not loosely, on theory.
  - A concept has been identified: RISK.
    - Meta-analyses used to identify factors and to estimate potential for recidivism.
    - The major draw-back to meta-analyses: we do not have to rely on theory to guide our research.
  - “Garbage in, garbage out” does not quit apply, but “let’s throw it against the wall and see what sticks” does seem to apply.



# Measurement Theory

- ◎ The first step in measurement theory is “developing a theoretical definition”.
  - We have gotten consistent results in terms of predictive validity.
    - Main goal has been to predict recidivism or more precisely “re-conviction”, and secondarily, understand how it all fits together and what it means about risk.
- ◎ We have made little progress on developing an accepted theory of risk, as it applies to sexual re-offending.

# RISK

Forensic Use of Actuarial Risk Assessment with Sex Offenders: Accuracy, Admissibility and Accountability (Janus and Prentky, 2003).

- Actuarial Risk Assessment:
  - ...employs empirically derived "mechanical" rules for combining information to produce a *quantitative* estimate of risk.
- "discussions of risk demand clarity about the specific type of behavior in question."

# Actuarial Risk Assessment

Janus and Prentky (2003).

- A strong argument could be made for requiring a rather high level of reliability for risk assessment testimony. After all, the consequences resting on the assessments are momentous--long-term loss of liberty, on the one hand, and prevention of potential sexual violence on the other. Under such a rigorous standard, **it is likely that no risk assessment testimony--clinical or actuarial--would pass muster.**

# RISK and ARA Tools

Craig, L., Browne, K., Stringer, I., Beech, A. Limitations in actuarial risk assessment of sexual offenders: a methodological note. *The British Journal of Forensic Practice*. February 2004, 6 (1) 16-21.

- “With a base rate of 6%, an actuarial risk instrument with good predictive accuracy ... would be wrong nine times out of 10” (p. 18); it is best to use AUC, an index that tells us how well we can accurately predict (compared to chance. .5) if someone is going to be re-convicted.
- The better instruments have an AUC of .70 to .75, which means that we are likely to be wrong 25 to 30 % of the time.
- “...practitioners might be better served if actuarial measures were developed to assess level of risk in specific subgroups of sexual offenders” (p. 25).

# Error and Reliability

Nunnally, J.C. (1978) *Psychometric Theory*

- ⦿ Any measurement has error.
- ⦿ To the extent to which measurement error is slight, a measure is said to be reliable.
- ⦿ Reliability concerns the extent to which measurements are repeatable.
- ⦿ ...high reliability does not necessarily mean high validity, but
- ⦿ **RELIABILITY IS NECESSARY...FOR VALIDITY.**

# Internal Consistency

- ◎ Reliability Estimation: examine the reliability of the instrument by estimating how well the items, presumably, **reflect the same construct** yield similar results.
- ◎ In other words, how consistent the results are for different items representing the same construct within the measure. Is each item measuring the same thing (repeatable)?

# Internal Consistency

- Different types of reliability coefficients:
  - **Average Inter-Item Correlation:** You correlate each item with each other item and divide by the number of items.
  - **Average Item-total Correlation:** compute a total score for the items and use that as an additional variable in the analysis.
  - **Split-Half Reliability:** randomly divide all items that purport to measure the same construct into two sets. Administer the entire instrument to a sample of people and calculate the total score for each randomly divided half.
  - **Cronbach's Alpha:** BY COMPUTER ANALYSIS, calculate a split-half reliability and then randomly divide the items into another set of split halves and re-compute, and keep doing this until you have computed all possible split half estimates of reliability. **Cronbach's Alpha is mathematically equivalent to the average of all possible split-half estimates.** Calculate all split-half estimates from the same sample; the computer selects random subsets of items and compute the resulting correlations.

(Santos, R. Extension Information Technology, Texas Agricultural Extension Service, Texas A&M University)

# Internal Consistency

- Cronbach's Alpha: is a measure of internal consistency: how closely related a set of items are, as a group.
- A "high" value of alpha is often used as evidence that the items measure the same underlying (or latent) construct.
- (A high alpha does not imply that the measure is unidimensional; this is determined by Factor Analysis)



# Standards of Reliability

Nunnally (1978, p. 245)

- ⦿ In early stages of research: “modest reliability” or an alpha of .70
- ⦿ In basic research: .80 is acceptable
- ⦿ (p. 246) In ... settings where important decisions are made with respect to specific test scores, **a reliability of .90 is the minimum that should be tolerated, and ... .95 should be considered the desirable standard.**

# Alpha for Static 99

SAMPLE	Valid N/n	Alpha	Alpha (Forbes 2007)
Entire Sample	239	.502	--
Anglo Americans	150	.446	.530
African Americans	61	.409	.411
Latinos	79	.341	--

# Procedures

- ⦿ Looked at the raw data used for the coding of the Static 99, to see if there is a better way to combine items so that a scale with a higher alpha might be developed.
- ⦿ Looked at the frequencies, and based on those results, we recoded the data.

# Recoding of Variable

- ◎ **Recoded Raw Data (1=1,2=2,3=3,4=4,5+=5)**
  - **RC Age (S99i1)**
  - **RC Index Non-Sexual Offense (S99i3)**
  - **RC Prior Non-sexual violence (S99i4)**
  - **RC Prior Sex Charges (S99i5)**
  - **RC Prior Sex Offenses (S99i5)**
  - **RC Prior Sentencing Dates (s99i6)**
  - **RC Prior Convictions for non-contact sex offenses (s99i7)**
  - **RC Total Stranger Victims:** Add Adult Stranger + Child Stanger
  - **RC Unrelated Victim :** Counted the number of unrelated victims
  - **RC Total Male Victims:** Counted the number of male victims
  - **RC Total Denial**

# Alpha for Recoded Variables

SAMPLE	Valid N/ n	Alpha
Entire Sample	206	.812
Anglo Americans	97	.811
African Americans	42	.786
Latinos	66	.815

<b>Recoded Variable</b>	<b>Entire Sample Alpha if Item Deleted</b>	<b>Anglo Am Alpha if Item Deleted</b>	<b>African Am Alpha if Item Deleted</b>	<b>Latino Alpha if Item Deleted</b>
1. Offender age	.821	.830	.777	.824
2. Longest Relationship	.837	.845	.798	.833
3. Index Non-sexual Offense	.764	.750	.740	.786
4. Prior Non-sex Offense	.763	.757	.732	.772
5. Prior Sexual Charges	.754	.748	.735	.762
6. Prior Sex Offense Convictions	.749	.743	.722	.760
7. Prior Sentencing Dates	.788	.787	.758	.792
8. Non-contact Sex Offense	.757	.750	.739	.765
9. Unrelated Victims	.824	.820	.815	.828
10. Stranger Victims	.819	.818	.782	.821
11. Male Victims	.819	.824	.796	.816
12. Denial	.819	.817	.802	.818

# Discussion

- ◎ Scale development should be guided by measurement theory.
  - Our research should be based by theory, not just “mechanical” analyses of numbers. We need to understand risk, not just measure it.
- ◎ In the United States, it is imperative that we understand how risk might manifest in different cultural or ethnic groups.
- ◎ The Static 99 appears to have a valid set of variables, but the properties of the scale should be closely examined.

# Limitations and future research

## ⦿ Limitations

- Retrospective study using only archival data.
- Sample size was relatively low.
- No follow up to assess ethnic differences in recidivism and predictive validity of the Static-99 were possible.

## ⦿ Future research

- Continued research of ethnic differences among sex offenders.
- Follow up needed to assess recidivism and predictive validity of risk assessment measures across ethnic groups
- Norms need to be established for each ethnic group.



# Thanks to...

- The Massachusetts Department of Correction and the Massachusetts Treatment Center (Robert F. Murphy, Jr., superintendent at the time).
- The generous support from Roger Williams University through the Foundation for the Promotion of Teaching and Scholarship.
- Research Assistants:
  - Leslie Woods, Michelle Nosal, Michele Waldron, Amanda Spikes, Brandy Campbell (grad students), Kimberly Moyers, Sara Liebert, Christa DiCasparro, Amber-Leigh Brzezinski, Thea Rowan, Paige Congdon, Miranda Sarjeant, Lauren Flannery, Frank Castorina, and Maggie Hanvey (undergrad students).
- **Contact information: [aleguizamo@rwu.edu](mailto:aleguizamo@rwu.edu)**

# References

- Allan, A., Dawson, D. & Allan, M. (2006). Prediction of risk of male sexual reoffending in Australia. *Australian Psychologist*, 41(1).
- Barbaree, H. E., Seto, M. C., Langton, C. M. & Peacock, E. J. (2001) Evaluating the predictive accuracy of six risk assessment instruments for adult sex offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28(4).
- Bartosh, D. L. Garby, T., Lewis, D., & Gray S. (2003). Differences in the predictive validity of actuarial risk assessments in relation to sex offender type. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology*, 47, 422-438.
- Bigras, J. (2007). La prédiction de la récidive chez les délinquants sexuels [Prediction of recidivism among sex offenders]. *Dissertations Abstract International*, 68 (09). (UMI No. NR30941).
- Boer, A. (2003). Evaluating the Static-99 and Static-2002 risk scale using Canadian sexual offenders. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Leicester, Leicester, United Kingdom.
- Bonta, J., & Yessine, A. K. (2005). [Recidivism data for 124 released sexual offenders from the offenders identified in The National Flagging System: Identifying and responding to high-risk, violent offenders (User Report 2005-04). Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada]. Unpublished raw data.
- Brouillette-Alarie, S., & Proulx, J. (2008, October). Predictive and convergent validity of phallometric assessment in relation to sexual recidivism risk. Poster presented at the annual conference for the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Atlanta, GA.
- Cortoni, F., & Nunes, K. L. (2007). Assessing the effectiveness of the National Sexual Offender Program (Research Report No. R-183). Unpublished report, Correctional Services of Canada.
- Craissati, J., Bieber, K., & South, R. (2008). What do sex offenders really get up to? Risk prediction, community failure and "sexually risky behaviors" in a nine year follow up study. Unpublished manuscript.
- Eher, R. Rettenberger, M., Schilling, F., & Pfafflin, F. (2009). [Data from sex offenders released from prison in Austria]. Unpublished raw data.

- Endrass, J., Urbaniok, F., Held, L., Vetter, S., & Rossegger, A. (2009). The accuracy of the Static-99 in predicting recidivism in Switzerland. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53, 482-490.
- Epperson, D. L. (2003). Validation of the MnSOST-R Static-99, and RRASOR with North Dakota prison and probation samples. Unpublished Technical Assistance Report, North Dakota Division of Parole and Probation.
- Forbes, S.M. (2007). *Race Differences in Scores of Actuarial Measures of Sex Offender Risk Assessment*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Louisville, 2007).
- Haag, A. M. (2005). [recidivism data from 198 offenders detained until their warrant expiry date. From: Do psychological interventions impact on actuarial measures: An analysis of the predictive validity of the Static-99 and Static-2002 on a re-conviction measure of sexual recidivism. *Dissertations Abstract International*, 66 (08), 4531B. (UMI No. NR05662)]. Unpublished raw data.
- Hanson, R. K. & Morton-Bourgon, K. (2009). The accuracy of recidivism risk assessments for sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of 118 prediction studies. *Psychological Assessment*, 21(1).
- Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J., Scott, T., & Helmus, L. (2007) *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The dynamic Supervision Project* (Corrections Research User Report No. 2007-05). Ottawa, ON, Canada: Public Safety Canada.
- Hanson, R. K. & Thornton, D. (2000) Improving actuarial risk assessments for sex offenders: A comparison of three actuarial scales. *Law and Human Behavior*, 24(1).
- Långström, N. (2004) Accuracy of actuarial procedures for assessment of sexual offender recidivism risk may vary across ethnicity. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 16(2).
- Langton, C. M. (2003). Contrasting approaches to risk assessment with adult male sexual offenders: An evaluation of recidivism prediction schemes and the utility of supplementary clinical information for enhancing predictive accuracy. *Dissertations Abstract International*, 64 (04), 1907B. (UMI No. NQ78052).
- Nicholaichuk, T. (2001). The comparison of two standardized risk assessment instruments in a sample of Canadian Aboriginal sexual offenders. Paper presented at the annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, San Antonio, TX.
- Sjöstedt, G. & Långström, N. (2001) Actuarial assessment of sex offender recidivism risk: A cross-validation of the RRASOR and the Static-99 in Sweden. *Law and Human Behavior*, 25(6).

Skelton, A., Riley, D., Wales, D. & Vess, J. (2006). Assessing risk for sexual offenders in New Zealand: Developing and validation of a computer-scored risk measure. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 12(3), 277-286.

Soothill, K., Harman, J., Francis, B. & Kirby, S. (2005). Identifying future repeat danger from sexual offenders against children: A focus on those convicted and those strongly suspected of such crime. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology*, 16(2).

Sudo, J., Sato, M., Obata, S. & Yamagami, A. (2006). Exploring the possibility of risk assessment of Japanese sexual offenders using Static-99. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 16

Swinburne Romine, R., Dwyer, S. M., Mathiowetz, C., & Thomas, M. (2008, October). *Thirty years of sex offender specific treatment: A follow-up study*, Poster presented at the conference for the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Atlanta, GA.

Ternowski, D. R. (2004) Sex offenders treatment: An evaluation of the Stave Lake Correctional Centre Program. *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 66 (06), 3428B. (UMI No. NR03201).