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Introduction

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2010), 125,910 males and females were the victims of sexual assault in the year 2009. Although sexual offending tends to be associated with male offenders, researchers have found that 8.7% of sexual offenses committed in the United States are committed by females (Cortoni & Hanson, 2005; Heatherton, 1999).

Of particular concern beyond the number of sexual offenses committed in a given year is the number of new offenses of any type that are committed by re-offenders, or what is referred to as the rate of general recidivism. Recidivism is an important issue when working with sexual offenders because the consequences of being wrong (i.e., releasing a convicted sexual offender who recidivates, especially by committing another sexual offense) can be emotionally damaging to the victim, the victim’s family, and the community.

Estimates of rates of recidivism for sexual offenders have ranged from approximately 5% to 43% (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2003; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005). For example, of all male sexual offenders who were released from prison in the United States in 1994, 43% committed a new crime of any type by the year 1997, and 5.3% of this reoffending group committed a new sexual offense (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2003). In a study that included multiple countries in addition to the United States, Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2005) found that, over approximately a 5-to 6-year period, 36.2% of male sexual offenders committed a new crime and 13.7% of male sexual offenders committed a new sexual offense. Although recidivism rates for
males have been established, information on recidivism rates for female sexual offenders has just begun to be collected. Recent researchers have found that 19% to 24% of female sexual offenders recidivated by committing any new crime, about 5% recidivated by committing a violent offense, and 1% to 3% recidivated by committing a new sexual offense, with the follow-up time ranging from 2 to 12 years (Cortoni, Hanson, & Coache 2010).

When a person commits a sexual offense and is being considered for community supervision, it is important to know information about risk factors related to recidivism in order to provide adequate interventions that would reduce the chances of recidivism (Cortoni, 2010). Risk factors for recidivism for male sexual offenders have been well established, and risk-assessment tools have been developed (Hanson, Harris, Scott, & Helmus, 2007; Hanson & Thornton, 2000; Helmus, Thornton, Hanson, & Babchishin, 2011). Unfortunately, little research has been conducted to assess risk factors associated with recidivism among female sexual offenders (Cortoni, 2010). In fact, according to Cortoni (2010), research on risk factors for recidivism for female sexual offenders is about 20 years behind research on male sexual offenders. Further, this lack of research on risk factors for female sexual offenders has limited the development of risk-assessment tools and treatment needs for this population. Therefore, it is important to investigate risk factors related to recidivism in female sexual offenders in order to take steps in the development and implementation of assessment and interventions.

The purpose of the current study was to (a) explore characteristics of female sexual offender recidivists and nonrecidivists; (b) examine the use of the Static-99R, a
validated risk-assessment tool used for male sexual offenders, for prediction of general and violent recidivism by female sexual offenders; and (c) identify static risk factors for female sexual offenders currently or previously on community supervision.
Review of the Literature

In this review of the literature, I discuss risk factors and risk assessments for male and female criminal offenders, risk factors and risk assessments for male sexual offenders, and risk factors and characteristics of female sexual offenders. Each of these areas will be related to a four-generation model of risk assessments.

Risk Factors and Risk Assessments Related to Recidivism for Criminal Offenders

Andrews and Bonta (2010) defined risk factors as characteristics of people and their environments that increase the likelihood of future criminal behavior. These authors categorized risk factors as either static or dynamic. Static risk factors are historical factors that cannot change, whereas dynamic risk factors can change and can be targeted in treatment. A model describing four generations of risk assessment that will be incorporated in multiple sections of the literature review is discussed first in this section. Then, risk factors related to recidivism literature are reviewed, and a specific general risk assessment family is discussed. Finally, literature on risk factors and assessments for female offenders is discussed.

The development of risk assessments: A four-generation model. Assessments of risk for criminal recidivism have been conducted for approximately 30 years (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Andrews, Bonta, and Wormith (2006) described the development of risk assessment for criminal recidivism in terms of four generations. The first generation was risk assessment based on unstructured clinical judgment; that is, a qualified clinician would interview offenders and make a prediction based on the interview. The second
generation of risk assessment was evidenced based, focusing almost exclusively on static risk factors. Third-generation risk assessments were developed in order to add dynamic factors to the static factors. The dynamic factors allowed assessors to examine areas that could be targeted for change. Finally, fourth-generation assessments were created in order to add a case-management aspect to the risk assessments. Therefore, assessors could measure offenders’ static and dynamic risk factors, identify an offender’s needs, and respond to these needs through a case-management approach. These generations provide a framework to the understanding of other risk assessments described in later sections. However, they do not include structured clinical judgment tools, such as the HCR-20 (Webster, Douglas, Eaves, & Hart, 1997).

**Risk factors for recidivism.** In an early study of static and dynamic risk factors, Gendreau, Little, and Goggin (1996) completed a meta-analysis to identify factors that were related to criminal recidivism in adults. Criminal recidivism was defined as an arrest, conviction, incarceration, parole violation, or any combination of these. The authors obtained 131 studies; 95% of the samples consisted of male or mixed populations, and most of the studies had been conducted in the United States or Canada. The authors originally explored 18 predictors that were later condensed into eight predictor groups: demographic information\(^1\), criminal history, criminogenic needs, family issues, cognitive functioning problems, distress, finance problems, and social skills deficits. The family issues domain included family history of criminal behavior, family childrearing practices, and the family arrangement. The criminogenic needs domain included antisocial personality, antisocial associates, antisocial attitudes, social conflict,

\(^1\) The authors stated that demographic information consisted of age, gender, and race, but, besides mentioning younger age, they did not report which gender or race were significant predictors of recidivism.
and substance abuse. The authors found that all eight of the domains were related to recidivism. They also found that criminal history and criminogenic needs were the strongest predictors of recidivism.

Similarly, Bonta, Law, and Hanson (1998) completed a meta-analysis to explore static and dynamic risk factors related to violent and general recidivism in a population of offenders with mental disorders (defined as individuals who had received interventions for mental health). A total of 58 studies with 64 samples were included. The authors found that being younger (this factor was not defined further), male, and single were predictive of general recidivism. Histories of criminal behavior, substance abuse problems, family problems, and poor relationships were also related to general recidivism. When exploring violent recidivism, the authors discovered that poor adjustment to work environments was the best predictor of violent recidivism, with family problems as the second best predictor. They also found that being young, being single, having a diagnosis of Antisocial Personality Disorder, and having a violent criminal history were predictive factors. The authors concluded that the factors related to general and violent recidivism in a population of offenders with mental disorders were very similar to risk factors for offenders without mental disorders.

Based on research on risk factors related to general recidivism, Andrews and Bonta (2010) identified eight static and dynamic factors, known as “the central eight,” that were related to general recidivism. The first four factors, known as “the big four” because they were the strongest predictors, were a history of antisocial behavior, a pattern of antisocial personality characteristics, antisocial attitudes, and having antisocial companions. The remaining four factors, known as “the moderate four,” were family or
marital problems, school or work problems, lack of leisure activities, and problems with substance use. Andrews and Bonta suggested that these factors were similar to the factors found by Gendreau et al. (1996) and Bonta et al. (1998). Andrews and Bonta compared eight meta-analyses exploring risk factors related to recidivism and calculated effect sizes for the big four and the moderate four factors. They found that each of the big four factors could by itself account for 5% to 9% of the variance in recidivism and that each factor of the moderate four accounted for 2% to 4%. The authors concluded that the central eight factors were powerful predictors of criminal recidivism.

In sum, there appears to be agreement that at least eight risk factors are predictive of general recidivism in adults (Andrews & Bonta, 2010): antisocial behavior, antisocial personality, antisocial attitudes, antisocial companions, family/marital problems, school/work problems, leisure deficiencies, and substance abuse problems.

**Utility of the LSI risk assessments for general recidivism.** After identifying factors related to general recidivism, researchers began to develop risk-assessment tools with the identified static and dynamic factors related to criminal recidivism. The Level of Service Inventory (LSI) tools are one of the most widely used general risk-assessment measures for community supervision assessment and case management (Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2004). Because of their popularity, these tools will be the focus of the literature review in order to provide an introduction to general risk assessment. The LSI family uses semi-structured interviews and record reviews to assess the risk of recidivism (Girard & Wormith, 2004). Based on the four-generations model, the most recent revisions of the LSI represent the third generation of risk assessment (i.e., the LSI-Revised; LSI-R; Andrews & Bonta, 1995) and the fourth generation of risk assessment
(i.e., the Level of Service/Case Management Inventory; LS/CMI; Andrews et al., 2004). The LSI-R contains 10 factors: the central eight plus a finance factor and an accommodation factor. These two factors were removed from the LS/CMI because the central eight have been found to be the most predictive of general recidivism. The eight factors of the LS/CMI provide a risk score, with a higher score being associated with higher risk. The LS/CMI includes the central eight factors from the LSI-R, plus case-management planning and a section used to obtain additional information (e.g., mental health issues or prison experience). These sections do not impact the risk score that is obtained from the central eight.

With respect to the predictive ability of the LSI family of assessments, Wormith, Olver, Stevenson, and Girard (2007) conducted a 10-year follow-up study examining predictive accuracy of the diagnosis of Antisocial Personality Disorder (APD), the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R), and the LS/CMI. The sample included 61 male offenders who were either incarcerated in federal or provincial facilities or on probation in Canada. Their ages ranged from 18 to 45 years and most were Caucasian (93.4%). The participants were interviewed and assessed using the PCL-R and LS/CMI, and three symptoms for APD were coded based on criteria from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-Third Edition (DSM-III; American Psychiatric Association, 1980): symptoms of APD beginning prior to the age of 15, expression of symptoms since the age of 18, and uninterrupted antisocial behavior. This factor produced a score ranging from 0-3. Criminal records were obtained for each participant to assess recidivism using several indices: the number and description of new charges, number and description of new convictions, sentencing dates, and length of sentencing. Recidivism descriptions
were separated into six categories: sexual crime, violent nonsexual crime, general nonsexual crime, nonviolent crime, any crime, and re-incarceration. The recidivism data were coded as both dichotomous (yes or no) as well as continuous variables (specific coding of the continuous variable was not described). The authors found that all three measures were strongly predictive of violent recidivism and re-incarceration, but none were predictive of sexual recidivism. They also found that the family and marital problems factor of the LS/CMI was related to all nonsexual recidivism categories, the criminal history factor was related to violent recidivism and reincarceration, and the antisocial behaviors factor was related to violent recidivism.

Similarly, Campbell, French, and Gendreau (2009) conducted a meta-analytic study to measure the predictive validity of multiple measures, including the LSI-R and LS/CMI, for predicting institutional violence and violent recidivism. A total of 88 studies, primarily conducted in Canada and the United States with predominantly male samples, were included. Subjects who were only convicted of a sexual offense were excluded. The authors found that the LSI-R had one of the largest average effect sizes when predicting institutional violence and that the LS/CMI was a strong predictive tool for violent recidivism. They found that the best tools for predicting institutional violence were the Historical, Clinical, and Risk Management Violence Risk Assessment Scheme (HCR-20; Webster et al., 1997) and the LSI-R. The authors did not find any one tool that was the most effective for predicting violent recidivism. The authors concluded that multiple tools, including the LSI-R and LS/CMI, could be used to predict institutional violence and violent recidivism.
Overall, the LSI-R has been found to have predictive validity for institutional violence (Campbell et al., 2009), and the LS/CMI has been found to have predictive validity for violent recidivism and reincarceration (Campbell et al., 2009; Wormith et al., 2007). The LS/CMI has not been shown to be predictive of sexual recidivism.

**Gender differences in risk factors for recidivism.** Many risk-assessment measures for female offenders have been derived from research based on males (Salisbury, Van Voorhis, & Spiropoulos, 2009). It has been suggested that some factors related to general recidivism in females have not been addressed in risk-assessment tools such as the LSI scales (Salisbury et al., 2009). In an early study, Bonta, Pang, and Wallace-Capretta (1995) examined risk factors related to general recidivism for female offenders. The sample included 136 adult females who were incarcerated or on conditional release. The authors completed a semi-structured interview with the participants, reviewed participant records, and collected general recidivism data 3 years after the participants were released from prison or put on community supervision. The authors found a negative correlation between recidivism and the age of the offender when admitted to the penitentiary; specifically, the younger an offender was when she was admitted to the penitentiary, the greater the likelihood of recidivating. The same relationship was found for recidivism and age at the time of the interview. Committing unarmed robbery and substance-use violations were positively related to recidivism for female offenders, but having a juvenile criminal history, having a co-offender, using a weapon in an offense, and abusing alcohol and drugs were not related to recidivism. Having children was also not related to recidivism; however, being a single mother was associated with an increased likelihood of recidivism. Finally, engaging in self-harming
behaviors and being a victim of adult physical abuse were also associated with higher
drates of recidivism.

Olson, Alderden, and Lurigio (2003) explored gender differences in risk factors
related to general recidivism and community supervision violations. The sample included
3,325 adults (2,636 men and 689 women) who had been discharged from community
supervision in the state of Illinois. Probation officers were asked to fill out a data
collection form each time they discharged an offender. This form included information
about the offender’s demographics, gang affiliation, substance use, risk level, and living
arrangements. The authors found that men who recidivated were more likely to be young,
single, gang members, and/or high school dropouts when compared to male
nonrecidivists. Male recidivists also were more likely than male nonrecidivists to have a
prior criminal history and current substance-abuse problems. Female recidivists were
more likely than female nonrecidivists to have a criminal history, have a current
substance-abuse problem, and have dropped out of high school. However, age and
marital status were not related to recidivism for female offenders.

Olson et al. (2003) also combined data for men and women into one group to
explore risk factors for recidivism. They found that factors that were predictive for the
combined group were the same as the factors that were predictive for the male recidivists
but not for the female recidivists, suggesting that when males and females were combined
factors unique to females were lost. Younger age, lower income levels, lower education
levels, gang affiliation, criminal history, substance abuse, and urban jurisdiction type
were related to increased community supervision violations for males. In contrast, lower
education levels and a history of substance abuse were the only factors related to
increased community supervision violations for females. The authors concluded that many of the risk-assessment tools included factors that were more predictive for men than for women and that these factors could be inflating female offenders’ predicted risk.

Dowden and Andrews (1999) completed a meta-analysis exploring specific factors that were targeted in treatment to determine whether they were associated with lower rates of recidivism for female offenders. The authors used a subset of 26 studies from two other meta-analyses, so as to have samples primarily or completely comprised of female participants. The authors found that the risk of recidivism decreased significantly when treatment focused on reducing the number of antisocial associates and increasing family affection (this factor was not defined), suggesting that these factors were related to recidivism. They also found that targeting antisocial attitudes and behavioral control problems in treatment was associated with a significant decrease in recidivism. Larger effects were also found when treatment providers targeted higher risk offenders.

Overall, research has suggested that male and female offenders share some risk factors for recidivism, such as younger age, substance use, criminal history, antisocial associates, and dropping out of high school (Bonta et al., 1995; Dowden & Andrews, 1999; Olson et al., 2003). However, some additional factors that have not been found to be related to recidivism for males, such as being a single parent, engaging in self-harming behaviors, and being a victim of adult physical abuse, were found to be related to higher rates of recidivism for females (Bonta et al., 1995). Further, some factors that were predictive for males and often included in risk assessments were not related to female offender recidivism, such as age and marital status (Olson et al., 2003). However, when
targeting factors such as the nature of social companions, affection expressed in the family, antisocial attitudes, and the amount and quality of supervision, recidivism decreased for female offenders (Dowden & Andrews, 1999). Each of these factors is addressed in the LSI risk assessments, and the utility of these assessments for females will be discussed further.

Utility of LSI scales for female nonsexual offenders. Although risk-assessment tools such as LSI assessments have been validated for women (Andrews et al., 2004), most research conducted on developing these tools was based on White male offenders rather than females (Blanchette & Brown, 2006). To address this problem, Smith, Cullen, and Latessa (2009) conducted a meta-analysis to examine the predictive ability of the LSI-R for recidivism in female offenders. The authors included 25 published and unpublished studies with a total sample of 14,737 female offenders. Sixteen studies included both male and female offenders, which permitted within-sample comparisons. The authors found that the LSI-R was predictive of recidivism for female offenders and that the LSI-R predicted recidivism similarly for male and female offenders, suggesting that there was no difference between genders. The authors recommended using the LSI-R for both males and females in correctional settings.

Rettinger and Andrews (2010) examined the ability of the central eight factors mentioned earlier and of additional gender-specific factors to predict general recidivism, violent recidivism, and number of new convictions. The gender-specific factors included emotional stress, minority status, abuse history, self-harming behaviors, suicide attempt history, relationship distress, mental health history, financial issues, single parenthood, and parenting stress. A total of 411 females who were either incarcerated or on
community supervision in Ontario, Canada, participated. The majority of participants were single and Caucasian. Participants were interviewed, and the LSI-R and the LS/CMI were scored. Recidivism data were obtained 57 months after the interviews. The authors found that the LS/CMI total score was predictive of all three types of recidivism. Further, each of the central eight factors was significantly related to all three types of recidivism, with the big four (history of antisocial behavior, pattern of antisocial personality characteristics, antisocial attitudes, and antisocial companions) being the major predictors. The authors also found that the LS/CMI was equally predictive across age, ethnicity, poverty, education, and employment factors. When analyzing the gender-specific factors, the authors found that experiencing sexual and/or emotional abuse as a child was related to violent offending. All of the gender-specific factors either were not related to recidivism or did not add incremental validity beyond the central eight. Overall, the authors concluded that the central eight factors were highly predictive of recidivism in female offenders.

Van Voorhis, Wright, Salisbury, and Bauman (2010) conducted a study to explore the incremental validity of adding a female-specific supplemental tool to gender-neutral risk assessments (including the LSI-R) in the prediction of risk of recidivism or prison misconduct by adult females. The authors explored two possible methods of supplementing the gender-neutral assessments. The first method was a paper-and-pencil questionnaire that assessed the following factors: low self-efficacy, adult victimization, child abuse, parental strain, and relationship problems. The second method included the same factors in a paper-and-pencil questionnaire but also included both factors not exclusive to females (depressive symptoms, psychotic symptoms, family of origin
problems, anger or hostility, homelessness, mental health history, and financial problems) and protective factors (family of origin support, relationship support, educational resources); information on the additional factors were collected during an interview. The authors included 879 adult females from three different settings: prison, probation, and prerelease. The authors explored the supplements with the LSI-R in Colorado, Minnesota, and Maui; however, Maui did not have a prison sample. For probation participants, the LSI-R was related to recidivism in Maui and Minnesota. Two additional factors (parental strain and low self-efficacy) from the first model were related to recidivism and resulted in a strong partial correlation when added to the LSI-R for probationers in Minnesota. For the Maui probationers, the second model factors of family of origin support, mental health history, and homelessness moderately improved the predictive ability of the LSI-R. For prison populations, child abuse and relationship problems were related to prison misconduct in Colorado and Minnesota. These two factors also showed incremental validity when they were added to the LSI-R in Colorado and Minnesota. The authors reported no significant findings in the prerelease sample. Overall, they concluded that the LSI-R was predictive of recidivism for female offenders; however, in particular samples, female-specific factors may add predictive validity to the LSI-R.

In summary, gender-specific factors such as sexual abuse, emotional abuse, child abuse, parental strain, low self-efficacy, homelessness, mental health history, and relationship problems appear to be related to risk of recidivism by female offenders (Bonta et al., 1995; Olson et al., 2003; Van Voorhis et al., 2010). Family of origin support was also found to be a protective factor (Van Voorhis et al., 2010). Further, both the LSI-R and LS/CMI appear to be valid tools for assessing female offenders’ risk of
general recidivism (Rettinger & Andrews, 2010). Finally, when assessing female offenders for general recidivism, third-generation (LSI-R) and fourth-generation (LS/CMI) tools are available.

**Comparison of females and males on the LSI scales.** Some researchers have conducted comparisons of scores for males and females on the LSI scales. Lowenkamp, Holsinger, and Latessa (2001) investigated the validity of the LSI-R for predicting recidivism and explored the extent to which childhood physical and sexual abuse, a factor not included in the LSI-R, predicted recidivism in male and female offenders. Subjects were 442 adult offenders (72% male, 28% female) who had been previously incarcerated and transferred to a community corrections residential facility for treatment. All subjects had been discharged from the treatment facility (by completing treatment, absconding, or being reincarcerated) before November 30, 1998. Recidivism was defined as reincarceration in a state prison. The sample was 53% Black, 45% White, and 2% other ethnicities, and 11% of the participants reported having been a victim of childhood physical and/or sexual abuse.

Lowenkamp et al. (2001) obtained offenders’ LSI-R scores from the residential facility. They also obtained each offender’s race and age. The authors found that the LSI-R risk score was related to recidivism for males, females, and the combined sample. Moreover, the LSI-R was the best predictor of recidivism for males, females, and the combined sample. Race, age, and child abuse were not predictive of recidivism; however, time in the community was predictive of recidivism. The authors concluded that the LSI-R was a valid tool for predicting general risk for both males and females.
In a later study, Vose, Lowenkamp, Smith, and Cullen (2009) examined the predictive validity of the LSI-R for recidivism in a population of adult male and female offenders. A total of 2,849 (2,448 males and 401 females) offenders on probation ($n = 1,976$) or parole ($n = 873$) were included. Data were collected from the Iowa Department of Corrections. The authors obtained LSI-R scores for each of the subjects at two different times in a 5-year period, which allowed the authors to assess change in risk over time. Recidivism was defined as any new misdemeanor or felony conviction and was measured as a dichotomous variable (yes or no). The authors found that the LSI-R predicted recidivism for males and females at both time points, and the predictive validity of the LSI-R for males and females did not differ significantly at either time point. They found the same results when controlling for race, age, and type of supervision. The authors also found that the magnitude of change in LSI-R scores between Time 1 and Time 2 was a significant predictor of recidivism, such that the smaller the change in scores the higher the risk of recidivism. Finally, a higher risk score on the LSI-R was predictive of a higher chance of recidivism. The authors concluded that the LSI-R was a valid predictor of recidivism regardless of gender.

Andrews et al. (2011) conducted a meta-analysis to explore the predictive validity of the LS/CMI factors for criminal recidivism in both male and female offenders. A total of 2,069 male offenders and 354 female offenders were included; 1,875 were adults and 548 were youths (however, although the authors stated that they used the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory [YLS/CMI], all results provided were for the LS/CMI). The authors found that the central eight factors of the LS/CMI were predictive of recidivism for both male and female offenders. Further, the substance-abuse factor was
more related to criminal recidivism for females than it was for males. The authors stated that the LS/CMI over-predicted recidivism in low-risk female offenders (i.e., female offenders in the low-risk category recidivated at a substantially lower rate than did males in the same low-risk category). Overall, the authors suggested exploring different cut-off scores for low-risk female offenders.

To conclude, it appears that the third-generation LSI-R and fourth-generation LS/CMI risk assessments are valid tools for both males and females criminal offenders (Andrews et al., 2011; Lowenkamp et al., 2001; Vose et al., 2009).

Risk Factors for Recidivism and the Development of Risk Assessments for Male Sexual Offenders

Risk factors related to recidivism for male sexual offenders have also been separated into static risk factors and dynamic risk factors (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Examples of static risk factors include criminal history, victim demographics, and age of offender at time of release into the community. Dynamic risk factors are further divided into stable and acute dynamic risk factors in research on male sexual offenders (Hanson & Harris, 2000). Stable dynamic risk factors, such as an offender’s social group or an offender’s attitudes toward supervision, are capable of being changed over a matter of months or years (Hanson et al., 2007). Acute dynamic risk factors, such as substance intoxication or negative emotions, can change quickly, in a matter of days, hours, or minutes (Hanson & Harris, 2000). Stable and acute dynamic risk factors may also overlap. For example, substance abuse may change quickly or slowly, and thus it may be categorized as either an acute or a stable factor. Research on risk factors for recidivism and the development of risk assessments for male sexual offenders can be best
characterized as a progression from identifying static risk factors to combining static, stable, and acute risk assessments to increase predictive ability.

**Static risk factors and assessments for recidivism.** Many small-scale studies have been conducted to explore risk factors for recidivism in male sexual offenders, yielding inconsistent findings (Hanson & Bussière, 1998). To address this issue, Hanson and Bussière conducted a meta-analysis exploring factors related to sexual, violent nonsexual, and general recidivism in a population of male sexual offenders. Through multiple literature searches, the authors found 61 studies related to male sexual offenders and recidivism with a total of 28,972 male sexual offenders in the combined sample. The authors found that the rate for sexual recidivism was 13.4%, the rate for nonsexual violent recidivism was 12.2%, and the rate for general recidivism was 36.3%. Looking first at sexual recidivism, static or unchangeable factors related to sexual recidivism were being young,2 being single, having been convicted of prior sexual offenses, having strangers as victims, having unrelated victims, and participating in various types of sexual crimes. Further, the strongest predictor for sexual recidivism was increased sexual deviancy, meaning that male sexual offenders with prior sexual offenses or deviant sexual interests had an increased risk of sexually recidivating. For nonsexual violent recidivism, risk factors were being young, being single, being an ethnic minority, having an assorted criminal history, and having a diagnosis of antisocial or “psychopathic personality disorders” (Hanson & Bussière, 1998, p. 353). Finally, factors related to general recidivism were being young, being single, being an ethnic minority,

---
2 “Being young” was never operationally defined by Hanson and Bussière (1998). With the same data, Hanson (1997) defined this factor, based on an informal investigation of the variables, as being younger than 25.
demonstrating continuous engagement in criminal activities, and “antisocial personality or psychopathy” (Hanson & Bussière, 1998, p. 353).

Hanson (1997) developed a screening tool based on the research included in Hanson and Bussière’s (1998) meta-analysis. Hanson selected a pool of static or historical predictor variables and defined each of the variables, then developed the scale by examining and analyzing seven archival studies that included these variables. The development sample and a validation sample were from the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. Based on this analysis, Hanson created the Rapid Risk Assessment for Sexual Offense Recidivism (RRASOR), a four-item screening tool, using the best predictor variables. This tool would be considered a second-generation tool based on the four-generation model discussed above (Andrews et al., 2006). The items included being younger than 25, having unrelated victims, having male victims, and having any prior sexual offenses. Using the development and validation samples, Hanson found that the scale demonstrated a moderate level of predictive validity (ROC area of .71).

In a report on sexual offending, Grubin (1998) discussed another second-generation scale, known as the Structured Anchored Clinical Judgment (SACJ) that had been developed by David Thornton. This scale was created based upon previous relevant literature and unpublished data from a prison in the United Kingdom. The scale included multiple items about criminal history, victim characteristics, and offender characteristics, as well as a measure of the progress an individual makes while in prison (e.g., completing sexual offender treatment). Grubin stated that both the SACJ and the RRASOR had the

---

3 David Thornton did not write about the SACJ scale directly. Instead, Grubin (1998) discussed the scale based on personal communication with Thornton. This scale is mentioned in this section because it was used in the development of the STATIC-99 and later in the STATIC-99R, which is an important scale for the current study.
potential to be promising screening tools but that more work was needed. However, no data were presented to support this claim.

In continuing research on and development of second-generation risk-assessment tools, Hanson and Thornton (2000) conducted a study to compare the RRASOR, the SACJ-Min (a subset of the SACJ that was still predictive), and the Static-99, a new scale created by the authors that combined items from the RRASOR and the SACJ-Min. The Static-99 includes nine items related to increased risk: being younger than 25 when released into the community, having prior sexual offenses, having four or more prior sentencing dates, having an nonsexual violence conviction with the index sexual offense, having any previous nonsexual violent convictions, having any noncontact sexual offense convictions, having any unknown victims, having any male victims, and having any unrelated victims. The Static-99 also includes one protective factor: being in a live-in relationship for at least 2 years. Scores on these items are summed to create a total score that places the offender into a low, moderate-low, moderate-high, or high risk category.

The authors compared the three scales across four samples for predictive accuracy (three samples were from Canada and one sample was from the United Kingdom). For three samples, recidivism was defined as new convictions for a sexual or violent crime, and for the remaining sample recidivism was defined as any charge or readmission to the facility for a sexual of violent crime. The authors found that the Static-99 was better than the RRASOR and SACJ-Min at predicting sexual recidivism and violent recidivism. However, they stated that including dynamic factors with static factors already measured by the scale might improve the predictive accuracy of the Static-99.
Because of consistent findings that criminal activity decreases with age, Helmus, Thornton, Hanson, and Babchishin (2011) reevaluated the Static-99 to explore whether this scale adequately assessed older offenders. The authors collected 24 samples of raw data from studies that had been completed on the Static-99. A total of 8,390 male sexual offenders from the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Denmark, Austria, Sweden, Germany, and New Zealand were included in the study. For 11 samples, recidivism was defined as any new conviction for a sexual or violent crime. For 13 samples, recidivism was defined as any new charge of a sexual or violent crime. The authors found that increased age was related to lower risk based on the Static-99. Further, they found that increased age was also negatively related to sexual and violent recidivism. Lastly, Helmus et al. (2011) discovered that the age weights included in the Static-99 (0 points for anyone over the age of 25 when released into the community) overestimated the risk of sexual offenders who were over the age of 40 when they were released into the community. To correct this, the authors revised the age factor to reduce the risk score (by subtracting points from the scale) if the offender was 40 years old or older when he was released into the community. This revision created the Static-99R.

To summarize, in their meta-analysis, Hanson and Bussière (1998) found multiple static factors related to sexual, violent, and general recidivism. Based on the results from this study, the researchers developed second-generation, static risk-assessment tools to predict recidivism of sexual offenders. These assessments included the RRASOR (Hanson, 1997), SAC-J (Grubin, 1998), and the Static-99 (Hanson & Thornton, 2000). Of these tools, the Static-99 was the best at predicting sexual and violent recidivism. In their continued effort to improve scales, Helmus et al. (2011) developed the Static-99R to
address the overestimation of risk in older adults. Researchers suggested adding dynamic risk factors with the static risk factors in order to increase predictive ability (Hanson & Thornton, 2000).

**Dynamic risk factors and assessments for recidivism.** Having considered static risk factors related to recidivism for male sexual offenders, I now turn to the development of dynamic risk factors and assessments for recidivism. Hanson and Harris (2000) reported a study in which they explored static and dynamic (both stable and acute) risk factors related to sexual recidivism. The authors compared male sexual offenders who sexually recidivated with male sexual offenders who did not recidivate. The sample consisted of 409 male sexual offenders (208 recidivists and 201 nonrecidivists) who had committed a contact sexual offense and who were on community supervision in Canada. The authors collected data through interviews of community supervision officers and by reviewing multiple types of information in the offenders’ files. They obtained information from the sample from 1 and 6 months before the recidivating offenders committed their new sexual offense.

In their analysis, Hanson and Harris (2000) first explored the static factors and found that recidivists, relative to nonrecidivists, had a greater variety of victim types, fewer related victims, more unknown victims, more deviant sexual interests, and more sexual offenses as a juvenile. They also found that recidivists were younger when they began community supervision and were more likely to be unsuccessful in treatment, have a lower intelligence, and have unstable childhoods relative to nonrecidivists. When exploring stable dynamic factors, the authors found that unemployment, substance abuse during supervision, intimacy problems, negative social environment, attitudes supporting
sexual offending, poor self-management, preoccupation with sex, and lack of cooperation with supervision were present more often in recidivists than in nonrecidivists. With respect to acute dynamic risk factors, the authors found that substance abuse during supervision, anger, increased psychiatric symptoms, attitudes supporting sexual offending, increased victim access, and lack of cooperation with supervision were more apparent in recidivists than in nonrecidivists. As mentioned previously, stable and acute dynamic risk factors can overlap. In this study, substance abuse during supervision, attitudes supporting sexual offending, and lack of cooperation with supervision were found to be both stable and acute dynamic risk factors.

Looking next at a third-generation scale, Hanson and Harris (2001) examined the utility of the Sex Offender Need Assessment Rating (SONAR), a scale derived from the findings in Hanson and Harris (2000). The SONAR includes nine dynamic risk factors. Five of the factors are stable: intimacy problems, negative social environment, attitudes supporting sexual offending, poor sexual self-management, and poor general self-management. Four factors are acute: problems with substances, negative emotions, anger, and accessibility to victims. The authors scored the SONAR items based on data available from the sample used by Hanson and Harris (2000). They found that recidivists obtained a higher score on the SONAR than did nonrecidivists. They also found that the SONAR was able to differentiate recidivists from nonrecidivists at a moderately high level (ROC area of .74). When controlling for other variables, such as age, static factors, and violence risk factors, the SONAR still contributed to predicting recidivism.

The SRA is an assessment procedure that includes static factors, dynamic stable factors, dynamic acute factors, and treatment progress. The IDA addresses the stable dynamic risk factors for sexual recidivism. Thornton completed two studies: one to verify three of the domains used in the IDA, and the other to assess the predictive ability of the IDA. The IDA includes four domains: deviant sexual arousal, attitudes supporting sexual offending, negative affect, and poor self-management. In the first study, deviant sexual arousal was not measured because there was no information available. The sample consisted of 158 adult males who were convicted and serving a prison sentence for a sexual crime against a child in Canada. The sample was divided into recidivists ($n = 54$) and nonrecidivists ($n = 104$), and criminal histories and psychometric test information were obtained from a database. The author found that recidivists had more attitudes supporting sexual offending, more negative affect, and poorer self-management than did nonrecidivists. Subjects in Thornton’s second study included 117 adult males convicted of and serving a prison sentence for a sexual crime. They were also being assessed for amenability to sexual offender treatment. Seven of the 117 subjects were recidivists. Data were collected from a database and included the assessment information. Using logistic regression, Thornton found that the IDA was able to predict sexual recidivism. The author concluded that the IDA section of the SRA would add to the predictive accuracy of risk assessments measuring static factors such as the Static-99.

Beech, Friendship, Erikson, and Hanson (2002) conducted a study to examine deviancy (a dynamic risk factor) and its role in predicting sexual recidivism, which they defined as new conviction of a sexual crime. The study was part of the Sex Offender Treatment Evaluation Project (STEP) conducted in the United Kingdom. The sample
consisted of 53 sexual offenders who offended against children, were on probation, and were being assessed for amenability to sexual offender treatment. The participants were Caucasian and had been previously incarcerated for an average of 4.9 years. The sample was tracked for approximately 6 years, during which time 15% of the sample recidivated. The authors obtained demographic data, offender and victim information, and criminal history. They also conducted interviews, administered the Static-99, and administered 14 scales to the participants to measure deviancy. The deviancy scales measured emotional distress, acknowledgment of responsibility for offense, attitudes toward sexual offending, and denial. In addition, the authors administered a social desirability scale to assess response bias and adjust scales accordingly. The authors found that static factors of the Static-99 were related to recidivism, and high deviancy was also related to recidivism, independent of the static factors. The authors concluded that assessing dynamic risk factors, such as deviancy, was important in predicting recidivism.

With dynamic risk factors becoming a part of assessment tools, Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2005) completed an updated study based on Hanson and Bussière (1998) by further examining the dynamic risk factors related to sexual, sexual nonviolent, violent (both sexual and nonsexual), and general recidivism in a sample of male sexual offenders. This meta-analysis included 82 studies identified through a literature search. The sample consisted of 29,450 male sexual offenders. The definition of recidivism varied among the studies: for 25 studies, researchers used a re-arrest as their criterion; for 24 studies, researchers used reconviction, three used reincarceration, 26 used multiple criteria such as arrest and parole violations, two used self-report, and two were unknown. The authors found that sexual deviancy was the strongest predictor of sexual recidivism.
They also found that intimacy problems, specifically conflicts in romantic relationships and difficulty relating emotionally with children, were significantly related to sexual recidivism. Having an antisocial point of view (i.e., antisocial personality, antisocial traits, and a history of violating rules) was related to all categories of sexual, nonsexual violent, violent, and general recidivism. They also noted that some variables assessed and addressed in clinical treatment were not related to recidivism. These factors included denial, lack of empathy for the victim, and lack of motivation to participate in treatment.

Overall, as indicated by these studies, dynamic risk factors have been used to increase the predictive accuracy of risk assessments of male sexual offenders. Through this exploration, third-generation, dynamic risk assessments were created, including the SONAR (Hanson & Harris, 2001), SRA (Thornton, 2002), and the STEP (Beech et al., 2002). The development of these tools led to an updated meta-analysis that identified the predictive accuracy of dynamic risk factors in order to create more valid risk assessments in the future (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005). The dynamic risk factors found to be predictive of recidivism were sexual deviancy, intimacy problems, and an antisocial point of view.

**Combining static and dynamic risk assessments for recidivism.** With the Static-99 established and dynamic risk factors (stable and acute) identified, Hanson et al. (2007) completed a large study exploring the assessment of stable and acute risk factors in order to evaluate risk for recidivism in male sexual offenders. They also examined a method of combining static, stable, and acute risk assessments, creating a fourth-generation assessment tool to predict sexual recidivism in these offenders. The subjects were 991 male sexual offenders on community supervision in all Canadian provinces and
two U.S. states (Alaska and Iowa). The authors used the Static-99 to obtain static risk factors. They created the Stable-2000, a 16-item scale based on Hanson and Morton-Bourgoin (2005) that also combined items from the SONAR, STEP, and SRA, to assess stable dynamic factors. The authors also created the Acute-2000, a seven-item scale based on previous literature, to assess acute dynamic factors that can be a focus for case management.

After being trained on the Static-99, Stable-2000, and Acute-2000, supervision officers completed the Static-99 within 1 month of beginning offender supervision and the Stable-2000 within 3 months of beginning supervision (Hanson et al., 2007). The Stable-2000 was then administered every 6 months. The Acute-2000 was completed after the first Stable-2000 and given during every session the supervision officer saw the sexual offender. When an offender recidivated, the authors obtained information regarding the description of the offense as well as information about when the offense had occurred in order to categorize the behavior. Specifically, recidivism was separated into five mutually exclusive types: a sexually motivated crime; any sexual recidivism, including sexual behaviors that were self-reported by the offender or violated a condition of their supervision, which could be both illegal and legal (e.g., loitering by an elementary school); any violent or sexual crime that involved physical confrontation with a victim; any crime; and any recidivism, including behaviors that only resulted in supervision sanctions. (In their description of the types of recidivism, many of the categories appeared to overlap. For example, committing a sexual crime could be classified as all five types. The method by which the authors categorized each offense was unclear.)
When assessing the relationship between stable risk factors and recidivism, Hanson et al. (2007) found that seven of the 16 factors were predictive of every type of recidivism measured. An additional three were predictive of the criteria they were designed to predict (e.g., using sex as a coping mechanism was related to sexual recidivism). Three were found to be predictive of the criteria they were designed to predict when the factor was revised. For example, having an emotional connection with a child was predictive of recidivism for child molesters; therefore, the authors revised the factor to only be scored with someone who had at least one victim 13 years old or younger. Based on these results, the authors modified the Stable-2000 by preserving the 10 items that were predictive and revising three items to make them more predictive. This process resulted in the Stable-2007. The authors then assessed the utility of using the stable scales (Stable-2000 and Stable-2007) and the Static-99 in combination to predict recidivism. They explored the combination of the Stable-2000 and the Static-99 as well as the combination of the Stable-2007 with the Static-99. The authors found that the Stable-2000 added to the predictive ability of the Static-99 for all types of recidivism except for sexual crimes. However, the Stable-2007 added to the predictive ability of the Static-99 for all types of recidivism including sexual crime.

When assessing the relationship between acute dynamic factors and all types of recidivism, Hanson et al. (2007) discovered that four of the seven items (access to victims, sexual fixation, hostility, and supervision resistance) were related to all types of recidivism. They also found that the additional three items (emotional instability, lack of social supports, and substance abuse) were related to all types of recidivism except sexual or violent crimes. Therefore, the authors revised the Acute-2000 and created a new scale,
the Acute-2007, which consisted of two subscales: an overall scale for general recidivism and a subscale strictly related to sexual or violent recidivism. When controlling for Static-99 and Stable-2007 items, the overall scale of the Acute-2007 was able to contribute to the prediction of general and violent recidivism, and the sexual/violent subscale contributed to the prediction of all types of recidivism. Consequently, the authors concluded that combining the Static-99, Stable-2007, and Acute-2007 factors improved the prediction of all types of recidivism that were studied.

To summarize what has been discussed, the development of risk assessments predicting the likelihood of male sexual offender recidivism began with identifying static risk factors related to recidivism, such as having previous sexual offenses or an unrelated victim (Hanson & Bussière, 1998). This led to the development of a second-generation assessment tool, the Static-99, a 10-item scale (with nine risk factors and one protective factor) that categorized offenders into one of four risk levels (Hanson & Thornton, 2000). Later, this scale became the Static-99R when the age item was revised (Helmus et al., 2011). Researchers then focused on the development of dynamic risk assessments (Beech et al., 2002; Hanson & Harris, 2001; Thornton, 2002), which gave rise to an updated meta-analysis to identify dynamic risk factors related to recidivism (sexual deviancy, intimacy problems, and an antisocial point of view; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005). Finally, the Stable-2007 and Acute-2007 were created based on Hanson and Morton-Bourgon’s meta-analysis and previous dynamic risk-assessment tools. The Stable-2007 and Acute-2007 were combined with the Static-99, creating a fourth-generation assessment tool, to improve the predictive ability of recidivism (Hanson et al., 2007).
Female Sexual Offenders

Female sexual offender research is behind male sexual offender research by approximately 20 years (Cortoni, 2010). Much of the research for female sexual offenders has focused on topics such as characteristics and typologies (Gannon, Rose, & Cortoni, 2010). In this section, I discuss characteristics of female sexual offenders, typologies of female sexual offenders, and risk factors related to recidivism for female sexual offenders.

**Static Characteristics of Female Sexual Offenders.** Lewis and Stanley (2000) examined characteristics of 15 adult and adolescent women accused of committing sexual crimes. Based on chart review, the authors found that the average age of the women was 28.2 years, a majority (67%) were Caucasian, and 60% had not completed high school. A majority (80%) reported a history of sexual abuse in their lifetime. Most victims were male (14 out of 23) and Caucasian (67%). With respect to the specifics of the crime, 7% of the offenses included substances, 67% occurred at the victim’s residence, and 47% of the women had male co-offenders. In each case, the male co-offender was having a sexual relationship with the female offender. The authors noted that their study was only descriptive in nature and that future research must be completed in order to understand characteristics of women who sexually offend.

Nathan and Ward (2002) explored the characteristics of 12 female sexual offenders incarcerated or under community supervision in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. The authors obtained data from the females’ sentencing, clinical interviews, and results on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI-2). The average age of offenders was 30 years. Most of the offenders had been victims of sexual abuse (n = 9)
and/or physical abuse ($n = 7$) at some point in their lives. The majority of the offenders ($n = 9$) had male co-offenders at the time of the offense. Only three had prior convictions, none of which were for sexual offenses. The average age of victims was 11 years. All but one of the offenders offended with female victims. When offenders were asked about their motivations to offend, the most common answers indicated that they had responded to coercion by the co-offender, they had wanted revenge against their ex-partners or perpetrators of their victimization, and/or they had wanted to gain acceptance from their co-offender. Other motivations included jealousy, power, and affection. The results of the MMPI-2 were varied, with some women having elevations on psychopathic deviate, depression, paranoia, masculinity/femininity, and hypochondriasis scales.

Elliott, Eldridge, Ashfield, and Beech (2010) also conducted a descriptive study to examine characteristics of women who sexually offended. The subjects were 43 adult women who were referred to a United Kingdom treatment facility after being convicted of or admitting to sexual abuse of a child. The authors collected data from the clinical files of the treatment facility. By using frequency counts, the authors found that about half of the sample had had negative childhoods (51%), and a majority reported experiencing emotional, physical, and/or sexual abuse as children (67%). The authors also found that a minority of the sample had previous convictions (14% for nonsexual and nonviolent crimes, 2% for violent crimes, and 5% for sexual crimes). A majority (74%) reported being in prior physically or emotionally abusive relationships. The authors concluded that the majority of female sexual offenders had had a chaotic lifestyle beginning in their childhood.
Wijkman, Bikleveld, and Hendriks (2010) explored characteristics of female sexual offenders in the Netherlands. The authors obtained data from court files of 111 adult females who had at least one hands-on offense. The average age of the women when they committed their sexual offenses was 34 years. The authors found that 54% of the women grew up in intact families, 31% reported having been sexually abused as a child, and 16% reported having been physically abused as a child. Most of the women had not received a high school diploma and had lower than average intelligence. When examining the specific offenses, the authors found that 63% of the female sexual offenders had co-offenders, 60% had abused girl/female victims, 45% were related to their victims, 46% knew their victims, and 9% had stranger victims.

Overall, researchers have found through frequency and descriptive analysis that female sexual offenders frequently have offended with a co-offender, have minimal criminal histories, and have been a victim of abuse as a child (Elliott et al., 2010; Nathan & Ward, 2002; Wijkman et al., 2010). There were mixed findings with regard to the victims’ sex, with one study finding the majority of victims to be male (Lewis & Stanley, 2000) and others finding the majority to be female (Nathan & Ward, 2002; Wijkman et al., 2010).

Another approach to the study of female sexual offenders has been to compare them to male sexual offenders and/or other criminal offenders. Vandiver and Walker (2002) conducted a study to examine characteristics of female sexual offenders and to compare these characteristics with those of male sexual offenders. Criminal records of 40 women and 1,604 men registered as sexual offenders in the state of Arkansas were reviewed. A majority of female sexual offenders were Caucasian (90%), had been
arrested for their first sexual offenses between the ages of 19 to 25 years (43%), and did not have a criminal record prior to the sexual offense (73%). All of the victims were younger than 16 years old, and there was no significant difference in the number of male and female victims. When the authors compared female to male sexual offenders, they found that female offenders’ first conviction was significantly more likely to have been a sexual offense; no other differences were significant. Vandiver and Walker concluded that there was a lack of research on the characteristics of female sexual offenders and that more research was needed to increase awareness and aid in treatment of this population.

Vandiver (2006) compared characteristics of 123 female sexual offenders who offended alone and 104 female sexual offenders who offended with a co-offender. Based on a records review, female sexual offenders who had a co-offender were found to be more likely to have been convicted of a nonsexual offense at the same time as their sexual offense than were solo female sexual offenders. Those with co-offenders were more likely than were solo offenders to have had multiple victims for their index offenses and to be related to their victims. Although the groups did not differ significantly with respect to the sex of the victim, there was a nonsignificant trend toward solo offenders being more likely to have male victims and female sexual offenders with co-offenders being more likely to have female victims. Solo offenders were more likely than were female sexual offenders with co-offenders to be acquaintances with their victims than to be related to or to not know their victims. Female sexual offenders with co-offenders were more likely to be related to their victim than were solo offenders. Finally, the majority of co-offenders were male; however, eight female sexual offenders with co-offenders had female co-offenders.
In a more recent study, Johansson-Love and Fremouw (2009) compared characteristics of female sexual offenders with characteristics of three comparison groups: male sexual offenders, male nonsexual offenders who had a victim in their crime, and female nonsexual offenders who had a victim in their crime. The researchers reviewed 124 inmate files (31 from each of the four groups) from three state prison facilities in West Virginia. The authors found that female sexual offenders had no preference for the sex of their victim when compared to the three comparison groups. Female sexual offenders were significantly more likely to have known their victim than were male sexual offenders, and they were significantly more likely to have a co-offender than were either male sexual offenders or male nonsexual offenders. Relative to the three comparison groups, a larger percentage of the female sexual offender group had been victims of sexual abuse in their lifetime; however, the difference was significant only for the comparison with male nonsexual offenders. Female sexual offenders were significantly less likely to have a history of alcohol abuse than were individuals in the three comparisons groups and were also less likely to have a history of drug abuse than were male and female nonsexual offenders. Finally, the authors found that female sexual offenders were significantly more likely to deny their offense than were male and female nonsexual offenders. The researchers concluded that female sexual offenders varied from other offending populations and recommended more research using comparison groups as well as using standardized tests to measure characteristics of female sexual offenders.

Overall, a variety of unique characteristics have been found for female sexual offenders in comparison with other offender groups. When compared to male sexual and nonsexual offenders and female nonsexual offenders, female sexual offenders were more
likely to have a limited criminal history, no preference for the sex of the victim, and a history of victimization (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Vandiver & Walker, 2002). Researchers also found differences between solo female sexual offenders and co-offending female sexual offenders, with solo female sexual offenders preferring male victims and being more likely to be acquaintances with their victims (Vandiver, 2006). Co-offending female sexual offenders preferred female victims and were more likely than solo offenders to offend against victims who were related to them (Vandiver, 2006). Although they found preferences, the two groups did not significantly differ with respect to the sex of their victim (Vandiver, 2006).

**Dynamic Characteristics of Female Sexual Offenders.** In addition to static characteristics, researchers have also explored dynamic characteristics of female sexual offenders. In an early study, Green and Kaplan (1994) examined mental health and child victimization differences between 11 incarcerated female sexual offenders and 11 incarcerated female nonsexual offenders. The two groups were matched as much as possible on age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and prison security level. The average age of the participants was 36.45 years, with a range from 24 to 44 years. The Structured Clinical Interview for *DSM-III-R*, Outpatient Version (SCID-OP), the SCID-II for Personality Disorders, and the Harvard-Upjohn Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Interview were administered in order to obtain a diagnosis. The Wyatt Sexual History Questionnaire was administered in order to assess childhood victimization. The authors found that more female sexual offenders were victims of child physical and sexual abuse than were female nonsexual offenders. Further, female sexual offenders had been abused solely by relatives whereas those in the comparison group were more likely to be abuse
outside of the family. In regard to mental health, both groups had a high incidence of Axis I and Axis II disorders. Although there were no difference between groups in the diagnosis of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, female sexual offenders were more likely to attribute their PTSD to their childhood victimization than were nonsexual offenders. Female sexual offenders were diagnosed with Avoidant and Dependent Personality Disorders more frequently than were nonsexual offenders, whereas nonsexual offenders were diagnosed with Antisocial Personality Disorder more frequently than were sexual offenders. Female sexual offenders were also found to have higher scores on the Global Assessment of Functioning Scale, indicative of more impairment, relative to nonsexual offenders. Overall, the authors concluded that female sexual offenders had more mental health impairment and child victimization than did nonsexual offenders.

Strickland (2008) compared female sexual offender characteristics to female nonsexual offender characteristics using standardized testing materials. A total of 130 female inmates (60 sexual offenders and 70 nonsexual offenders, matched based on demographic information) were selected from three state prisons in Georgia. The participants completed three tests that measured personality characteristics, substance abuse, and childhood trauma. Strickland found that sexual offenders were significantly more likely than nonsexual offenders to have been victims of sexual abuse, emotional abuse, physical abuse, or physical neglect as a child. She also found that sexual offenders were more likely to endorse feelings of anxiety in social and sexual situations than were nonsexual offenders. Strickland concluded that, because of their history of childhood abuse and/or neglect, female sexual offenders had few skills to cultivate successful
interpersonal relationships. She suggested that such skills deficits might have been one reason why these women had sexually offended.

More recently, Fazel, Sjostedt, Grann, and Långström (2010) explored psychiatric issues of female sexual offenders in Sweden. The researchers compared 93 female sexual offenders to 13,452 female nonsexual violent offenders and 20,597 females randomly selected from the general population. Psychiatric information was obtained from a nationwide registry. Female sexual offenders had been hospitalized for psychiatric reasons far more frequently than had women in the general population (36.6% and 4.6%, respectively). Also, 7.5% of female sexual offenders had been diagnosed with a psychotic disorder and 18.3% had been diagnosed with a substance use disorder, whereas only 1.4% of females in general population had been diagnosed with a psychotic disorder and 0.9% with a substance-use disorder. The authors did not find any differences between female sexual offenders and female nonsexual violent offenders on these diagnoses of psychosis or substance abuse (10.7% and 19.5% for female nonsexual violent offenders, respectively). The authors suggested that psychiatric issues may be a risk factor for female sexual offenders, and mental health issues should be screened for and treated.

Beech, Parrett, Ward, and Fisher (2009) conducted a qualitative study to explore the cognitions and motivations of female sexual offenders to see if they were similar to prior themes found for male sexual offenders. Participants were 15 Caucasian incarcerated female sexual offenders. The average age of the sample was 47.3 years and the average prison sentence was 6.3 years. Participants were interviewed using a semi-structured interview method to assess their cognitions and motivations. The authors found that female sexual offenders exhibited four cognition and motivation themes that were
similar to those reported by male sexual offenders: feeling out of control, viewing the world as unsafe, viewing children sexually, and viewing their offense as protective. They did not exhibit the theme of entitlement, which had been found for male sexual offenders; however, one of the two coders believed that an additional theme of feeling coerced was exhibited by females and not males. The authors suggested there were both similarities and differences between male and female sexual offenders.

Lawson (2008) conducted a qualitative analysis to explore the current, everyday experiences of female sexual offenders who are required to register as sexual offenders. The author reviewed interview records of 20 females who had been required to register as sexual offenders. The author found that relationship experiences constituted the major theme in the interviews, with three subthemes: relationship with self, relationship with an intimate partner, and relationship with others. Female sexual offenders held negative beliefs about themselves and other adults; however, they appeared to idealize children. Further, the author reported that the offenders appeared unable to meet their social needs, which may have been a part of the motivation for the offending behavior.

To conclude, research has suggested that female sexual offenders were more often victims of physical, emotional, and sexual abuse perpetrated by relatives than were nonsexual offenders (Green & Kaplan, 1994; Strickland, 2008). Also, female sexual offenders were more likely to be diagnosed with psychosis and substance use disorder than the general population and to have a higher level of mental health impairment than nonsexual offenders (Green & Kaplan, 1994; Fazel et al., 2010). They also have been found to have higher levels of social anxiety than nonsexual offenders and to be unable to meet their social needs (Lawson, 2008; Strickland, 2008). Lastly, female sexual offenders
have reported cognitions of feelings out of control, viewing the world as unsafe, viewing children sexually, and viewing their offender as protective (Beech et al., 2009).

**Noncontact Female Sexual Offender Characteristics.** Very limited research has been conducted in regard to characteristics of females who have committed noncontact sexual offenses (Elliott & Ashfield, 2011). Alexy, Burgess, and Baker (2005) examined media records to explore characteristics of internet offenders. The sample included 225 cases of internet cases found in 91 sources of media between the years 1996 and 2002. Approximately 5% \( (n = 11) \) of all internet offenses had been committed by women. The offenses committed by women included trading child pornography, having sexual conversations with minors online, or a combination of the two. The majority of the female offenders \( (n = 7, 64\%) \) were involved in trading child pornography. The authors concluded that classification of internet offenders was complex and that more research needs to be completed.

In a more recent study, Elliott and Ashfield (2011) explored characteristics of female sexual offenders who committed an offense using the internet. The actual sample size was not reported, however; the authors stated that it was small and that the research was only meant to target aspects for further research. They concluded that female sexual offenders who used the internet to offend were extremely rare. The researchers also suggested that further research should address interpersonal deficits, deviant arousal, and cognitive distortions in this population. Finally, they suggested that female sexual offenders who used the internet in their offenses appeared to be similar to female sexual offenders who had contact offenses but that more research was needed.
Overall, research conducted on characteristics of female sexual offenders who committed noncontact sexual offenses has been minimal. Preliminary research has suggested that noncontact female sexual offenders were rare and similar to female sexual offenders who commit sexual offenses (Alexy et al., 2005; Elliott & Ashfield, 2011).

**Female sexual offender typologies.** Another approach to studying female sexual offenders has been the development of female sexual offender typologies. Such categorization schemes are believed to be useful in identifying and treating this population (Vandiver & Kercher, 2004). However, the development of these typologies is still in its infancy.

Mathews, Matthews, and Speltz (1989) and Matthews, Mathews, and Speltz (1991) completed an exploratory study on female sexual offender typologies. The authors used qualitative methods to study 16 adult female sexual offenders who were attending a treatment facility in Minnesota. The majority of the sample were Caucasian \(n = 14\). Patterns and themes were constructed from interviews, records, questionnaires, and testing. The authors found three types of female sexual offenders. The first was labeled the *teacher/lover offender* type, wherein the offender fell in love with the victim and did not believe she was abusing the victim. All the offenders in this category had experienced emotional abuse at some time in their lives, and some had also experienced sexual abuse as a child. They also had problematic relationships with adult males at the time of their offense. The second type of female sexual offender was called the *intergenerationally predisposed offender*. These women were solo offenders as well as offenders who acted against people in their family. Sexual abuse was found to be prevalent within the offender’s family over a period of years, and the abuse was kept a secret. These offenders
found it difficult to develop healthy relationships in adolescence and had the label of being promiscuous. The last type of female sexual offender was referred to as the *male coerced offender*. These offenders committed their sexual offender with a male co-offender. They were passive and were in controlling, abusive relationships. All of the offenders in this category had been sexually abused by males as a child and had not told anyone about the abuse. The authors stated that female sexual offenders reported that acceptance and a nonjudgmental attitude by treatment providers were vital to their treatment.

In a more recent study, Vandiver and Kercher (2004) developed six types of female sexual offenders through cluster analysis. Their sample included 471 adult female sexual offenders who were registered in the state of Texas. The most common type of female sexual offender (*n* = 146) was labeled *heterosexual nurturer*. Offenders of this type only victimized males, and the authors reported that this category was similar to that of the teacher/lover category; however, it was expanded to include any female in a mentor or caretaking role. The authors hypothesized that the motivation for these females to offend was that they viewed the offenses as nonabusive. The second type was called *noncriminal homosexual offenders*; in this group, most of the victims were female, and the authors speculated that many of these females had co-offenders (although that information was not obtained). The third type was called *female sexual predators* and included females who were most likely to be re-arrested and to have multiple criminal offenses. The authors found that these women were very similar to other female nonsexual offenders.
The fourth type identified by Vandiver and Kercher (2004) was called young adult child exploiters and consisted of females who offended with young victims (average victim age of 7 years). The offenders in this category comprised the youngest group, with the average age at the time of arrest being 28. The fifth type was labeled homosexual criminals and consisted of females who had the highest number of arrests and had older victims (average victim age of 32 years); in addition, most of the victims were female. The authors reported that the motivation for these offenders was financial gain (e.g., by compelling prostitution) rather than deviant sexual satisfaction. Therefore, sexual assault was not involved with this type. The last type was aggressive homosexual offenders who victimized primarily older (average victim age of 31 years) and female victims. This type was different from the other adult type in that the offense often involved sexual assault. The authors concluded that most researchers developing female sexual offender typologies had only explored abuse on children and were missing female sexual offenders who abused adults.

Sandler and Freeman (2007) conducted a similar study to test the typologies of Vandiver and Kercher (2004). Their sample included 390 female sexual offenders who were registered in the state of New York. The age range was 17 to 83 years ($M = 33$ years). The authors obtained information from the sexual offender registry and criminal history files. The authors entered the offenders’ and victims’ ages as Z scores in order to limit their influence during the analysis, which was a different approach from that used by Vandiver and Kercher (2004). Also using cluster analysis, the authors found six types of female sexual offenders; however, some groups were markedly different from those identified by Vandiver and Kercher. The first and largest group of offenders ($n = 158$)
was called *criminally-limited hebephiles* (a hebephile is someone with a sexual preference for individuals in the early years of puberty). The average age of these offenders was 32.6 years, and the average age of the victims was 13.8 years. The offenders had primarily offended against male victims (70%) and had a low rate of re-arrest, incarceration time, and supervision violations. The second group was labeled *criminally-prone hebephiles*, and it included women who were slightly younger than criminally-limited hebephiles ($M = 29.1$ years) and who offended against slightly older victims ($M = 14.8$ years). This group had higher rates of re-arrests, incarceration time, and supervision violations than did criminally-limited hebephiles. Offenders in this group also preferred male victims.

The third group identified by Sandler and Freeman (2007) was called *young adult child molesters*. Their average age was 28.2 years, making them the youngest group. They also offended against the youngest victims ($M = 4.1$ years). They had the second lowest rate of re-arrests, with only the criminally-limited hebephiles having a lower rate, and no one in this group committed a supervision violation. Offenders in this group offended against males 48% of the time. The fourth group was labeled *high-risk chronic offenders*, and this group had the highest rates of total arrests, re-arrests, and arrests before they registered as sexual offenders when compared to all other groups. They also had the highest rates of drug arrests, incarceration time, and supervision violations when compared to all other groups. Offenders in this group offended against females 56% of the time, and this group included the highest number of offenders who were not Caucasian (38%). The fifth group was labeled *older nonhabitual offenders* who had limited criminal records outside of their sexual offense, making this group’s total arrests
significantly lower than all other groups other than young adult child molesters. They also had the lowest rate of arrest after registering as a sexual offender, and no one in this group had been re-arrested, arrested for drugs, or violated supervision. This group was also the oldest ($M = 51.1$ years). The last group, *homosexual child molesters*, primarily offended against females (91%). These offenders had a high percentage of drug arrests and incarceration time; however, they had low rates of re-arrest and supervision violations.

To conclude, research on typologies of female sexual offenders is still in the early stages. Matthews et al. (1989) and Mathews et al. (1991) described three types of female sexual offenders, and this grouping has been considered the most useful for researchers and clinicians (Harris, 2010; Nathan & Ward, 2002). More recently, Vandiver and Kercher (2004) and Sandler and Freeman (2007) also developed typologies of sexual offenders. All three have both similarities and differences. Vandiver and Kercher’s group labeled heterosexual nurturer and Sandler and Freemans’ group labeled criminally-limited hebephiles were suggested by the authors to be similar to Matthew et al.’s teacher/lover type. Also, Sandler and Freeman suggested that their group labeled adult child molesters was similar to Vandiver and Kercher’s young adult child exploiters. However, the typologies developed by Vandiver and Kercher differed from the typologies found by Sandler and Freeman in that Vandiver and Kercher found a preference for female victims whereas Sandler and Freeman did not. This difference influenced the typologies developed in both studies. Another difference was that, unlike Matthews et al., the researchers of the other two studies included adult victims and were
able to create typologies that addressed those victims. Overall, Sandler and Freeman concluded that female sexual offenders were a heterogeneous group.

**Risk factors for recidivism by female sexual offenders.** Little research has been conducted to look at risk factors for sexual or nonsexual recidivism by female sexual offenders. Freeman and Sandler (2008) conducted a study to explore differences between risk factors in adult male and female sexual offenders. The subjects consisted of 390 female sexual offenders and 390 matched male sexual offenders who were registered as sexual offenders in the state of New York. The authors collected data from the New York sexual offender registry and the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, including demographics of the offender, criminal history of the offender, details of the sexual offense, and information about the victim. The authors found that males had a greater number of previous drug, violent, and sexual offense arrests than did female sexual offenders. The authors concluded that male sexual offenders looked more similar to general offenders than did female sexual offenders to general offenders. When specifically looking at factors related to nonsexual recidivism, the authors found that increased number of drug offense arrests, increased number of violent felony arrests, increased number of prior incarceration terms, and decreased age were significant risk factors for nonsexual recidivism for both male and female sexual offenders. When looking at factors related to sexual recidivism, the authors found that increased number of prior sexual offenses, increased number of child victims, and increased number of community supervision violations were significant risk factors for sexual recidivism for both male and female sexual offenders. They also found that increased age lowered the
risk of sexual recidivism for both groups. The authors concluded that the differences between male and female sexual offenders and risk factors for recidivism were limited.

In a later study, Sandler and Freeman (2009) explored variables that differentiated female sexual offenders who sexually recidivated from those who did not sexually recidivate. They also investigated static factors related to recidivism, such as criminal history and demographic information, while controlling for other factors. The authors defined recidivism as arrest for a new sexual crime rather than conviction. When the authors were exploring static factors, recidivism was separated into four types: any re-arrest, felony re-arrest, violent felony re-arrest, and sexual re-arrest. However, the authors reported that sexual re-arrest was their focus. The four types of recidivism were coded in a binary fashion (i.e., re-arrested or not). The subjects included 1,466 females (32 recidivists and 1,434 nonrecidivists) who were convicted of a sexual offense in the state of New York. When comparing sexual recidivists to sexual nonrecidivists, the authors found that sexual recidivists more frequently had at least one previous drug, misdemeanor, or felony offense. They also found that most female sexual offenders who sexually recidivated were convicted of an offense related to prostitution.

When exploring static factors related to recidivism, Sandler and Freeman (2009) found that an increased number of prior child victim convictions, an increased number of prior misdemeanor convictions, and increased age were related specifically to sexual recidivism. The authors noted that the finding that increased age was related to sexual recidivism differed from results in other studies and was different from risk factors found for male sexual offenders. However, when female sexual offenders who were convicted of prostitution-related crimes were removed, increased age was no longer a significant
factor, suggesting that females who prostitute may be different from other female sexual offenders. When exploring violent re-arrest, an increased number of prior violent felonies and an increased number of drug charges increased their risk. When exploring any felony re-arrest, increased age, increased number of misdemeanors, and increased number of drug charges were related to increased risk. When exploring any re-arrest, decreased age and increased number of misdemeanors also were related to increased risk. Sandler and Freeman suggested that risk factors for sexual recidivism may be different for men and women and that particular factors differentiate women who sexually recidivate from women who do not sexually recidivate. They concluded that their study was only a beginning and that more research was needed.

Overall, limited information is available on risk factors related to recidivism for female sexual offenders. When looking at the assessment of risk through the four-generations model, female sexual offender risk assessment is still in the first generation (Andrews et al., 2006). Given that fourth-generation risk-assessment tools are available for male and female general offenders and for male sexual offenders, it is clear that much more work needs to be done (Andrews & Bonta, 1995; Andrews et al., 2004; Andrews et al., 2011; Hanson et al., 2007; Lowenkamp et al., 2001; Vose et al., 2009). Research has suggested that some risk factors for recidivism are similar for both male and female sexual offenders, such as increased number of sexual offenses, increased number of child victims, and increased number of supervision violations (Freeman & Sandler, 2008). When exploring differences between female sexual offender recidivists and nonrecidivists, female recidivists had a more extensive criminal history (Sandler & Freeman, 2009). There was also some indication that female sexual offenders whose
offense was related to prostitution may differ from other female sexual offenders, particularly with respect to age as a risk factor (Sandler & Freeman, 2009).

**Purpose of the Present Study**

As mentioned previously, few studies have been conducted to date with female sexual offenders, and the field is approximately 20 years behind male sexual offender research (Cortoni, 2010). The research that has been completed on female sexual offenders has focused primarily on characteristics and typologies of female sexual offenders, and the methodology has been descriptive in nature (Gannon et al., 2010).

The development of assessment tools used to measure the risk of any criminal recidivism is one important area of research for female sexual offenders. However, research in this area is even more limited than in other areas, with only two published studies exploring risk factors related to recidivism for this population (Freeman & Sandler, 2008; Sandler & Freeman, 2009). Freeman and Sandler (2008) suggested that there was little difference in risk factors for recidivism (re-arrest for sexual or nonsexual offenses) by male and female sexual offenders. When comparing female recidivists to nonrecidivists, Sandler and Freeman (2009) found that a more extensive criminal history and a higher number of child victims increased the risk of criminal recidivism in female sexual offenders. Yet there has not been further research to verify the findings of either of these studies.

Due to the gap in research identifying risk factors related to recidivism, treatment services and criminal justice facilities have limited assessment and/or treatment options for female sexual offenders (Vandiver, 2002). These limitations leave assessors with first-generation models of assessment (i.e., clinical judgment) and/or fourth-generation
general risk-assessment tools such as the LS/CMI (Andrews et al., 2004) to assess risk of recidivism with female sexual offenders. Researchers exploring typologies for female sexual offenders have shown that this group is heterogeneous in terms of offender and victim characteristics (Matthews et al. 1989; Mathews et al. 1991; Sandler & Freeman, 2007; Vandiver & Kercher, 2004). Because of this, there is a possibility that risk factors may be different for each group. However, research on risk factors for female sexual offenders in general is needed before looking at subtypes of female offenders, and the current lack of a cohesive typology schema would make research on subtypes difficult to conduct. Furthermore, psychometrically sound risk assessments have been created for male sexual offenders as a whole, even though they are also a heterogeneous group (Hanson et al., 2007; Hanson & Thornton, 2000). Therefore, it makes sense at this stage to examine risk factors for female sexual offenders as a group.

Given the identified gaps in the literature, the purpose of the current study was to (a) explore characteristics of female sexual offender recidivists and nonrecidivists, (b) measure the predictive accuracy for female sexual offenders of a risk-assessment tool developed for use with male sexual offenders (the Static-99R), and (c) begin to identify static risk factors for female sexual offenders. To do this, I assessed the power of the Static-99R for predicting violent recidivism (i.e., any violent charges or convictions) or general recidivism (i.e., any criminal charges, convictions, or supervision violations) in a group of adult females convicted of sexual offenses. I also assessed the relationship between the 10 factors of the Static-99R and recidivism (both general and violent). The 10 factors are as follows:

- age of the offender
• relationship status of the offender
• number of sentencing dates prior to the index sexual offense
• presence of prior sexual offenses
• presence of nonsexual violent offense at the same time as the sexual index offense
• presence of prior nonsexual violence offenses
• presence of noncontact sexual offenses in the offender’s history
• the offender’s familiarity to the victim, the offender’s relationship to the victim
• sex of the victim

By measuring the predictive accuracy of a developed risk-assessment tool and measuring the relationship of static factors to general and violent recidivism, researchers and professionals can begin to develop risk-assessment tools that can aid in treatment and supervision strategies specifically designed for female sexual offenders. Further, researchers can begin to differentiate risk factors between females and males, thereby laying the groundwork for assessment tools tailored specifically for females.

Hypotheses

Predictive accuracy of the Static-99R. Some researchers have found that female and males sexual offenders did not differ on risk factors found on the Static-99R, such as age and criminal history factors (Freeman & Sandler, 2008). However, other researchers have found that female sexual offenders differed from male sexual offenders on the magnitude of these risk factors, such that female sexual offenders had more limited criminal histories and were slightly younger than male sexual offenders (Vandiver &
Walker, 2002). Other risk factors of the Static-99R have only been researched in regard to characteristics of female sexual offenders and not specifically risk factors related to recidivism (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Vandiver, 2006; Wijkman et al., 2010). This research has indicated that male and females did differ on factors found on the Static-99R, such as the offender’s familiarity to the victim, the offender’s relationship to the victim, and the sex of the victim (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Vandiver, 2006; Wijkman et al., 2010). Therefore, I hypothesized that the Static-99R would not be predictive of general or violent recidivism for female sexual offenders.

**Static risk factors and recidivism.** Consistent with previous research on risk factors related to female sexual offenders (Freeman & Sandler, 2008; Sandler & Freeman, 2009), I had five hypotheses, as follows:

1) Age of the offender would be negatively correlated with general recidivism.

2) Number of prior sentencing dates would be positively associated with general recidivism.

3) Presence of prior sexual offenses would be positively associated with general recidivism.

4) Presence of a nonsexual violence index offense would be positively associated with later violent charges and convictions.

5) Presence of prior nonsexual violent offenses would be positively associated with later violent charges and convictions.

Because the relationships of other potential risk factors and recidivism in female sexual offenders have not been researched, the following five hypotheses were based on prior research of female sexual offender characteristics (Elliot & Ashfield, 2011; Elliott
et al., 2010; Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Lewis & Stanley, 2000; Nathan & Ward, 2002; Strickland, 2008; Vandiver, 2006; Vandiver & Walker, 2002; Wijkman et al., 2010):

1) Research has indicated that female sexual offenders were often in physical or emotionally abusive relationships, may have interpersonal deficits, and were often in relationships with co-offenders (Elliott et al., 2010; Lewis & Stanley, 2000; Strickland, 2008). Based on the findings that many female sexual offenders’ relationship quality was negative, I hypothesized that females who had been in a live-in relationship for two or more years at any time in their adult life would be more likely than females who had not been in a live-in relationship for two or more years at any time in their life to recidivate with any kind of recidivism. This hypothesis is different from prior research findings for male sexual offenders suggesting that not being in a relationship increases risk for male sexual offenders (Hanson & Thornton, 2000).

2) There has been very limited research on noncontact sexual offenses perpetrated by females, but prior research has suggested that females who engaged in noncontact sexual offenses over the internet were similar to female sexual offenders who engaged in contact offenses (Elliot & Ashfield, 2011). Therefore, I hypothesized there would be no association between noncontact sexual offenses and general recidivism.

3) Researchers have found that female sexual offenders were less likely than male sexual offenders to have stranger victims and the majority of female sexual offenders know their victim(s) (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009, Vandiver,
2006). Further, these findings have suggested that stranger victims were more difficult to access for females (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009). Because more effort may be required to obtain stranger victims, it is possible that individuals who obtain stranger victims may have higher level of deviance than do individuals who do not have stranger victims. Therefore, I hypothesized that having stranger victims would be positively associated with general recidivism.

4) Researchers have found that female sexual offenders did not have a preference for either related or unrelated known victims (Wijkman et al., 2010). Therefore, I hypothesized that the relationship of the victims would not be associated with general recidivism.

5) Based on inconsistent findings regarding female sexual offenders’ preference for the sex of the victim (Lewis & Stanley, 2000; Nathan & Ward 2002; Vandiver, 2006; Vandiver & Walker, 2002; Wijkman et al., 2010), I hypothesized that the sex of the victim would not be associated with general recidivism.
Method

In this section, I define terms, discuss the subjects and setting, and discuss the procedure and analyses that were used for the current study.

Definitions of Terms

**Sexual offender in the state of Oregon.** According to Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 181.594, a *sexual offender* is defined as a person who has committed a sexual crime (Oregon State Legislator, 2012). An offender can be further defined as a *sexually violent dangerous offender* if he or she has a large number of psychopathic traits, deviant sexual arousal, and a history of sexual offenses, as well as if he or she presents a high risk to re-offend (ORS 137.765).

**Sexual crime.** A sexual crime in the state of Oregon includes both contact and noncontact offenses. A contact offense includes crimes that require physical contact with a victim, such as rape, sodomy, bestiality, or sexual abuse of a child (ORS 181.594). A noncontact offense include crimes that do not involve physical contact with a victim, such as viewing child pornography, encouraging child sexual abuse, or stealing items for sexual purposes (ORS 181.594).

**Index sexual offense.** The offender’s index offense is defined as the offender’s most recent sexual offense and can be a prison/supervision violation, criminal charge, or criminal conviction (Harris, Phenix, Hanson, & Thornton, 2003). An index sexual offense can also include multiple counts if, for example, the offender was charged with or convicted of multiple sexual offenses for one alleged incident or was charged or convicted for more than one alleged incident at the same time.
**Violent Crime.** A violent crime in the United States is defined as a crime committed in one of four categories: nonnegligent manslaughter or murder, forcible rape, robbery, or aggravated assault (U.S. Department of Justice, 2011). In the current study, the category of nonsexual violent crime excluded forcible rape (considered to be a sexual violent crime).

**Subjects and Database**

The sample in the current study consisted of 60 adult females convicted of a sexual or sexually motivated crime who were previously or currently on community supervision in one of five counties in the Portland, Oregon, metropolitan area. The current study excluded female offenders who were charged exclusively with prostitution and/or child pornography sexual offenses. It also excluded female offenders who were charged with sexual offenses when they were juveniles.

The data for the sample were obtained from a database created from case files from multiple Community Correction facilities in the Portland, Oregon, metropolitan area. The data in the case files were obtained from numerous resources, such as the Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS), Oregon Department of Corrections (ODOC), police reports, polygraph reports, community supervision officers, treatment providers, and court proceedings. The 10 static factors that were used for this study were coded for all 60 female sexual offenders based on information in their case files.

To protect subjects’ confidentiality, the information in the database was de-identified. Information in the database that was pertinent to the current study is described here. Other information included in the database but not considered in the current study can be found in the Appendix.
- Demographic data:
  - The offender’s self-reported gender from the LEDS report, coded as *female, male* (i.e., the subject self-identified as male or post-sexual-reassignment surgery), or *transgender* (i.e., the person self-identified as transgender or as being pre-sexual-reassignment surgery).
  - The self-reported ethnicity of the offender, coded based on information found in records of interviews in the case file. Categories included *African American, Asian, Caucasian, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, Native American,* and *other*.
  - The offender’s age at the time of her first sexual offense conviction. This information was obtained from criminal records and the LEDS report.
  - The offender’s date of conviction and date of community supervision expiration, based on data from the court proceedings and the LEDS reports.
  - The offender’s self-reported highest education level found in the interview records in the case file, coded as follows: *some high school, high school completion, GED, some technical school, some college with no degree, Associate’s degree completion, Bachelor’s degree completion, some graduate school with no degree,* or *graduate degree completion.*
  - A self-reported or previously diagnosed physical or cognitive disability found in interview records or evaluation reports in the case file, coded as *present* or *absent.*
The offender’s self-reported employment, coded as present or absent for each of three time points: before the sexual offense conviction, during litigation for the sexual offense, and at the time the coding was being completed. It was also noted if there was no information about employment in the file or if the offender had no work history. Data were found in interview records in the case file.

The offender’s self-reported sexual orientation found in interview records in the case file, coded as heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, or other.

The offender’s self-reported religious affiliation found in interview records in the case file, coded as present or absent.

Information regarding the index offense was found in the LEDS report and interview records and consisted of the following:

Whether the offender acted alone or with a co-offender, coded as acted alone or with a co-offender. If the offender offended with a co-offender, further information was included about the co-offender’s sex (coded as male or female), the offender’s relationship dynamics with the co-offender, and victim’s relationship with the co-offender. Relationship dynamics with the co-offender were included in the database as qualitative information and were not specifically coded. Information was included as to what type of relationship (e.g., friend, acquaintance, or sexual partner) the offender and co-offender had, how they met, and/or any other relationship information that was available in the case file. The victim’s relationship with the co-offender was also included in the database as
qualitative information and was not specifically coded. Any information about the co-offender’s relationship was included, such as the type of relationship (e.g., friend, stranger, or relative), how they met, and/or any other relationship information that was available in the case file.

- Details of the sexual offense and specific convictions, including the victim’s report of the sexual offense and the offender’s self-report of the offense. This factor was qualitative and was not specifically coded.

- Risk assessment factors and scores from the Static-99R were coded based on the LEDS report and ODOC data gathered from the case file or through assessments already completed by professionals. Specific factors related to the proposed study are described in detail in the next section. The Static-99R factors were coded and scored based on information obtained from the case files and LEDS reports. Another doctoral level psychology student and I coded the Static-99R factors and scores; both of us were trained in using this assessment measure. Because these assessment tools have not been normed to date on female sexual offenders, the information from this assessment tool was gathered for research purposes only.

- Recidivism data were obtained from ODOC, community supervision records, and the LEDS record. The follow-up period ranged from 1 to 22 years ($M = 6.38$, $Mdn = 4$). Figure 1 visually describes the classification of offenses for recidivism. The following recidivism factors were included:
Supervision violations since the time of release from their first sexual crime, coded as present or absent based on the LEDS report and community supervision records. If supervision violations were present, the violation was coded as a technical violation (i.e., failing to follow rules of community supervision) or law violation (i.e., breaking the law).

New criminal charges (i.e., after the time of release), coded as present or absent. If they were present, they were further categorized by type of crime (i.e., sexual, nonsexual violent, drug, or other). Therefore, an offense could be coded as more than one type of crime (e.g., both as a drug crime and a nonsexual violent crime). This information was based on ODOC, community supervision, and LEDS records.

New criminal convictions, coded as present or absent and by type of crime (i.e., sexual, nonsexual violent, drug, or other offense). Therefore, an offense could be coded as more than one type of crime (e.g., having both a sexual offense conviction and nonsexual violence conviction). This information was derived from ODOC, community supervision, and LEDS records.
A dichotomous general recidivism variable was also created to summarize all of the recidivism factors. Specifically, if the offender had any supervision violations, charges, or convictions, this variable was coded as present. Otherwise, this variable was coded as absent.

Measure

The Static-99R (Hanson & Thornton, 2000) includes 10 static risk factors that are combined to generate a total score ranging from -3 to 12. The total score corresponds to four levels of risk (low, low-moderate, moderate high, high). The factors of the Static-99R are the same as the factors of the Static-99 except that the Static-99R has updated age weights on the age factor (Helmus et al., 2011). The Static-99 and Static-99R have been shown to be predictive of general, violent, and sexual recidivism (Babchishin, Hanson, & Helmus, 2011; Barbaree, Seto, Langton, & Peacock, 2001). The Static-99 has been shown to have good interrater reliability ($r = .90$), predictive validity ($p = .01$ for general, violent, and sexual recidivism), and concurrent validity with similar scales ($p = .001$, Barbaree et al., 2001). The Static-99R was found to have strong predictive validity as well ($p = .01$ for violent and sexual recidivism, $p = .001$ for general recidivism, Babchishin et al., 2011). The Static-99R has been normed on male sexual offenders and was used in the proposed study for research purposes only.

Risk Factors

The risk factors for the current study were selected from factors included on the Static-99R, a validated risk assessment for male sexual offenders. For the purposes of using the Static-99R, the factors were defined as they are on the Static-99R (Helmus et al., 2011; Harris et al., 2003). For the purpose of testing the relationship of the factors
with recidivism, age and number of prior sentencing dates were defined differently from the definition on the Static-99R, as detailed below. All other factors were defined as they are on the Static-99R. The factors are as follows:

- **Age.** To assess the predictive accuracy of the Static-99R, age at release after incarceration for the offender’s sexual crime was defined as they are for the Static-99R. Specifically, the definition of age consisted of four categories: ages 18 to 34.9 years, ages 35 to 39.9, ages 40-59.9, and ages 60 and older. To assess the relationship between this factor and recidivism (general and violent), age was coded as the offender’s age in years at the time of her sexual offense conviction, which was different from the Static-99R.

- **Relationship status.** The offender’s self-report of having ever lived with a lover for two or more years, coded as present or absent.

- **Presence of nonsexual violent index offense.** The offender having been convicted of a violent crime at the same time as the index sexual offense, coded as present or absent.

- **Presence of prior nonsexual violent offenses.** The offender having convictions for nonsexual violent offenses prior to the index offense, coded as present or absent.

- **Number of prior sentencing dates.** The offender’s number of sentencing dates prior to the index sexual offense was defined as having appeared in court and being sentenced for any crime or number of crimes committed prior to the index sexual offense. Although the outcome of the sentence could be minor (e.g., paying a fine), the crime must have been serious enough to warrant community
supervision or incarceration. The offender must have been convicted of the prior crime(s) in order to count the sentencing date. To assess the predictive accuracy of the Static-99R, sentencing date was coded as it was defined in the Static-99R. Specifically, number of prior sentencing dates was coded dichotomously as having three or fewer sentencing dates or having four or more sentencing dates. To assess the relationship of this factor to general and violent recidivism, this factor was coded as a continuous variable based on the total number of sentencing dates, which was different from the Static-99R.

- **Number of prior sexual offenses.** Presence of sexual offenses prior to the index sexual offense was defined as having charges or convictions for behavior that was sexual in nature. This factor includes community supervision violations as charges. Charges and convictions were collapsed and coded into three categories based on the Static-99R coding system: no charges or convictions, one or two charges or one conviction, three to five charges or two to three convictions, and six or more charges or four or more convictions.

- **Presence of noncontact sexual offenses.** Noncontact sexual offenses are defined as convictions for incidents that did not involve contact with a victim, such as child pornography, exhibitionism, or voyeurism. If the offender attempted to contact the victim (e.g., talking to him or her on the internet and then trying to visit the victim), the offense was considered a contact crime. This factor was coded as present or absent.
• **Familiarity with the victim.** A stranger victim is defined as having a victim whom the offender has known for less than 24 hours. Having a stranger victim was coded as *present* or *absent*.

• **Relationship with victim.** An unrelated victim is defined as someone who was not biologically or legally related to the offender; in addition, he or she is not perceived as being related to the offender. For example, if the offender is not biologically or legally related to a child victim but has been in the household for two or more years with the child and is considered “mom,” the offender is classified as being related to the victim. Having an unrelated victim was coded as *present* or *absent*.

• **Sex of the victim.** The sex of the victim refers to the biological characteristics of the victim and was coded as *male* or *female*.

**Procedure and Analysis**

**Descriptive Analysis of Recidivists and Nonrecidivists:** Frequency counts were used to describe female recidivists (sexual, nonsexual violent, and nonsexual and nonviolent) and nonrecidivists on demographic and criminal information.

**Analysis of the Static-99R.** A simple logistic regression was used to evaluate the ability of the Static-99R to predict general recidivism (i.e., supervision violations, criminal charges, and criminal convictions) or violent recidivism (i.e. violent charges or convictions).

**Analysis of the Static Risk Factors:** Point biserial and phi correlations were used to evaluate the relationship of the 10 static risk factors to general recidivism (i.e., supervision violations, criminal charges, and criminal convictions, familiarity with the
victim, relationship with victim, sex of the victim) and violent recidivism (i.e., violent charges or convictions).
Results

Data from a total of 60 adult female sexual offenders were included in this study. To assess how similar this sample is to a broader population of comparable offenders in the community, Table 1 provides available demographic information both for the current sample and for females on felony probation and females on parole as of December 1, 2012 (Oregon Department of Corrections, 2013). When compared to females on felony probation and females on parole, the current sample had more individuals who identified as Hispanic (10% vs. 3.4% and 3.7%, respectively). The current study also had more individuals in the age range 18 to 24 (28.3% vs. 19.2% and 12.8%, respectively) and fewer individuals aged 46 to 60 years (3.3% vs. 18.5% and 17.5%, respectively).

Table 1

Comparison of characteristics of sample and females on probation and parole in Oregon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>4315</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18ª</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and older</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4849</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One subject was under the age of 18 when she committed the crime but was charged and convicted as an adult.
Demographics and criminal information for the sample are shown in Tables 2 and 3, respectively (these data were not available for females on felony probation and female on parole). Overall, the female sexual offenders were approximately 30 years of age ($SD = 7.6$) at the time of their index offense. A majority of subjects were Caucasian and heterosexual. Educational status was distributed fairly equally. Over half of the subjects had been victims of childhood sexual abuse ($n = 35; 58.3\%)$.

Table 2

Demographic characteristics of sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Recividists</th>
<th>Sexual $(n = 4)$</th>
<th>Nonsexual Violent $(n = 4)$</th>
<th>Nonsexual Nonviolent $(n = 34)$</th>
<th>Nonrecidivists $(n = 18)$</th>
<th>Total $(N = 60)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicty</td>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; High school</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher educationª</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ªHigher Education includes any duration of time in technical school, undergraduate school, or graduate school
Table 3

Criminal characteristics of sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Recidivists</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual (n = 4)</td>
<td>Nonsexual Violent (n = 4)</td>
<td>Nonsexual Nonviolent (n = 34)</td>
<td>Nonrecidivists (n = 18)</td>
<td>Total (N = 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – 17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child (≤13)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – 17 and Child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Known Victims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Offense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voyeurism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape and Child Molestation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solo Offender</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Offender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In regard to criminal characteristics, subjects tended to have offended alone \((n = 45; \text{75.0\%})\), to have been unrelated to their victims \((n = 47; \text{78.3\%})\), and to have known their victims \((n = 58; \text{96.7\%})\). Two subjects had both known and unknown victims.

Subjects tended to offended against male victims between the ages of 14 to 17 \((n = 36; \text{60\%})\).

With respect to recidivism, 18 \((30.0\%)\) subjects did not recidivate and 42 \((70.0\%)\) were general recidivists (i.e., had committed a supervision violation, been charged with a new crime, and/or been convicted of a new crime). A total of 38 \((63.3\%)\) subjects committed a supervision violation, 14 \((23.3\%)\) subjects had been charged with a new crime but not convicted, and 21 \((35.0\%)\) subjects had been convicted of a new crime.

Each of the three types of recidivism (i.e., supervision violation, charge, and conviction) was defined further. Supervision violations were broken down into technical violations (i.e., violating rules of probation) and law violations (i.e., breaking new laws). Charges and convictions were separated into four parts: sexual offenses, nonsexual violent offenses, drug offenses, and any other offenses (e.g., failure to register, theft, criminal mischief, or harassment). Because I was most interested in sexual and violent recidivism, drug and “other” forms of recidivism were combined to create the nonsexual nonviolent recidivists group. Table 4 shows each of these types of recidivism.
Table 4

Recidivism data for sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Recidivists</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>Nonsexual Violent</td>
<td>Nonsexual Nonviolent</td>
<td>Nonrecidivists</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 4)</td>
<td>(n = 4)</td>
<td>(n = 34)</td>
<td>(n = 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Recidivism Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>34 (100.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>42 (70.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
<td>18 (30.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Supervision Violations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (88.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>38 (63.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (11.8%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
<td>22 (36.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Recidivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>16 (47.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>24 (40.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>18 (52.9%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
<td>36 (60.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Charges/Convictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (6.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>34 (100.0%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
<td>56 (93.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsexual Violent Charges/Convictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (6.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 (100.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>34 (100.0%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
<td>56 (93.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance-Related Charges/Convictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 (25.0%)</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>6 (17.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>9 (15.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 (75.0%)</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>28 (82.4%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
<td>51 (85.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Charges/Convictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>3 (75.0%)</td>
<td>12 (35.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>17 (28.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (25.0%)</td>
<td>22 (64.7%)</td>
<td>18 (100.0%)</td>
<td>43 (71.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. One instance of recidivism may be counted under multiple categories (see Figure 1).

General recidivism combined included subjects charged and/or convicted of new crimes as well as supervision violations that occurred after their index sexual offense.

General recidivism included subjects charged and/or convicted of new crimes that occurred after their index sexual offense.

Descriptive Analysis of Sexual Recidivists, Nonsexual Violent Recidivists, Nonsexual Nonviolent Recidivists, and Nonrecidivists

Frequency counts were used to describe female sexual recidivists, nonsexual violent recidivists, nonsexual nonviolent recidivists, and nonrecidivists on demographic and criminal information. Although statistical analysis was performed for nonsexual violent recidivists, the number of nonsexual violent recidivists was small (n = 4, 6.7%), which likely affected the ability to detect significant differences. Therefore, a description of this sample and comparison to the other groups was completed. Demographic and
criminal information for the four groups was shown above in Tables 2 and 3, respectively.

**Sexual Recidivists.** A total of four (6.7%) female sexual offenders committed (i.e., were convicted of) a new sexual crime after their index sexual offense. Of the four sexual recidivists, two (50.0%) committed only a sexual offense; one (25.0%) committed a sexual offense and an “other” offense; and one (25.0%) committed a sexual offense, a substance-related offense, and an “other” offense. Demographically, the sexual recidivists were, on average, in their late 20s ($M = 27.2$ years, $SD = 2.9$) when they committed their index sexual offense; none were employed at the time of their conviction. Two (50.0%) had obtained a GED and two (50.0%) had not completed high school. Three of the four sexual recidivists (75.0%) identified as heterosexual and one’s status was unknown. The subjects’ identified ethnicity varied (see Table 2).

In regard to criminal characteristics, two (50.0%) of the four sexual recidivists’ index offenses had included sexual intercourse with their victims, one (25.0%) had attempted sexual intercourse, and one (25.0%) had fondled her victim. The two subjects (50.0%) who had sexual intercourse as an index offense recidivated with the same offense (i.e., having sexual intercourse with their victims), and the other two (50.0%) initiated sexual contact with a minor. Three of the four subjects (75.0%) offended against male victims, and all offended against victims under the age of 18. Three subjects (75.0%) offended alone and three (75.0%) had one known victim in their index offense. Three subjects (75.0%) knew their victims, one subject (25.0%) perpetrated against both victims that she knew and victims that she did not know, and two subjects (50.0%) were related to their victims. With respect to childhood victimization, three of the four sexual
recidivists (75.0%) had been victims of childhood sexual abuse (the status of the fourth subject was unknown).

**Nonsexual Violent Recidivists.** A total of four female sexual offenders (6.7%) committed (i.e., were convicted of) a nonsexual violent crime after their index sexual offense. Of the four nonsexual violent recidivists, one (25.0%) committed a violent offense and a substance-related offense; two (50.0%) committed a violent offense and an “other” offense; one (25.0%) committed a violent offense, a substance-related offense, and an “other” offense. Demographically, the nonsexual violent recidivists were, on average, in their late 20s when they committed their index sexual offense ($M = 28.1$ years, $SD = 9.2$), heterosexual, and Caucasian. Additionally, none (0.0%) were employed at the time of their conviction and none (0.0%) had obtained higher education (i.e., two did not complete high school, one completed high school, and one was unknown).

In regard to criminal characteristics, two (50.0%) of the four nonsexual violent recidivists’ index offenses had included sexual intercourse with their victims, and two (50.0%) included oral sexual behavior and sexual fondling. Three of the four subjects (75.0%) had offended against male victims, and all had offended against victims under the age of 18. They had all offended alone and knew their victims. Three (75.0%) had one known victim in their index offense and two (50.0%) were related to their victims. With respect to childhood victimization, two (50.0%) of the four nonsexual violent recidivists had been victims of childhood sexual abuse.

**Comparison to sexual recidivists.** Overall, nonsexual violent recidivists were similar to sexual recidivists on most demographic and criminal characteristics (see Tables 2 and 3). Nonsexual violent recidivists had younger victims than sexual recidivists during
their index sexual offense, but the difference did not reach statistical significance, $z(2) = 0.16, p > .05$. Nonsexual violent recidivists were more likely to be Caucasian when compared to sexual recidivists, and this comparison did reach statistical significance, $z(6) = 2.19, p < .05$. It should be noted that the assumption of sufficient sample size was not met.

**Nonsexual Nonviolent Recidivists.** A total of 34 (56.7%) female sexual offenders committed a new nonsexual nonviolent crime (i.e., they obtained a supervision violation or were charged or convicted of a nonsexual nonviolent crime). Of the 34 nonsexual nonviolent recidivists, 18 (52.9%) committed a supervision violation only, one (2.9%) was charged with a new crime only, and two (5.9%) were only convicted of a new crime. Additionally, two (5.9%) both committed a supervision violation and were charged with a new crime; five (14.7%) both committed a supervision violation and were convicted of a new crime; one (2.9%) was both charged with a new crime and convicted of a new crime; and five (14.7%) had committed a supervision violation, been charged with a new crime, and been convicted of a new crime. Demographically, the nonsexual recidivists were, on average, 31.0 years of age ($SD = 6.9$) when they committed their index sexual offense. The subjects tended to be Caucasian ($n = 29, 85.3\%$) and heterosexual ($n = 24, 70.6\%$), and most had not obtained any higher education ($n = 26, 76.5\%$).

In regard to criminal characteristics, half ($n = 17, 50.0\%$) of the nonsexual nonviolent recidivists had had sexual intercourse with their victims at the time of their index offense. Victims were most frequently either under the age of 13 ($n = 14, 41.2\%$) or between the ages of 14 to 17 ($n = 19, 55.9\%$). One subject in this subgroup had victims in
both categories. The number of male ($n = 17, 50.0\%$) and female victims ($n = 14, 41.2\%$) appeared comparable (in addition, three subjects had offended against both sexes). These subjects tended to offend alone ($n = 24, 70.6\%$), know their victims ($n = 34, 100.0\%$), be unrelated to their victims ($n = 26, 76.5\%$), and have two or fewer victims in their index offense prior to recidivating ($n = 30, 88.3\%$). In addition to demographic and criminal characteristics, a majority of this subgroup had been victims of childhood sexual abuse ($n = 21, 61.8\%$).

**Comparison to sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists.** Compared to both sexual recidivists and nonsexual violent recidivists, nonsexual nonviolent recidivists were slightly older than both groups when they committed their index sexual offense, but these differences did not reach statistical significance, $t(36) = 1.07, p > .05$, and $t(36) = 0.77, p > .05$, respectively. Nonsexual and nonviolent recidivists did not have a strong preference for the sex of the victim when compared with either sexual recidivists, $z(36) = 0.34, p > .05$, or nonsexual violent recidivists, $z(36) = 0.34, p > .05$, and these slight differences did not reach statistical significance. Nonsexual and nonviolent recidivists also did not have a strong preference for the age of the victim when compared with either sexual recidivists, $z(36) = 0.24, p > .05$, or nonsexual violent recidivists, $z(36) = 0.83, p > .05$, and these slight differences were not significant.

When looking at education level, nonsexual nonviolent recidivists were more likely than were sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists to have obtained higher levels of education (70.6% obtained a high school diploma or higher education), whereas sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists were more likely not to have obtained a high school degree or higher. This finding reached statistical significance when nonsexual nonviolent
offenders were compared with nonsexual violent recidivists, \( z(36) = 1.82, p < .05 \), but not when they were compared with sexual recidivists, \( z(36) = 0.20, p > .05 \).

**Nonrecidivists.** A total of 18 (30.0%) female sexual offenders did not recidivate. Demographically, the nonrecidivists were, on average, 29.7 years of age (\( SD = 9.5 \)) when they committed their index sexual offense. Of the sample, a majority of the nonrecidivists were Caucasian and/or heterosexual. Seven of the 18 nonrecidivists (38.9%) had obtained higher education, which is higher than the rates in the sexual recidivist group (0.0%), the nonsexual violent recidivist group (0.0%), and the nonsexual and nonviolent recidivist group (17.6%; see Table 1).

In regard to criminal characteristics, nine of the nonrecidivating subjects (50.0%) had had sexual intercourse with their victims. The nonrecidivists tended to offend alone (\( n = 14, 77.8\% \)), know their victims (\( n = 17, 94.4\% \)), be unrelated to their victims (\( n = 17, 94.4\% \)), and offend against male victims between the ages of 14 and 17 (\( n = 14, 77.8\% \)). Half of the nonrecidivists (\( n = 9, 50.0\% \)) had been victims of childhood sexual abuse, which was lower than the rate found for the sexual recidivists (75.0%) and nonsexual, nonviolent recidivists (61.8%), but it did not reach statistical significance.

**Comparison to sexual, nonsexual violent, and nonsexual nonviolent recidivists.** When compared to the three recidivist groups, nonrecidivists were more likely to have a higher education (38.9% had education beyond high school). The difference reached statistical significance when compared to nonsexual violent recidivists, \( z(20) = 2.34, p < .01 \); however, it should be noted that the assumption of sufficient sample size was not met. The difference did not reach statistical significance for either sexual recidivists \( z(20) = 1.44, p > .05 \), or nonsexual and nonviolent recidivists, \( z(50) = 1.01, p > .05 \). When
compared to sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists, nonrecidivists were more likely to be unrelated to their victims, $z(20) = 3.15, p < .01$; however, it should be noted that the assumption of sufficient sample size was not met. When compared to nonsexual and nonviolent recidivists, nonrecidivists appeared to prefer male victims ($n = 13, 72.2\%$), whereas nonsexual and nonviolent recidivists did not have a clear preference for male victims ($n = 17, 50.0\%$). This difference approached statistical significance, $z(50) = 1.54, p = .062$.

**Analysis of the Static-99R.** Two simple logistic regressions were performed to determine whether the Static-99R total score could be used to identify general or nonsexual violent recidivism in a sample of female sexual offenders. The outcome variables (i.e., general recidivism and nonsexual violent recidivism) were dichotomous and indicated whether recidivism was present or absent.

The simple logistic regression assessing the ability of the Static-99R to predict general recidivism was not significant, $\chi^2 (1, N = 60) = 0.109, p = .742$, indicating that the Static-99R did not distinguish between those who did and those who did not recidivate generally.

The simple logistic regression assessing the ability of the Static-99R to predict nonsexual violent recidivism was also not significant, $\chi^2 (1, N = 60) = 0.072, p = .788$, indicating that the Static-99R did not distinguish between those who did and those who did not recidivate with a nonsexual violent charge or conviction.

**Analysis of Static Risk Factors.** Point biserial correlations were computed to assess the relationship between three static risk factors (i.e., age, number of prior sexual offenses, and number of prior sentencing dates) and recidivism (i.e., general and violent).
The results of the correlational analysis (see Table 5) indicated that none of the three factors were significantly correlated with general or violent recidivism.

Phi correlations were conducted to assess the relationship between seven static risk factors coded dichotomously (i.e., relationship status, presence of prior nonsexual violent offenses, presence of nonsexual violent index offense, presence of noncontact sexual offenses, familiarity with the victim, relationship with victim, and sex of the victim) and recidivism (i.e., general and violent). The results of the correlational analysis (see Table 5) indicated that none of the seven factors were significantly correlated with general or violent recidivism.

Table 5

**Correlations and significance levels comparing recidivism (general and violent) to static risk factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>General Recidivism</th>
<th>Violent Recidivism*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Prior Sexual Offenses</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Sentencing Dates</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Φ</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Φ</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index violent offense*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior violent offenses*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncontact Sexual Offenses</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with Victim</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Victim</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Victim</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Violent offenses and violent recidivism did not include sexual offenses
Discussion

The purpose of the proposed study was to (a) explore characteristics of female sexual offender recidivists (with sexual, nonsexual violent, and/or nonsexual nonviolent crimes) and nonrecidivists, (b) assess for female sexual offenders the predictive accuracy of a risk-assessment tool developed for use with male sexual offenders (the Static-99R, Hanson & Thornton, 2000), and (c) begin to identify static risk factors for female sexual offenders. To do this, I compared demographic and criminal characteristics among the four groups of subjects (sexual recidivists, nonsexual violent recidivists, nonsexual and nonviolent recidivists, and nonrecidivists), assessed the power of the Static-99R for predicting violent and general recidivism, and assessed the relationships between the 10 factors of the Static-99R and recidivism (both general and violent).

Summary of Results

Descriptive Analysis of Sexual Recidivists, Nonsexual Violent Recidivists, Nonsexual Nonviolent Recidivists, and Nonrecidivists. Of the 60 subjects in the study, four (6.7%) were sexual recidivists, four (6.7%) were nonsexual violent recidivists, 34 (56.7%) were nonsexual nonviolent recidivists, and 18 (30.0%) were nonrecidivists. These rates are higher when compared to prior research that has found that 1% to 3% of female sexual offenders were sexual recidivists, 5% were violent recidivists, and 19% to 24% were general recidivists (Cortoni et al., 2010). It is possible that the rates in the current study were higher due to the longer follow-up period for the current study. Specifically, the follow-up period for the current study was 1 to 22 years ($M = 6.38$, $Mdn = 4$), whereas Cortoni et al.’s (2010) study had a 2- to 12-year follow-up period ($M =
6.50) follow-up period. Additionally, the difference in the rate of recidivism in the current study may also be due to the way recidivism was defined (i.e., including supervision violations). It should be noted that a majority (86.6%) of female sexual offenders did not recidivate with either sexual or nonsexual violent crimes, possibly due to effective community supervision. Although recidivism rates were higher in the current study than in Cortoni et al.’s (2010) study, the base rate of sexual recidivism is still so low that it may be very difficult to find or create a tool that is predictive of sexual recidivism.

When exploring the criminal and demographic characteristics, there were multiple statistically significant differences among the groups and one difference that approached significance. Sexual recidivists and nonsexual violent recidivists were similar on most demographic and criminal characteristics, differing significantly only on ethnicity; specifically, nonsexual violent recidivists were more likely to be Caucasian whereas the ethnicity of sexual recidivists was more diverse (i.e., two Hispanic, one Native American, and one Caucasian). Nonsexual violent recidivists differed significantly from nonsexual and nonviolent recidivists on education: Nonsexual and nonviolent recidivists were significantly more likely to have obtained a high school diploma (or equivalent) or higher, whereas nonsexual violent recidivists were more likely not to have graduated from high school or not to have an equivalent certificate. Additionally, nonsexual violent recidivists also differed significantly from nonrecidivists on education: Nonrecidivists were more likely to have obtained a high school diploma (or equivalent) or higher, whereas nonsexual violent recidivists were more likely not to have graduated from high school or have an equivalent certificate. In terms of criminal characteristics,
nonrecidivists were significantly more likely to be unrelated to their victim, whereas sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists were more likely to be related to their victim. Lastly, one difference approached statistical significance: Nonrecidivists preferred male victims, whereas nonsexual and nonviolent recidivists did not show a preference for the sex of the victim.

Limited research has been conducted to explore differences in female sexual offenders’ demographic and criminal characteristics based on the type of recidivism they committed after their sexual offense. Researchers have found that decreased age was related to nonsexual recidivism (Freeman & Sandler, 2008; Sandler & Freeman, 2009), which is inconsistent with the current results. In the current study, nonsexual and nonviolent recidivists were slightly older than the other three groups, but these differences did not reach statistical significance. Sandler and Freeman (2009) did not find any demographic or criminal characteristics (besides prior violent criminal history) to be related to nonsexual violent recidivism. Their findings are inconsistent with the current results that nonsexual violent recidivists were more likely to be Caucasian than were sexual recidivists and were more likely to have lower education when compared to nonrecidivists.

**Analysis of the Static-99R.** Logistic regressions were conducted to measure the power of the Static-99R to predict violent and general recidivism. As hypothesized, the Static-99R did not predict general or violent recidivism.

This finding is consistent with Hanson and Thornton’s (2000) recommendation not to use the Static-99R with female sexual offenders due to the fact that it has not been validated on this population. It is also consistent with research comparing female and
male sexual offender characteristics that has suggested that these two groups differ on factors found on the Static-99R, such as criminal history, age, familiarity with the victim, relationship with the victim, and sex of the victim (Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Vandiver, 2006; Vandiver & Walker, 2002; Wijkman et al., 2010).

**Analysis of Static Risk Factors.** Point biserial and phi correlations were used to assess the relationship between the 10 factors included in the Static-99R and recidivism (i.e., general and violent). The results indicated that none of the 10 factors were correlated with general or violent recidivism. In this section, I note whether or not the hypotheses were supported and compare the findings with the current literature.

**Age of the offender.** I hypothesized that the age of the offender would be negatively correlated with general recidivism. This hypothesis was not supported and is inconsistent with current literature suggesting that decreased age was a significant risk factor for nonsexual recidivism or any re-arrest (Freeman & Sandler, 2008; Sandler & Freeman, 2009).

**Number of prior sentencing dates.** I hypothesized that the number of prior sentencing dates would be positively associated with general recidivism. This hypothesis was not supported and is not consistent with previous findings that more arrests and incarceration terms were significant risk factors for nonsexual recidivism (Freeman and Sandler, 2008).

**Number of prior sexual offenses.** I hypothesized that the number of prior sexual offenses would be positively associated with general recidivism. This hypothesis was not supported and is not consistent with previous findings that an increased number of arrests and incarceration terms were significant risk factors for nonsexual recidivism (Freeman
& Sandler, 2008). Freeman and Sandler did find that prior sexual offenses and increased supervision violations were related to sexual recidivism but not nonsexual recidivism; therefore, this finding in the current study is consistent with their findings. However, the lack of a significant finding in the current study may reflect sample size more so than the absence of an association.

**Nonsexual violence index offense.** I hypothesized that the presence of a nonsexual violent index offense would be positively associated with later violent charges and convictions. This hypothesis was not supported and is inconsistent with findings that an increased number of prior violent felonies were significantly related to violent recidivism (Sandler & Freeman, 2009).

**Prior nonsexual violent offenses.** I hypothesized that the presence of prior nonsexual violent offenses would be positively associated with later violent charges and convictions. This hypothesis was not supported and is inconsistent with findings that an increased number of prior violent felonies were related to violent recidivism (Sandler & Freeman, 2009).

**Relationship status.** I hypothesized that females who had been in a live-in relationship for two or more years at any time in their adult life would be more likely than females who have not been in a live-in relationship for two or more years at any time in their life to recidivate with any kind of recidivism. This hypothesis was not supported. No prior researchers specifically measured the relationship between relationship status and recidivism. However, the finding is inconsistent with prior research on characteristics of female sexual offenders in which female sexual offenders were often in physically or emotionally abusive relationships, may have displayed
interpersonal deficits, and were often in relationships with co-offenders (Elliott et al., 2010; Lewis & Stanley, 2000; Strickland, 2008). This finding thus suggests that relationship status is likely more complex than the duration of the relationship for female sexual offenders, which I was unable to assess in the current study. In addition, the finding may be in line with results for male sexual offenders, for whom not being in a relationship has been associated with increased risk (Hanson & Thornton, 2000).

**Noncontact sexual offenders.** I hypothesized that there would be no association between noncontact sexual offenses and general recidivism. This hypothesis was supported and is consistent with findings that females who engaged in noncontact sexual offenses over the internet were similar to female sexual offenders who engaged in contact offenses (Elliot & Ashfield, 2011). However, due to the small sample and subsample sizes, it is not clear whether this finding represents an actual lack of association.

**Familiarity with the victim.** I hypothesized that having stranger victims would be positively associated with general recidivism. This hypothesis was not supported. The positive direction of the finding in the current study is consistent with this premise based on the research; however, it did not reach significance.

No researchers have specifically measured the relationship between familiarity with the victim and recidivism. Previous researchers have found that female sexual offenders were less likely than were male sexual offenders to have stranger victims, that the majority of female sexual offenders knew their victim, and that stranger victims were more difficult to access (Johansson-Love & Fremouw 2009, Vandiver, 2006). I predicted that having stranger victims would be related to general recidivism because more effort may be required to obtain stranger victims and it was possible that individuals who
obtained stranger victims may have had higher level of deviance than individuals who did not have stranger victims. However, due to the small sample and subsample sizes, it is not clear whether this finding represents an actual lack of association.

**Relationship with the victim.** I hypothesized that the relationship with the victims would not be associated with general recidivism. This hypothesis was supported and is consistent with prior findings of researchers exploring characteristics of female sexual offenders that female sexual offenders did not have a preference for either related or unrelated known victims (Wijkman et al., 2010). However, due to the small sample and subsample sizes, it is not clear whether this finding represents an actual lack of association.

**Sex of the victim.** I hypothesized that sex of the victim would not be associated with general recidivism. This hypothesis was supported and is consistent with findings that female sexual offenders did not have preference for the sex of the victim (Johansson-Love & Fremouw 2009; Vandiver, 2006; Vandiver & Walker, 2002). However, due to the small sample and subsample sizes, it is not clear whether this finding represents an actual lack of association.

**Strengths and Limitations**

The current study has several strengths. First, it expands on the limited research available on female sexual offenders and the even more limited research on recidivism of female sexual offenders. It is the first study in which the predictive ability of the Static-99R for general and violent recidivism was assessed in a sample of female sexual offenders. Additionally, it is the first study in which relationships between static risk factors included in the Static-99R and general and violent recidivism were assessed.
The current study is also one of the few studies in which female sexual offenders were separated into groups based on the type of recidivism they committed and explored demographic and criminal characteristics among the groups (Freeman & Sandler, 2008; Sandler & Freeman, 2009). Another strength is that the total sample size was large when compared to most other research exploring female sexual offenders (typical sample sizes have ranged from 11 [Green & Kaplan, 1994] to 60 [Strickland, 2008]). In addition, this was one of the largest samples of female sexual offender samples that did not include prostitution crimes.

Prior researchers have generally defined recidivism as charges and/or convictions (Hanson & Thornton, 2000; Helmus, Thornton, Hanson, & Babchishin, 2011; Beech, Friendship, Erikson, and Hanson, 2002). In the current study, I expanded the definition of recidivism to include supervision violations because new criminal activity may be managed through application of supervision violations for individuals currently on probation or parole in the community rather than via a formal legal penalty. This addition is a strength in that it allows prediction of a broader variety of problematic behaviors that communities want to monitor. However, it is also a limitation because I cannot clearly compare my findings to previous research. Additionally, the Static-99R was not designed to predict recidivism defined as anything other than charges and convictions.

A second limitation in the current study was the definition of recidivism as a dichotomous variable rather than a continuous variable. Because of this definition, I was unable to assess whether any of the predictor variables were related to the frequency and nature of the recidivism.
Another limitation was that data were collected only from the greater metropolitan area of Portland, Oregon; therefore, these findings may not generalize to other areas in the United States or to international locations. The data collection method is another limitation. Specifically, I used archival data and did not have the opportunity to interview the subjects. If data were missing or inconsistent, there was no way to contact the individual or clarify contradicting information. This reliance on archival records may mean that some of the information in the database was inaccurate or missing.

Although the current sample size is large when compared to other female sexual offender research, it is still a small sample size overall. Additionally, the sample included a very small subsample of sexual recidivists \( (n = 4) \) and nonsexual violent recidivists \( (n = 4) \), and these groups are likely not representative of the population given that there were so few individuals in these categories. Further, the small subsample of nonsexual violent recidivists may have led to the lack of significant findings and the unexpected direction of relationships when looking specifically at the relationship of Static-99R risk factors with violent recidivism.

**Implications**

The current results suggest that the Static-99R is not a tool that should be used to predict general or violent recidivism for female sexual offenders. Further, the results suggest that the 10 factors included in Static-99R should not be considered as risk factors for general or violent recidivism for female sexual offenders. Therefore, I do not recommend the factors as defined by the Static-99R be used to make predictions about risk. Until a specific tool that is validated to assess risk of recidivism for female sexual offenders is created, it is recommended that individuals use a general risk-assessment
tool, such as the LS/CMI, that has been validated on females to assess general risk. Additionally, it is important for assessors to acknowledge that the base rate for sexual recidivism for female sexual offenders is very low, and it is difficult to predict low-base-rate events with accuracy. However, replication of this study is needed.

Several implications relate to demographic and criminal characteristics among the three different recidivism groups and nonrecidivists. First, sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists were similar on most of the demographic and criminal characteristics assessed, suggesting that these individuals may be more similar than different. Legally, this finding is consistent with sexual offenses being considered a violent crime. Regarding risk, sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists may have similar risk factors, but this should be explored further.

One significant finding was the difference in education among groups in that sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists had lower levels of education than the other two groups (though the finding only reached statistical significance for nonsexual violent recidivists). I did not assess whether education was a risk factor related to recidivism (i.e., I did not assess the ability of education to predict recidivism); however, obtaining higher levels of education may be an important treatment consideration for this population. Specifically, education may be an important proxy for resources such as access to work, higher socioeconomic status, increased social supports, and treatment.

In regard to criminal characteristics, nonrecidivists seemed to have older victims (age 14 to 17) when compared with the other groups. This finding may suggest that nonrecidivists were able to shift to older sexual partners (i.e., ages 18 years and older) more easily than did the other groups. Age of the victim may be an important factor to
continue to explore as a possible risk factor. Additionally, sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists were more likely to have victims related to them when compared to nonrecidivists. Relationship with the victim was not predictive of general or violent recidivism, but the lack of an effect may be due to the small subsample size and limited power. Therefore, relationship with the victim may be one important factor to continue to explore as a possible risk factor specifically for violent and/or sexual recidivism.

There have been mixed findings to date regarding preference of sex of the victim among female sexual offenders (Lewis & Stanely, 2000; Nathan & Ward 2002; Vandiver, 2006; Vandiver & Walker, 2002; Wijkman et. al., 2010). Results from this study indicate that nonsexual and nonviolent recidivists did not appear to have a preference for the sex of their victims, whereas nonrecidivists appeared to prefer male victims; however, this result only approached significance. All other studies exploring the preference of sex of their victims have only looked at female sexual offenders overall. The results from the current study suggest that there may be a difference in preference for the sex of a victim between female sexual offenders who recidivate (nonsexually and nonviolently) and nonrecidivists. If this implication is correct, it may partially explain prior mixed findings regarding the preference of the sex of the victim; however, more research must be completed.

**Directions for Future Research**

Replication of the predictive ability of the Static-99R with a larger sample of female sexual offenders and samples from different geographical areas would be valuable. According to the Oregon Department of Corrections (2013), 28.9% of females on parole and 20.1% of females on probation in Oregon committed a new felony within
36 months after being released into the community. This rate is lower than the national average of 61.0% of females being arrested for a new crime within 36 months (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002). Therefore, replicating this study in other geographic areas with higher recidivism rates may yield different results with recidivism and community supervision practices. Further, having a larger subsample of sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists would be beneficial. It is possible that some of the nonsignificant findings reflected the small sample of sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists. By having a large sample of sexual and nonsexual violent recidivists, these subsamples could be better explored quantitatively.

Replication of the demographic and criminal characteristics among the three groups of recidivists and nonrecidivists would also be valuable. Some initial findings, such as level of education, relationship with the victim, and preference of the sex of the victim could have important treatment implications and need to be validated.

Additionally, coding recidivism as a continuous variable would also be advantageous. By having a continuous recidivism variable, future researchers could better explore the relationship between specific risk factors and type and frequency of recidivism, rather than simply the occurrence of recidivism.

Given the significant differences in education among the groups, it would be beneficial to further examine this factor by replicating this study as well as by assessing the predictive ability of education for general and violent recidivism. Because the current study did not indicate that static factors included in the Static-99R were related to general or violent recidivism, exploring other static factors as well as dynamic factors would be valuable for the development of risk tools for this population. Additionally, exploring the
quality (rather than duration) of romantic relationships for female sexual offenders in relationship to recidivism would be valuable to understand if there is a difference between males and females on this factor.

Because of the addition of supervision violations into the current definition of recidivism (i.e., charges and convictions), it is imperative that future researchers separate supervision violations from charges and convictions and then compare the findings when supervision violations are included.
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Appendix

Additional Information in Database

The following information was included in the database in addition to the pertinent information described previously.

- Criminal history information (both self-reported and legally documented), obtained through the LEDS reports and interview records in the case file. The factor was qualitative and not specifically coded.

- Victim data were obtained from court records, police reports, and interview records in the case file and included the following:
  - Gender was coded as *male, female, or both*.
  - Age in years at the time of the sexual offense was coded as a continuous variable.

- Number of known victims was coded as a continuous variable was based on self-report, interviews, and polygraph reports.

- How the offender accessed victims (i.e., at place of employment, biological children, partner’s children, obtained by co-offender), found in police reports and self-reported in interviews in the case file. Each type of access to victim was coded as *present or absent*.

- Risk assessment factors and scores such as the LS/CMI, PCL-R, STABLE-2007, coded based on information gathered from the case file or through assessments already completed by professionals. The LS/CMI was completed by an offender’s
community supervision officer. If a PCL-R was included in the file, a qualified mental health professional had completed it during a prior psychological or psychosexual evaluation. The STABLE-2007 factors were coded and scored based on information obtained from the case file.

- Mental health diagnoses were coded based on self-report from interview records or diagnoses given during psychosexual or psychological evaluations.
- If available in the case file, intelligence scores were coded based on psychological evaluations that included cognitive testing.
- The offender’s current and previous treatment history, coded by type of treatment given: sex offense specific, mental health, domestic violence, substance abuse, or developmental disability. This factor also included an unknown variable if information about treatment was not in the case file.
- Cooperation in current or previous treatment, coded as cooperating or not cooperating based on mental health and community supervision reports.
- The offender’s view of treatment, coded as positive, negative, or neutral based on interviews, treatment records, and community supervision reports discussing the offender’s involvement in treatment.
- A history of childhood sexual, emotional, or physical abuse and childhood neglect, coded as present or absent based on the self-report of the offender during interviews found in the case file.
- The offender’s use of pornography, coded as present or absent. If present, type of pornography, themes of pornography, and use during the offense was coded.
The offender’s self-reported history of substance use, type of substance(s) used, and substance use during previous offenses or index offense, coded by the type of substance used and based on the offender’s self-report found in interview records.

The offender’s romantic relationship status during the index offense or prior offenses, coded as present, absent, or not available based on interview records found in the case file.

A history of domestic violence or sexual abuse by a romantic partner, coded as present, absent, or not available based on interview records found in the case file.