

2003

An exploratory study to identify the predictors of sexual reoffending by male sexual offenders in Western Australia

Deborah Dawson
Edith Cowan University

Alfred Allan
Edith Cowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworks>



Part of the [Law Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Dawson, D., & Allan, A. (2003). *An exploratory study to identify the predictors of sexual reoffending by male sexual offenders in Western Australia*. Perth, Australia: Edith Cowan University and Western Australian Department of Justice.

This Report is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworks/7292>

**AN EXPLORATORY STUDY TO
IDENTIFY THE PREDICTORS OF
SEXUAL REOFFENDING BY MALE
SEXUAL OFFENDERS IN WESTERN
AUSTRALIA**

Deborah Dawson

Alfred Allan

A research project of the Offender Program - Edith Cowan Research Team

Edith Cowan University

Perth, December 2003

Investigators

Alfred Allan

School of Psychology, Edith Cowan University

Peter Prigrove

Western Australian Department of Justice

Senior researcher

Deborah Dawson

Junior researcher

Ranjini Sathyanath

Acknowledgments

This project was jointly sponsored by Edith Cowan University and the Western Australian Department of Justice. However, the views expressed in this report are those of the research team and do not necessarily represent those of either of these institutions.

The research team wishes to thank:

Audrey Baker (until she left the service of the Department of Justice at the end of September 2003) and Les Harrison and Shelly Hicks since then for their valuable support;

Dr Ricks Allan who provided assistance at various levels;

The members of the Indigenous Advisory Committee who are always available for consultation when we need their valued advice;

Fran Bell who conducted the pilot study on the risk models;

The team leaders from the Offender Programs Edith Cowan Project (OPEC) who assisted in training the student research assistants and collecting the data – Jacinta Beer, Fran Bell, Jo Clare, Michelle Betti, Raquel Glass, Kerry Jensen, Erin Logan, Karren McDomertt, Troy Nix, Chantelle Reed, Scott Reid, Natalie Walsh, Kate Riorden and;

The student research assistants from OPEC who gave their time every week to collect data.

Executive Summary

As the prediction of the risk of sexual reoffending behaviour has become more important in the corrections setting, so has the development of instruments to assist practitioners in doing risk evaluations. International research underpins most of the instruments used in Western Australia (WA), and in Australia for that matter. The present study explored the predictive accuracy of instruments developed internationally and locally as a function of ethnicity (Indigenous and non Indigenous) and nature of offending (non violent sexual and violent sexual). The Rapid Risk Assessment for Sexual Recidivism (RRASOR) and the Static 99 were the international instruments, for the prediction of sexual reoffending, that were evaluated. Two WA instruments were investigated. Firstly, the Violent Offender Treatment Program Risk Assessment Scale (VOTP RAS), also called the Level of Service Need Inventory (LOSNI), an instrument that was developed to predict violent reoffending. Secondly, the 3-Predictor model that was previously developed by Allan and Dawson (2002) to predict sexual reoffending of Indigenous sexual offenders. Available data suggested that the locally developed 3-Predictor model was the most accurate of all these instruments.

In the present study the 3-Predictor model was cross validated and was found to be accurate for both Indigenous and non Indigenous sexual offenders when culturally appropriate definitions were used. As established in previous studies conducted by Allan and Dawson (2002), predictive accuracy declined when the model was applied to violent sexual offenders. Further investigation tentatively revealed that the most accurate way of assessing risk with this specific group was to combine the 3-Predictor model score with the Static 99 score. This finding, while requiring more rigorous investigation was promising, as previous attempts to develop a model in WA had proved unsuccessful.

In respect to the other models investigated, the LOSNI , originally developed to predict violent reoffending, provided good accuracy in predicting violent non sexual reoffending risk among sexual offenders and achieved the same levels of accuracy found by the developers when validated in the present study. However, the LOSNI was not a good predictor of sexual reoffending. The outcomes for the Static 99 suggest this tool is likely to be highly accurate for the WA sexual offending population. The RRASOR did not provide the level of accuracy found with other populations and thus could not be recommended for local use.

In summary, the present study has indicated that the 3-Predictor model can be used with both Indigenous and non Indigenous sexual offenders if attention is given to cultural differences. Violent sexual offenders, however, appear to differ from non violent sexual offenders and a different system of risk and needs assessment is indicated. The combination of the 3-Predictor model and the Static 99 suggests a promising alternative. The treatment needs of violent sexual offenders also require further investigation and the outcomes of the present study have highlighted potential areas of need.

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY TO IDENTIFY THE PREDICTORS OF SEXUAL REOFFENDING BY MALE SEXUAL OFFENDERS IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Introduction

Sexual offenders constitute a major client group of psychologists and other social scientists (practitioners) that work for the Western Australian Department of Justice (Department). One of the major tasks of practitioners employed by the Offender Programs Branch (OPB) of the Department is the assessment of sexual offenders' risk of reoffending and their treatment needs. This study aimed to generate data that will enhance the ability of practitioners working for OPB to do this task.

When the Western Australian Sex Offender Treatment Unit was recently evaluated the researchers recommended that the focus of offender treatment should be on offenders with a high risk of reoffending (Greenberg, Da Silva, & Loh, 2002). To identify these offenders they recommended that practitioners doing assessments of sexual offenders should use an actuarial instrument to guide clinical decision making that incorporate both static (primarily historical) and dynamic risk factors.

To our knowledge no instrument of this nature has been developed in Australia. In fact, instruments of this nature are rare internationally as researchers have only recently started developing them. Canadian research underpins most of the instruments available, such as the Sexual Offender Risk Assessment Guide (SORAG; Quinsey, Lalumiere, Rice, & Harris, 1995); Sex Violence Risk-20 (SVR-20; Boer, Wilson, Gauthier, & Hart, 1997); Rapid Risk Assessment for Sexual Offence Recidivism (RRASOR; Hanson, 1997; Hanson & Bussiere, 1996); and the Sexual Offender Need Assessment Rating (SONAR; Hanson & Harris, 2000). The notable exception is an English instrument, the Structured Anchored Clinical Judgement (SACJ; Grubin, 1998) which was combined with the RRASOR to form the Static 99 (Hanson & Thornton, 1999; 2000).

The only locally developed instrument that could be considered for use with sexual offenders in Western Australia (WA) is the Violent Offender Treatment Program Risk Assessment Scale (VOTP RAS). This instrument, which is now commonly called the Level of Service Need Inventory (LOSNI) was designed in WA for the assessment of violent non sexual offenders' eligibility for treatment (Ward & Dockerill, 1999). The LOSNI has not been cross validated and the reported accuracy rates (.72 to .76 based on varying time-at-risk) are based on a limited sample of 50 Indigenous and 152 non Indigenous violent offenders (Ward & Dockerill, 1999). Not only the accuracy, but also the cultural fairness of the instrument, is uncertain. Allan and Dawson (2002) found that the accuracy of the risk and need characteristics of Indigenous offenders were mediated by the nature of the offence (violent sexual and non violent sexual offending). This

suggests that the risk and need factors for Indigenous male sexual offenders may differ from that of violent non sexual offenders.

In summary, there is currently no locally developed instrument aimed at sexual offenders that OPB can use to address the recommendations of Greenberg et al. (2002). In the absence of such an instrument that Australian practitioners can use, Allan and Dawson (2002) observed that practitioners have the following options:

- (a) Use one of the instruments developed by one of the overseas research groups (“overseas instruments”).
- (b) Select one of the available instruments and examine the degree to which the psychological constructs and models are valid for Australian populations, and adjust if necessary.
- (c) Do a study to identify the risk, need and protective factors amongst Indigenous and non Indigenous males and then develop a unique instrument that will take these factors into account, as well as the requirements of the practitioners who must administer the instrument.

We believe that option (a) is the least appropriate and (c) the most appropriate alternative, but as a full discussion of the reasons for this conclusion is beyond the ambit of this document we will give a brief summary of the most important themes of our rationale.

Firstly, all the overseas instruments are based on a regression model and use factors obtained from a specific population. As the accuracy of such risk tools are dependent on risk markers that best characterise the population of interest, care should be taken when they are applied with people from other cultures (Brown, 1996; Clear, 1995; Tonry, 1987). Using them in WA where a relatively high number of Indigenous males come in contact with the criminal justice system is a particular concern. The literature suggests that the risk factors for Indigenous violence may differ from that of non Indigenous Australians and people from other cultures (see for example Cunneen & Libesman, 1995; Howells, Day, Byrne, & Byrne, 1999; Mals, Howells, Day, & Hall, 2000; McRae, Nettheim, & Beacroft, 1997; O’Shane, 1992; Payne, 1992; Wootten, 1992). This was confirmed by practitioners working in the area during a series of focus groups conducted by Dawson and Allan (2000; 2001).

Secondly, despite some debate about this (see Mossman, 2000; Steadman et al., 2000), it appears as if the overseas instruments do not yet satisfy all ethical, legal and practical expectations (Gendreau, Goggin, & Smith, 2002; Hanson, 1997; Rogers, 2000). This is especially true in respect of sexual offending instruments, because they fail to take into account that sexual offenders are heterogeneous (Knight & Prentky, 1993; Prentky, Knight, & Lee, 1997; Prentky, Lee, Knight, & Cerce, 1997) and that offender type is related to recidivism (see for example Furby, Weinrott, & Blackshaw, 1989; Hanson & Bussiere, 1998; Marshall, 1997). They also generally tend to over-emphasise risk at the cost of criminogenic and non-criminogenic needs (Howells et al., 1999), and protective factors (Rogers, 2000; Sheldrick, 1999).

We believe it is inappropriate and premature to adopt any of the available instruments in WA and that option (c), that is the development of a unique instrument to assess the risk of sexual

recidivism and the needs of WA sexual offenders, will best serve the requirements of OPB's practitioners. Before embarking on such a project it is, however, necessary to explore some preliminary issues. Firstly, we should, in view of Allan and Dawson's (2002) findings, determine whether a generic tool should be constructed for all sexual offenders, or separate tools for violent sexual offenders and non violent sexual offenders, and whether separate tools should be developed for Indigenous and non Indigenous sexual offenders. Secondly, an instrument developed with data currently available will be limited because it would not include potential predictors that we know may be important from recent research. Consequently a study aimed at developing an instrument should preferably be prospective and collect data about potential predictors identified by a literature review of past research aimed at identifying potential predictors. In the absence of such research this study was an attempt to identify predictors to include in a prospective study. Thirdly, while option (a) is not acceptable and while we have reservations about option (b), we cannot exclude the possibility that one of the existing instruments may, with or without alteration, have utility in WA. This is of immediate importance as there is currently a debate within OPB regarding which is the most appropriate instrument that could be to used as an interim measure.

In consultation with OPB and after considering the literature available, we decided to examine two local and two overseas instruments. To start with, the LOSNI because it may have predictive value with violent sexual offenders. Secondly, the 3-Predictor model that was developed on the WA population of Indigenous sexual offenders (Allan & Dawson, 2002; Dawson & Allan, 2001). It was also found to be highly accurate for a small sample of sexual offenders that included non Indigenous offenders (109 Indigenous; 92 non Indigenous) and left very little variance unaccounted for. It was included in the present study to investigate if similar levels of accuracy and variance could be obtained for Indigenous and non Indigenous sexual offenders and thus circumvent the need to construct a new model as planned. Thirdly, we included the RRASOR, one of the overseas instruments specifically designed for use with sexual offenders, because an internal investigation of OPB suggested that it may have good predictive value in WA. The RRASOR has already been cross validated in Canada (Dempster, 1998; Hanson, 1997; Hanson & Thornton, 2000) and Sweden (Sjöstedt & Langström, 2001). The final instrument that was included was the Static 99 as it has been shown that it has good predictive accuracy with sexual offenders in Canadian and English populations (Hanson & Thornton, 1999; 2000). The Static 99 was included at the request of OPB during the period of data collection when it identified the instrument as a viable alternative to the RRASOR. As a consequence of the late inclusion the data collected and analysed to evaluate this instrument came from a small sample.

The specific aim of this study was to extend an ongoing retrospective review of OPB's offender files to collect data about static and dynamic variables that may predict the risk of sexual reoffending by both non Indigenous and Indigenous male sexual offenders in WA in order to:

- Investigate the predictive accuracy of the 3-Predictor model, the LOSNI, Static 99 and RRASOR in this population as a function of offence type (non violent sexual compared to violent sexual) and ethnicity (Indigenous compared to non Indigenous); and
- If these instruments are found not to be accurate, to isolate predictors and construct a new model for this population.

Methodology

Definitions

Indigenous and non Indigenous Offenders

Offenders who stated for the purpose of their Department of Justice intake forms that they were Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander were defined as Indigenous and persons identifying themselves as of any other origin were defined as non Indigenous. While this definition was limited by overlooking "tribal and regional" variations it was a consequence of using historical file data.

Non Violent Sexual Offence

Any offence identified by Offender Programs as requiring a sexual offender intervention program.

Violent Sexual Offence

Any offence identified by Offender Programs as requiring a sexual offender intervention program and where the offence included an act that would also be considered as assault causing harm to the person. To meet the criteria for sexually violent the act of violence had to be supported by medical reports, material facts or sentencing remarks in the relevant file.

Violent Offence

A violent offence is an offence where violence without harm (for example armed robbery) or assault causing harm to the person (or worse) has occurred and does not involve sexual acts of any nature.

Reoffender and non Reoffender

Sexual reoffenders could fall into one of two categories. Firstly, *non violent sexual reoffenders* convicted by a court of a subsequent sexual offence that did *not* additionally include assault causing harm to the person. Secondly, *violent sexual reoffenders* convicted by a court of a subsequent sexual offence that additionally included assault causing harm to the person. To meet the criteria for sexually violent the act of violence has to be supported by medical reports, material facts or sentencing remarks in the relevant file.

Violent reoffenders were those found guilty by a court of committing subsequent violent offences (including violence without and with harm) not involving acts of a sexual nature.

Those who did not meet the criteria for classification as non violent sexual, violent sexual or violent reoffenders, were defined as *non reoffenders*. Breach of order for non-compliance was not considered as a reoffence, as this type of conviction was considered more reflective of institutional behaviour. A subsequent offence that was committed while on bail, but dealt with at the same time of the index offence, was classified as a reoffence.

Time at risk was calculated from arrest date of original offence to the arrest date of the subsequent offence (excluding prison time).

Predictor Definitions

All predictors were coded using definition manuals developed with reference to the literature and each rater was trained until 85% concordance was reached for each predictor with all raters. Where the definition of a predictor was deemed culturally inappropriate by the Indigenous Advisory Committee an appropriate definition was negotiated.

3-Predictor Model

The definition for each predictor of this model is stated here to assist the reader in interpreting the results. As can be seen from the definitions they have been contextualised where required for application to Indigenous offenders.

Poor Coping Skills

This was coded if there was evidence on file that the offender had used alcohol or other maladaptive behaviours as a coping strategy. For Indigenous offenders the offender may state he uses one or more maladaptive behaviours to deal with *hurting inside* (Memmott, Stacy, Chambers, & Keys, 2001).

Unfeasible Release Plans

Evidence on file the offender did not have feasible or realistic release plans when he was released from prison or court. This was coded, for example, where the offender planned to return to a high risk environment. For Indigenous offenders this would include returning to an area where he was involved in a feud that was ongoing and was at risk of engaging in further feuding behaviour or returned to an environment where he was not only the perpetrator of violence but also the victim.

Another indicator was where there was a lack of adequate support for the offender in the community, or where he was unlikely to have the support required to maintain treatment gains post release. For Indigenous offenders this would include instances where the offender had been prohibited for either cultural or justice reasons from returning to the community where he normally resides.

Unrealistic Long-term Goals

This was coded if there was evidence on file that the offender is unable to plan for the future in a realistic way. For example, plans in respect of relationships and work (pattern of meaningful activity for Indigenous offenders) he can clearly not achieve given his history and circumstances.

Database

In the course of the research two distinct databases were used. For the purpose of investigating Indigenous offenders as a distinct group, the first database of 1838 Indigenous sexual or violent offenders consisted of 67 psychosocial variables and three risk/needs instruments. The second database of 1000 Indigenous and non Indigenous sexual offenders were extended to include 242 psychosocial/risk and/or needs items and 4 risk/needs instruments. Some of the offenders in the first database were used in the development of the 3-Predictor model and some in the second database were used in a pilot study of the risk models (Bell, 2002). These offenders were excluded from the sample used for analysis in the current study. One thousand non violent and violent sexual offenders were reserved for future cross validation of the present findings. The reserved cases were deemed crucial as both violent sexual offenders and Indigenous offenders are less prevalent within the population and efforts to construct an adequate model for violent sexual offenders suggested the need for further studies. This left 525 Indigenous and non Indigenous sexual offenders in the sample for analysis. In some cases scores relevant to a specific research question were not available and therefore sample size is indicated where appropriate.

Statistical Analysis

Receiver Operating Characteristics were used to compare predictive accuracy and Discriminant Function Analysis (DFA) to assess classification accuracy. Receiver Operating Characteristics (ROC) produce a statistical index known as the Area Under the Curve (AUC) that in violence prediction is the probability that a reoffender chosen at random will have a higher score than a non reoffender chosen at random. One of the primary advantages of the ROC curve is that it is not affected by "biases in prediction outcomes" and thus sensitivity (accuracy rate of true positives) and specificity (accuracy rate of true negatives) can be manipulated in order to minimise the misclassification rate (Ward & Dockerill, 1999, p. 128).

Results

Investigation 1

The primary aim of this investigation was to determine whether the 3-Predictor model would provide similar levels of accuracy and variance as was found by Allan and Dawson (2002) for Indigenous sexual offenders, in a sample that included both non Indigenous and Indigenous sexual offenders.

It also aimed to determine the accuracy of this model as a function of offence type (non violent sexual compared to violent sexual) and ethnicity (Indigenous compared to non Indigenous).

In earlier studies the 3-Predictor model was found to be highly accurate (AUC = .97) in a sample that included both Indigenous and non Indigenous offenders (Allan & Dawson, 2002; Dawson & Allan, 2001). It was hypothesised that similar levels of accuracy, considering expected shrinkage, could be found through further cross validation. There were 226 offenders of the 525 in the sample that had scores available for the 3- Predictor model. These offenders represented a combined group of Indigenous and non Indigenous offenders and non violent sexual and violent sexual offenders. Due to the small sample size discrete analysis of Indigenous and non Indigenous offenders and non violent sexual and violent sexual offenders could not be conducted. Greater discussion of accurate predictors for violent sexual offenders is covered in investigation two (analysis 3).

As anticipated the 3-Predictor model was subject to shrinkage at cross validation, but still achieved high levels of accuracy (AUC = .84). The classification accuracy was 90% for non reoffenders and 75% for reoffenders (eigenvalue = .65; canonical correlation = .62). The accuracy rate for reoffenders increased to 82.5% when sexually violent offenders were removed from the sample.

On face value it would appear that non violent Indigenous and non Indigenous sexual offenders do not differ on psychosocial variables. The most accurate variables for predicting reoffending behaviour are unfeasible release plans, poor coping skills, and unrealistic long term goals. These variables outperform existing risk instrument variables that consist primarily of unchangeable factors. The assumption that Indigenous and non Indigenous offenders share the same variables is supported to the extent that variables that are predictive of reoffending behaviour are the same. However, these variables must be assessed based on culturally relevant definitions that take into account the distinctly different circumstances between groups (see definition list). In respect to psychosocial variables that are not predictive, differences between non Indigenous and Indigenous and non violent and violent sexual offenders are evident. Several of these factors provide avenues for prevention and intervention targets and will be investigated further. However, as the focus of this report is on predictive factors and a complete review has been reported elsewhere (Dawson & Allan, 2003), the outcomes are not reported here.

Investigation 2

The aim of this investigation was to determine the predictive accuracy of the LOSNI, Static 99 and RRASOR as a function of offence type (non violent sexual compared to violent sexual) and ethnicity (Indigenous compared to non Indigenous). There were 525 offenders in the sample. Three specific research questions were explored in this investigation.

Question 1

First we examined whether the predictive accuracy reported by Ward and Dockerill (1999) for the LOSNI (AUC = .73) in respect of violent offenders in WA could be replicated for sexual offenders in WA and whether accuracy is mediated as a function of ethnicity (Indigenous and non Indigenous). In addition, we explored whether the predictive accuracy reported by Ward and Dockerill could be replicated for sexual offenders who commit subsequent violent non sexual offences.

An AUC of .52 was achieved for the LOSNI in the analysis of non violent sexual offenders, with DFA analysis revealing all reoffenders had been incorrectly classified (non reoffenders 100% accurately classified). For violent sexual offenders an AUC of .70 was found, however again DFA analysis revealed all reoffenders were incorrectly classified (non reoffenders 100% accurately classified). As would be expected of a violence prediction tool, when only subsequent violent offending of these Indigenous and non Indigenous violent and non violent sexual offenders were considered, an AUC of .79 was achieved. The classification accuracy was 72.2% for non reoffenders and 73.8% for reoffenders. Thus, Ward and Dockerill's (1999) finding of an AUC of .73 for a sample of Indigenous and non Indigenous violent offenders was surpassed when the subsequent violent offending of sexual offenders was considered in the present study (AUC of .79).

In respect to ethnicity with all sexual offenders, the LOSNI was more accurate for non Indigenous offenders. The AUC for non Indigenous was .53 and for Indigenous .48. Classification accuracy for both groups was poor with all reoffenders being incorrectly classified (100% classification accuracy for non reoffenders). When only the prediction of violent offending (violent and non violent sexual offenders who committed subsequent violent offences) was considered, the LOSNI had an AUC of .65 for Indigenous offenders and .75 for non Indigenous offenders. Classification accuracy for non Indigenous offenders was 87.8% for reoffenders and 47.5% for non reoffenders. For Indigenous reoffenders the accuracy was 96.3% and 25.9% for non reoffenders.

Question 2

Next we examined whether the predictive accuracy reported by Hanson (1997) for the RRASOR (AUC = .71) in respect of Canadian sexual offenders could be replicated for sexual offenders in WA and tried to determine whether the accuracy is mediated as a function of ethnicity (Indigenous and non Indigenous).

In comparison to the LOSNI, greater rates of accuracy were found for the RRASOR in respect to sexual offending. The AUC was .71 for all sexual offenders (Indigenous and non Indigenous). Classification accuracy was good for non reoffenders (92.6%) but poor for reoffenders (27.1%).

For Indigenous offenders the AUC was .65 and again classification accuracy was poor for reoffenders (non reoffenders = 95%; reoffenders = 17.1%). For non Indigenous offenders the AUC was .74 and classification accuracy was 91.3% for non reoffenders and 33.6% for reoffenders.

Question 3

Next we examined whether the predictive accuracy reported by Hanson and Thornton (2000) for the Static 99 (AUC = .71) in respect of a combined sample of Canadian and United Kingdom (UK) sexual offenders could be replicated for sexual offenders in WA.

Due to the late inclusion of the Static 99 in the study we were unable to examine differences as a function of ethnicity and offence type. Thus, the following results are for a small sample (144) of non Indigenous, non violent sexual offenders. The AUC was .78, a finding that exceeded that of Hanson and Thornton (2000). Classification accuracy was not as good for reoffenders (52.5%) in comparison to non reoffenders (91.3%). These findings should be viewed with caution due to the small sample size. They are nonetheless consistent with previous Canadian and UK findings, in that, the Static 99 outperformed the RRASOR in terms of predictive accuracy (Hanson & Thornton, 2000).

Question 4

Finally we also tried to establish which is more accurate in predicting recidivism of violent sexual offenders:

- a violent reoffence prediction tool (LOSNI) or
- a sexual reoffence prediction tool (RRASOR or Static 99)?

The LOSNI achieved classification accuracy of 100% for non reoffenders and all reoffenders were incorrectly classified. The RRASOR did not fare much better with only 2.9% of reoffenders being correctly classified. A similar outcome was found for the Static 99 with all reoffenders being incorrectly classified.

Post hoc analysis revealed that for violent sexual offenders greater accuracy could be achieved by combining the scores of the 3-Predictor model and the Static 99. This represents a combination of highly accurate changeable factors (3-Predictor model: unfeasible release plans, poor coping skills, and unrealistic long term goals) and unchangeable factors (Static 99: prior sex offences, prior sentencing dates, history of non contact sex offences, index non sexual violence, prior non sexual violence, unrelated victims, stranger victims, male victims, young, single). Results are not reported here due to the small sample size (59 cases, based on those who met sexually violent criteria and had both Static 99 and 3-Predictor scores) and violation of some assumptions. This outcome is promising, as to date we have not been able to build a model on these offenders that was accurate and provided adequate separation between reoffenders and non reoffenders. This finding will be assessed further on the sample that has been reserved for more comprehensive investigation and cross validation.

Discussion

It was not necessary to pursue the second aim of the present study as the results indicated that the 3-Predictor model can be used for the prediction of reoffending with both Indigenous and non Indigenous sexual offenders if attention is given to the different cultural circumstances. Violent sexual offenders, however, appear to differ from non violent sexual offenders and a different system of risk prediction and needs analysis is indicated. The combination of the 3-Predictor model and the Static 99 suggests a promising alternative. The treatment needs of this group and pathways to prevention also require further investigation and the outcomes of the present study have highlighted potential areas of need. These areas of inquiry will be further investigated on the sample reserved for future cross validation.

The LOSNI provided good accuracy in predicting violent non sexual reoffending risk and achieved the same levels of accuracy found by the developers when validated for sexual offenders in the present study. The outcomes for the Static 99 suggest this tool is the most accurate of the International models and achieves similar levels of accuracy with Canadian, UK and WA populations of sexual offenders. With sexual offenders in WA the RRASOR does not appear to provide the level of accuracy found with other populations, and thus could not be recommended for local use.

Overall, the finding that all three predictors in the 3-Predictor model were dynamic, confirms the contemporary view regarding the importance of dynamic predictors of risk. A positive aspect of the prominence of dynamic predictors is that it implies that it is potentially possible to reduce sexual reoffending by attending to these factors. The combination of the 3-Predictor model and the Static 99 would provide the same opportunity with violent sexual offenders.

The importance of the findings of the study is that it demonstrated that it is possible to develop a risk of sexual offending instrument for the WA population that is more accurate than those currently available. However, we believe that a prospective study using the predictors identified during this study on much larger samples is what is required. This will have to be a longitudinal study to ensure a large enough sample and a long enough period at risk, as offenders have less opportunity to reoffend while in custody and may be constrained while subject to community based orders.

To conclude, this study demonstrated that it is possible to develop an instrument specifically for the WA population of sexual offenders that is more accurate than other instruments currently in use. It confirms that instruments comprising of dynamic factors are useful predictors of risk, and suggests that dynamic factors may play an important role in the sexual reoffending of sexual offenders.

References

- Allan, A., & Dawson, D. (2002). *Developing a unique risk of violence tool for Australian Indigenous offenders* (No. CRC 6/00-01). Canberra: Criminology Research Council.
- Bell, F. A. (2002). *Sexual and violent recidivism in Western Australian sex offenders: Assessing the predictive accuracy of risk assessment*. Unpublished Bachelor of Arts (Psychology) Honours, Edith Cowan University, Perth.
- Boer, D. P., Wilson, R. J., Gauthier, C. M., & Hart, S. D. (1997). Assessing risk of sexual violence: Guidelines for clinical practice. In C. D. Webster & M. A. Jackson (Eds.), *Impulsivity: theory, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 327-342). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Brown, M. (1996). Refining the risk concept: Decision context as a factor mediating the relation between risk and program effectiveness. *Crime and Delinquency*, 42(3), 435-455.
- Clear, T. R. (1995). The design and implementation of classification systems. *Federal Probation*, 59(2), 58-61.
- Cunneen, C., & Libesman, T. (1995). *Indigenous people and the law in Australia*. Sydney: Butterworth.
- Dawson, D., & Allan, A. (2000). *Practice informing research: focus group research and violent indigenous offenders*. Paper presented at the Australian Institute of Criminology's "Reducing Criminality: Partnerships and Best Practice" Conference, Perth, 31 July to 1 August, 2000.
- Dawson, D., & Allan, A. (2001). *Risk of violent re-offending: Do indigenous male offenders have different risk characteristics?* Paper presented at the Australian Institute of Criminology's "Best Practice Interventions in Corrections for Indigenous People" Conference, Sydney, 8-9 October 2001.
- Dawson, D., & Allan, A. (2003). *Indigenous male offenders: The impact of intergenerational transfer of trauma, the stolen generation and abuse as a child*. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Congress of The Australian and New Zealand Association of Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, Fremantle, Western Australia, 25-28 September, 2003.
- Dempster, R. J. (1998). *Prediction of sexually violent recidivism: A comparison of risk assessment instruments*. Unpublished BA (Hon), Simon Fraser University, Vancouver.
- Furby, L., Weinrott, M. R., & Blackshaw, L. (1989). Sex offender recidivism: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 105(1), 3-30.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Smith, P. (2002). Is the PCL-R really the "unparalleled" measure of offender risk? A lesson in knowledge cumulation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29(4), 397-426.
- Greenberg, D. M., Da Silva, J.-A., & Loh, N. (2002). *Evaluation of the Western Australian sex offender treatment unit*. Perth: University of Western Australia.
- Grubin, D. (1998). *Sex offending against children: Understanding the risk* (Police research series paper No. 99). London: Home Office.
- Hanson, R. K. (1997). *The development of a brief actuarial scale for sexual offence recidivism* (User report No. 97-04). Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Hanson, R. K., & Bussiere, M. T. (1996). *Predictors of sexual offender recidivism: A meta-analysis*. Retrieved 24 March 1997, from [//www.sgc.gc.ca](http://www.sgc.gc.ca)
- Hanson, R. K., & Bussiere, M. T. (1998). Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66(2), 348-362.
- Hanson, R. K., & Harris, A. (2000). *The sex offender need assessment rating (Sonar): A method for measuring change in risk levels*. Retrieved 10/04/2000, 2000, from [//www.sgc.gc.ca](http://www.sgc.gc.ca)

- Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (1999). *Static 99: Improving risk assessments for sex offenders*. Retrieved 16 August, 2002, from // www.sgc.gc.ca
- Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2000). Improving risk assessments for sexual offenders: A comparison of three actuarial scales. *Law and Human Behavior, 24*(1), 119-136.
- Howells, K., Day, A., Byrne, S., & Byrne, M. (1999). *Risk, needs and responsivity in violence rehabilitation: Implications for programs with indigenous offenders*. Paper presented at the Conference on Best practice interventions in corrections for Indigenous people, Adelaide, South Australia, October 1999.
- Knight, R. A., & Prentky, R. A. (1993). Exploring characteristics for classifying juvenile sex offenders. In H. E. Barbaree, W. L. Marshall & S. M. Hudson (Eds.), *The juvenile sex offender* (pp. 45-83). New York: Guilford Press.
- Mals, P., Howells, K., Day, A., & Hall, G. (2000). Adapting violent rehabilitation programs for the Australian Aboriginal offender. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 30*(1/2), 121-135.
- Marshall, P. (1997). *A reconviction study of HMP Grendon Therapeutic Community* (No. 53). London: Home Office Research and Statistics Directorate.
- McRae, H., Nettheim, G., & Beacroft, L. (1997). *Indigenous legal issues: Commentary and materials* (2 ed.). Sydney: Law Book Company.
- Memmott, P., Stacy, R., Chambers, C., & Keys, C. (2001). *Violence in Indigenous Communities*. Canberra: Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department.
- Mossman, D. (2000). Commentary: Assessing the risk of violence - Are "accurate" predictions useful? *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 28*, 272-281.
- O'Shane, P. (1992). Aborigines and the criminal justice system. In C. Cunneen (Ed.), *Aboriginal perspectives on criminal justice* (pp. 3-7). Sydney: Institute of Criminology.
- Payne, S. (1992). Aboriginal women and the law. In C. Cunneen (Ed.), *Aboriginal perspectives on criminal justice* (pp. 31-40). Sydney: Institute of Criminology.
- Prentky, R. A., Knight, R. A., & Lee, A. F. S. (1997). Risk factors associated with recidivism among extrafamilial child molesters. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65*, 141-149.
- Prentky, R. A., Lee, A. F. S., Knight, R. A., & Cerce, D. (1997). Recidivism rates among child molesters and rapists: A methodological analysis. *Law and Human Behavior, 21*(6), 635-659.
- Quinsey, V. L., Lalumiere, M. L., Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (1995). Predicting sexual offenses. In J. C. Campbell (Ed.), *Assessing dangerousness: Violence by sex offenders, batterers, and child abusers* (pp. 114-137). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rogers, R. (2000). The uncritical acceptance of risk assessment in forensic practice. *Law and Human Behavior, 24*(5), 595-605.
- Sheldrick, C. (1999). Practitioner review: The assessment and management of risk in adolescents. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 40*, 507-518.
- Sjöstedt, G., & Langström, N. (2001). Actuarial assessment of sex offender recidivism risk: A cross-validation of the RRASOR and the Static-99 in Sweden. *Law and Human Behavior, 25*(6), 629-645.
- Steadman, H. J., Silver, E., Monohan, J., Appelbaum, P. S., Robbins, P. C., Mulvey, E. P., et al. (2000). A classification tree approach to the development of Actuarial Violence Risk Assessing Tools. *Law and Human Behavior, 24*, 83-100.
- Tonry, M. (1987). Prediction and classification in criminal justice decision making. In D. M. Gottfredson & M. Tonry (Eds.), *Prediction and classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making* (pp. 1-20). Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Ward, A., & Dockerill, J. (1999). The Predictive Accuracy of the Violent Offender Treatment Program Risk Assessment Scale. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26(1), 125-140.

Wootten, H. (1992). Aboriginal people and the criminal justice system. In C. Cunneen (Ed.), *Aboriginal perspectives on criminal justice* (pp. 49-52). Sydney: Institute of Criminology.