

Juvenile Sex Offender Assessment Protocol-II (J-SOAP-II)

Manual

Robert Prentky, Ph.D.
Sue Righthand, Ph.D.

2003

NCJ 202316

Printed copies of this manual are available from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse. To order, call 800-851-3420 and ask for NCJ 202316.

Contact Information

The J-SOAP-II is an experimental scale and is the subject of ongoing research to improve reliability and further enhance predictive validity. We appreciate feedback from users about areas of ambiguity and ways to increase clarity. We are available to answer questions concerning the use of the J-SOAP, updates on validity studies, and training opportunities.

Robert Prentky, Ph.D.
P.O. Box 162
Accord, MA 02018-0162
Office: (508) 697-2744
Email: rprentky@comcast.net

Sue Righthand, Ph.D.
P.O. Box 1047
Rockland, ME 04841
VM: (207) 594-7880
Email: Rtnnds@aol.com

Table of Contents

Contact Information	i
Introduction.....	1
Caveat	1
Development and Validation of J-SOAP-II.....	2
Development.....	2
Validation	2
J-SOAP-II	5
References	6
Frequently Asked Questions	8
Scoring Guidelines.....	11
Scoring Instructions	12
Section I. Static Risk Assessment.....	12
Scale 1. Sexual Drive/Preoccupation Items	12
Scale 2. Impulsive/Antisocial Behavior Items	16
Section II. Dynamic Risk Assessment.....	21
Scale 3. Intervention Items.....	21
Scale 4. Community Stability/Adjustment Items.....	25
Juvenile Sex Offender Assessment Protocol-II Scoring Form	28
Juvenile Sex Offender Assessment Protocol-II Summary Form	29

Introduction

The Juvenile Sex Offender Assessment Protocol-II (J-SOAP-II) is a checklist whose purpose is to aid in the systematic review of risk factors that have been identified in the professional literature as being associated with sexual and criminal offending. It is designed to be used with boys in the age range of 12 to 18 who have been adjudicated for sexual offenses, as well as nonadjudicated youths with a history of sexually coercive behavior.

Decisions about reoffense risk should not be based exclusively on the results from J-SOAP-II. J-SOAP-II should always be used as part of a comprehensive risk assessment. Like any scale that is intended to assess risk, J-SOAP-II requires ongoing validation and possible revision, as we learn more about how J-SOAP-II works and about how best to assess the risk of youths who have sexually offended. Because the revised J-SOAP is a new scale, and we are just beginning to collect predictive validity data on it, we cannot provide users with cut-off scores for categories of risk at this point; this is all the more reason why scores from J-SOAP-II should not be used in isolation when assessing risk.

Caveat

When assessing risk with sex offenders in general, and with juveniles in particular, the stakes are often very high. In assessing the risk posed by a juvenile, we have an enormous burden of responsibility. Decisions based on our evaluations can have a profound impact: on the one hand, protecting society from genuinely high-risk youths, while on the other hand, possibly resulting in severe, life-altering consequences for low-risk youths.

It is imperative that clinicians who assess the risk of adolescent offending be very knowledgeable of the challenges involved in assessing this population. Unlike adults, adolescents are still very much “in flux.” No aspect of their development, including their cognitive development, is fixed or stable. In addition, their life circumstances often are very unstable. In a very real sense, we are trying to assess the risk of “moving targets.” Since risk status may change, sometimes dramatically, in a brief period of time, we strongly recommend that youths be re-assessed for risk at a minimum of every 6 months. At the very least, Scales 3 and 4 should be rescored every 6 months. Re-assessments should be done even more frequently if the examiner is aware of risk-relevant changes that have occurred in the youth’s life.

Prior to using J-SOAP-II, users should have training and experience in assessing juveniles who commit sexual offenses and risk assessment in general, particularly as it pertains to juvenile sex offending. In addition, prior to using J-SOAP-II, users should read the manual and be familiar with its contents. Before using the scale in any professional capacity, users should complete several practice cases and compare their scores with others who have scored the same case to identify and resolve any scoring difficulties. It is also recommended that J-SOAP-II users periodically consult with each other about their scoring and stay current with the evolving literature relevant for assessing juveniles who sexually offend.

Development and Validation of J-SOAP-II

Development

The original version of this risk assessment scale for juvenile sex offenders was developed at Joseph J. Peters Institute (JJPI) in Philadelphia in 1994 (Prentky, Harris, Frizzell, & Righthand, 2000). The risk assessment variables were developed after reviews of the literature that covered five areas: (1) clinical studies of juvenile sex offenders, (2) risk assessment/outcome studies of juvenile sex offenders, (3) risk assessment/outcome studies of adult sex offenders, (4) risk assessment/outcome studies from the general juvenile delinquency literature, and (5) risk assessment studies on mixed populations of adult offenders.

In all, 23 items representing 4 subscales were developed. These scales were intended to capture the two major historical (static) domains that are of importance for risk assessment with this population (Scale 1: Sexual Drive/Sexual Preoccupation and Scale 2: Impulsive, Antisocial Behavior), and the two major dynamic areas that could potentially reflect behavior change (Scale 3: Clinical/Treatment and Scale 4: Community Adjustment). The latter two subscales were of particular importance, because the original risk assessment protocol was developed to assess not only risk at discharge but change as a function of treatment.

No *a priori* item weighting was used. All items were trichotomized and assumed, for lack of empirical data to suggest otherwise, to be of equal importance. Trichotomization was intended to be a compromise, adding some increase in sensitivity over a simple rating of present/absent, while at the same time preserving acceptable interrater reliability. The coding for each item provided, to whatever extent possible, behavioral anchors to increase clarity and reliability.

Validation

The construction/validation sample consisted of 96 juvenile sexual offenders, ranging in age from 9 to 20 (average age was 14), who were referred to JJPI for assessment and treatment. The risk assessment protocol was completed on all 96 juvenile sex offenders as part of a comprehensive intake battery at JJPI. The protocol was completed again at time of discharge, on average 24 months later. The protocol was coded independently by two clinicians entirely from archival documents and data obtained from the intake battery. After the ratings were completed, the clinicians discussed disagreements, and the agreed-upon ratings were used to examine outcome.

Twelve-month follow-up data were obtained on 75 of the 96 youths in the study. The short-term [12-month] recidivism rate of 11% included three youths that committed another sexual offense, four youths that committed a nonsexual victim-involved offense, and one youth who committed a nonsexual, victimless offense.

The inter-rater reliability (IRR) for all items, except for Caregiver Instability, was good to excellent, ranging from .75 to .91, with an average IRR of .83. The reliability for Caregiver Instability was poor (.59), and that item has since been revised. Three of the subscales had moderate internal consistency, with alphas ranging from .68 to .73. The Clinical/Treatment scale had a high degree of

internal consistency (.85). Three of the four subscales comprised items with high item-total correlations ($r \geq .30$). Seven of the 9 items in Scale 2, 4 of the 5 items in Scale 3, and all items in Scale 4 exceeded this benchmark. The exception was Scale 1. The only Scale 1 item with a reasonably high item-total correlation was Prior Charged Sex Offenses.

Overall, there was an average total scale score of 21 for those juveniles who did not reoffend and an average scale score of 30 for those 3 juveniles who committed another sexual offense. These results were based on a very small sample of eight recidivists, only three of whom were sexual recidivists. For that reason we applied no inferential statistics, and observed group differences were not confirmed by statistical significance.

We looked at Treatment Outcome (assessed at time of discharge) in two ways, by correlating the total score for the six treatment outcome variables with the four follow-up variables and with the four subscales. The correlation between Treatment Outcome and the total scale score was .58. The correlations between Treatment Outcome and the two dynamic subscales were .62 for Clinical/Treatment and .43 for Community Adjustment. The correlations between Treatment Outcome and Follow-Up were .35 for the juveniles who reoffended and .55 for the juveniles who were removed from the community and placed.

This study was informative in pointing to areas that required revision and clarification. The scoring criteria for every item were carefully examined for ambiguity and behavioral examples and anchors were added. Two changes were made to Scale 1. First, the Scale 1 item that included offense planning (History of Predatory Behavior) was replaced with a more clearly defined Offense Planning item. The new Offense Planning item was behaviorally anchored and easier to code from file data than the more inferential History of Predatory Behavior item that required difficult judgments about behaviors such as grooming and exploitation. Second, a fifth variable was added to Scale 1 that was intended to capture the degree to which the juvenile sexualized his victims (for example, use of pornography in the offense, filming the victim, engaging in unusual or ritualized sexual acts with the victim). Two changes were also made to Scale 2. A Juvenile Antisocial Behavior item was added that was intended to assess general delinquency, and a History of Expressed Anger item was added that was designed to assess disruptions due to poorly controlled and poorly managed anger.

The revised scale, completed in 1998 and referred to as J-SOAP, was examined with a sample of 153 juveniles in Maine (Righthand, Prentky, Hecker, Carpenter, & Nangle, 2000). The juvenile sexual offenders in this sample had an average age of 16, and had been adjudicated for a sex offense or had been adjudicated for another offense, but had a documented sex offense in their records. The victims ranged in age from 1 year to 36 years, with an average age of 8.6 years. Inter-rater reliabilities for the four subscales ranged from .80 to .91. Internal consistency continued to be quite high for Scale 2 ($\alpha = .88$), Scale 3 ($\alpha = .95$), and Scale 4 ($\alpha = .80$), with Scale 1 evidencing moderate internal consistency ($\alpha = .64$).

We looked at the factor structure of the 26 items comprising the J-SOAP using principal component analysis (PCA) (Righthand et al., 2000). The four-factor solution provided strong empirical support for the four J-SOAP scales. The first factor, accounting for slightly over 20% of the variance, was the equivalent of Scale 2 (Impulsive, Antisocial Behavior) on J-SOAP. The first factor mapped

Scale 2 precisely, with all items on Scale 2 falling on it. The loadings for these 11 items ranged from .44 to .77. The second factor, also accounting for 20% of the variance, was the equivalent of Scale 3 (Clinical Intervention) on J-SOAP. All five Scale 3 items loaded on this factor along with one item (Quality of Peer Relations) that was from Scale 4 of J-SOAP. The loadings for the five Scale 3 items ranged from .83 to .88. The third factor, accounting for about 9% of the variance, was the precise equivalent of Scale 1 (Sexual Drive & Preoccupation) on the J-SOAP. All five Scale 1 items loaded on this factor, with item loadings ranging from .51 to .72. The fourth factor, accounting for about 8.5% of the variance, was the equivalent of Scale 4 (Community Adjustment) on the J-SOAP. Four of the five Scale 2 items loaded on this component, with item loadings ranging from .46 to .78.

The concurrent validity of the J-SOAP was explored by examining how well it correlated with the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LSI/CMI) (Righthand et al., 2000). In addition, we examined the relationship between the J-SOAP static scales (Scales 1 & 2) and criminal history variables coded from the juvenile's files. The coded variables were: (1) Total Offenses, the total number of offenses of any type committed by the youth, (2) Sexual Offenses, the total number of sexual offenses committed by the youth, (3) Sex Offense Victims, the number of victims of contact sexual offenses; and (4) Sexual Aggression, the degree of aggression displayed by the youth during any and all sexual activities throughout his life.

The LSI/CMI was highly correlated with the total J-SOAP score [$r = .91$], as well as the individual scales: Scale 1 [$r = .37$]; Scale 2 [$r = .81$]; Scale 3 [$r = .88$]; Scale 4 [$r = .91$]. Scale 1 was uncorrelated with Total Offenses [$r = .08$] but significantly correlated with Number of Sex Offenses [$r = .36$], Number of Sex Offense Victims [$r = .64$], and Degree of Sexual Aggression [$r = .27$]. Scale 2 was uncorrelated with Number of Sex Offenses ($r = .03$) but significantly correlated with Total Offenses [$r = .30$], Number of Sex Offense Victims [$r = .27$], and Degree of Sexual Aggression [$r = .29$].

Of the original sample of 153 youths, 134 could be reliably coded as to placement, either residential (a treatment or correctional facility) or in the community. The validity of the J-SOAP was also examined by comparing 45 residential and 89 community juveniles on J-SOAP scales (Righthand, Carpenter, & Prentky, 2001). Since Scale 4 is not scored for youths who have been in secure care for 6 months or longer, Scale 4 was not examined. The other three J-SOAP scales discriminated between the two groups, with the residential juveniles being significantly higher in risk than the community juveniles on all three scales.

In one of two recent predictive validity studies, Hecker, Scoular, Righthand, & Nangle (2002) examined juvenile and adult arrest and conviction data for a period spanning 10 to 12 years on a sample of 54 male adolescent sex offenders. Twenty of the juveniles committed a nonsexual offense (37%) and 6 of the juveniles committed a sexual offense (11%) during the follow-up period. Although the total J-SOAP score was not correlated with sexual recidivism, Scale 1 alone significantly improved the prediction of sexual recidivism above chance (ROC, AUC = .79). A serious caveat, however, is that there were only 6 sexual recidivists. The very low rate of sexual recidivism has been a methodological impediment that has hindered our ability to examine in greater depth the predictive validity of J-SOAP.

Waite, Pinkerton, Wieckowski, McGarvey, & Brown (2002) reported on a 9-year follow-up study of 253 very high-risk juvenile sex offenders. Although the detected rate of sexual recidivism was, once again, very low (4.3%, 11 youths were arrested for a new sexual offense), roughly 60% of the sample was arrested for other offenses. Using a modified Scale 2 from the J-SOAP (8 of the 11 items were coded), the juveniles were split into two groups: Low Impulsive/Antisocial ($n = 118$) and High Impulsive/Antisocial ($n = 135$). The proportion of the Low and High groups arrested for any new offense was 52.6% and 74.8%, respectively ($p < .001$). Although the numbers were very small, it is noteworthy that the High Scale 2 juveniles were three times more likely to be rearrested for a new sexual offense (9.8%, compared with 2.9% for the Low Scale 2 juveniles).

Righthand, Knight, and Prentky (2002) tested four theoretical models using structural equation modeling. This study explored (a) the relationship of antecedent adverse life experiences to J-SOAP Scales 1, 2, and 3, and (b) the relationship of J-SOAP to sex offense outcome variables. The six key findings from this study were: (1) there was a strong relationship between a history of sexual abuse and J-SOAP Scale 1, (2) the severity of the sexual abuse was the most important facet of sexual abuse for predicting outcome, (3) family violence/trauma and caregiver instability were both related to J-SOAP Scale 2, (4) J-SOAP Scale 1 was strongly related to the number of victims (the higher the score, the greater the number of victims) and victim gender (higher Scale 1 scores were associated with male victims), (5) J-SOAP Scale 2 was related to victim age (higher Scale 2 scores were associated with older victims (teenage or older)), and (6) J-SOAP Scales 1 and 2 both were associated with the amount of force used in the sexual offenses.

J-SOAP-II

The J-SOAP was revised again based on the results of the studies just described. In addition, an attempt was made to better anchor items in clear, behavioral terms. In this section, we will highlight the most important changes that have been made to J-SOAP. Only substantial changes, such as item additions and deletions, are described here. Because numerous, more subtle changes were made to item wording and scoring criteria, it is important to read over the revised scale carefully.

Scale 1. Six substantial changes were made. These changes include the addition of four new items, the deletion of one item, and an extensive revision of another. The decision to add several items was based on weaknesses in Scale 1 and recent research suggesting the potential importance of these items in assessing the risk of sexual reoffending. The four new items are: (1) Number of Sexual Abuse Victims, which measures the number of victims the juvenile has ever sexually abused, (2) Male Child Victim, which assesses the juvenile's history of sexually abusing a substantially younger male child, (3) Sexualized Aggression, which assesses the presence of gratuitous or expressive aggression that goes beyond what was required to complete the sexual offense, and (4) Sexual Victimization History, which assesses the juvenile's own history of sexual victimization and the complexity and severity of the abuse.

The deleted item is: High Degree of Sexualizing the Victim. This item had a very low frequency of occurrence and appeared of limited utility. One item, Evidence of Sexual Preoccupation/Obsessions, was replaced with a more clearly defined Sexual Drive and Preoccupation item. The new Sexual Drive and Preoccupation item was behaviorally anchored with a range of examples making it easier to code from file data. Scale 1 in the J-SOAP-II now has a total of eight items.

Scale 2. Six substantial changes were made. (1) Two items, History of Substance Abuse and History of Parental Substance Abuse, were eliminated. Several studies consistently indicated that these were weak items and were not contributing to the predictive ability of Scale 2. (2) The item School Suspensions or Expulsions was combined with the item School Behavior Problems to reduce the obvious overlap between those two items. (3) The item Impulsivity was dropped. As a risk predictor, lifestyle impulsivity appears to be more effective with adults than juveniles. The J-SOAP item, Juvenile Antisocial Behavior, provides a much better assessment of impulsivity in adolescence. (4) An item, Physical Assault History/Exposure to Family Violence, was added based on the empirical literature as well as our recent path analysis looking at the developmental antecedents of J-SOAP scales, (5) The item Caregiver Consistency was revised. In order to provide a more sensitive assessment of caregiver changes that might impact adversely affect the development of attachments and relationships, the item was changed to assess caregivers prior to age 10 rather than 16. J-SOAP-II Scale 2 now has a total of eight items.

Scale 3. Because J-SOAP-II may be useful for assessing nonsexual recidivism as well as sexual recidivism, relevant Scale 3 Intervention items were revised to include changes in attitudes and behaviors related to nonsexual offending as well as sexual offending. In addition, because empathy and remorse are really distinct attitudes and feelings, J-SOAP item Evidence of Empathy, Remorse, and Guilt was separated into two items, one simply entitled Empathy, and the other entitled Remorse and Guilt. Finally, based on Principal Components Analyses findings, the item Quality of Peer Relationships was moved from Scale 4 to Scale 3, where it appears to fit conceptually as an important target of treatment interventions. These changes result in J-SOAP-II Scale 3, the Intervention Scale, having a total of seven items.

Scale 4. Two substantial changes were made to Scale 4. One new item, Management of Sexual Urges and Desire, was added to assess the extent to which the juvenile manages his sexual urges and desires in socially appropriate and healthy ways. Also, as noted above, the item Quality of Peer Relationships was moved from Scale 4 to Scale 3. These changes resulted in Scale 4 having a total of five items.

In all, the revised scale has 28 items, 2 more than the original J-SOAP. J-SOAP-II replaces all previous versions of the J-SOAP.

References

- Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., & Quinsey, V. L. (1994). Psychopathy as a taxon: Evidence that psychopaths are a discrete class. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62: 387–397.
- Hecker, J., Scoular, J., Righthand, S., & Nangle, D. (2002, October). *Predictive validity of the J-SOAP over 10-plus years: Implications for risk assessment*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Hoge, R. D., & Andrews, D. A. (1994). *The Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory and Manual*. Ottawa, Canada: Carleton University, Department of Psychology.

Prentky, R. A., Harris, B., Frizzell, K., & Righthand, S. (2000). An actuarial procedure for assessing risk with juvenile sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 12(2): 71–93.

Righthand, S., Carpenter, E. M., Prentky, R. A. (2001, November). *Risk assessment in a sample of juveniles who have sexually offended: A comparative analysis*. Poster presented at the Annual Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, San Antonio, Texas.

Righthand, S., Knight, R., & Prentky, R. (2002, October). *A path analytic investigation of proximal antecedents of J-SOAP risk domains*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Righthand, S., Prentky, R., Hecker, J. E., Carpenter, E., & Nangle, D. (2000, November). *JJPI-Maine Juvenile Sex Offender Risk Assessment Schedule (J-SOAP)*. Poster session presented at the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers 19th Annual Research and Treatment Conference in San Diego, CA.

Righthand, S., Prentky, R. A., Knight, R. A., Carpenter, E., Hecker, J. E., & Nangle, D. (Manuscript in preparation). *Factor structure and validation of the Juvenile Sex Offender Assessment Protocol (J-SOAP)*.

Waite, D., Pinkerton, R., Wieckowski, E., McGarvey, E., & Brown, G. L. (2002, October). *Tracking treatment outcome among juvenile sexual offenders: A nine year follow-up study*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Frequently Asked Questions

1. What is actuarial risk assessment?

“Actuarial” refers to the work done by actuaries. Actuaries are individuals who are trained to calculate risks using statistics, usually for insurance companies. Actuarial scales are developed using statistical analyses of groups of individuals with known outcomes (such as men who have been convicted of a new sex offense and men who apparently have not reoffended sexually). These analyses tell us which items (“predictor variables”) do the best job of differentiating between those who reoffended and those who did not reoffend. Because some items inevitably do a better job than others, these analyses can also tell us how much each item should be weighted. The items are combined to form a scale. The scales are then used on other samples to see how well they work (to test their validity).

2. Is the J-SOAP an actuarial scale?

Although our goal is to provide the user with probabilistic estimates of risk for sexual recidivism, we still do not have adequate data on a sufficiently large number of juvenile sexual reoffenders to provide such estimates. Thus, at the present time, J-SOAP-II is not an actuarial scale. J-SOAP is an empirically informed guide for the systematic review and assessment of a uniform set of items that may reflect increased risk to reoffend.

3. Why are there no cut-off scores?

Cut-off scores are determined after many subjects have been scored and a large and diverse database is available. Most importantly, this database must include excellent followup information on sexual recidivism (those who have reoffended and those who have not). Rather than assigning cut-off scores based on insufficient information, we decided that the most prudent and responsible approach was to recommend the use of ratios. The score of each scale can be divided by the total possible score for that scale. The total J-SOAP-II score can also be reported as a ratio. These ratios or proportions reflect the observed “amount” of risk rated as present for each scale and for the total score. When the data that are being gathered clearly point to reliable cut-off scores with diverse samples of juveniles, we will recommend those cut-offs to users.

4. What about item weighting?

Actuarial scales may work better when items are properly weighted. Item weighting takes into consideration that some items simply are more important than others when it comes to predicting outcome. Proper item weighting is done with a statistical procedure called multiple linear regression. The result is a “weighted linear prediction.” Item weighting, however, is not required. Some argue that simple unit item weighting (the way the J-SOAP works) is just as effective.

This is, of course, an empirical question. In order to do proper item weighting, large samples of offenders are needed to determine the item weights, and we have not as yet gathered enough outcome data to examine the potential increase in accuracy using item weights.

At the present time, the J-SOAP is a simple unit weighted system. We add the scores for all of the items and divide by the total possible score to derive the proportion rated as present. Although this procedure may not be as effective as using item weights, it is superior to using clinically derived weights (clinical notions about how the items should be weighted, unsupported by any data).

5. Can I “adjust” the J-SOAP score?

This question is most relevant for discussions of actuarial risk assessment instruments, and, as noted above, the J-SOAP-II is not an actuarial instrument. Users might adjust a J-SOAP score by changing the way they rated a particular item because the score was not consistent with their impression of the juvenile. They would, in effect, be changing the criteria for scoring that item, and that is not acceptable. The scores for individual items, as well as the overall scale scores, should never be changed or adjusted. “Adjustment” is perfectly legitimate when writing up conclusions about the juvenile’s risk. In that context, you would be “adjusting” your conclusions, presumably based on risk-relevant information that the J-SOAP-II did not take into consideration, and not adjusting the J-SOAP-II scores. We might think of such risk-relevant information in the dynamic sense, as mitigating or aggravating factors that serve to increase or decrease risk. The clinician could report, for example, “Although the J-SOAP-II score is relatively low, there are clear aggravating factors in the individual’s life that may increase his risk . . .”

6. What can I do to improve my scoring reliability?

The single most important factor contributing to unreliability is the lack of information or the ambiguity of information being used to score the item. How incomplete or how ambiguous the information is may vary enormously from one case to another, and there are no simple or easy methods for dealing with this problem. In general, multiple sources of information are ideal. Not only is there a greater likelihood of finding needed information, but multiple sources provide a cross-check of the information.

To enhance reliability, we strongly recommend that examiners use as many sources of information as possible when scoring J-SOAP-II. In addition, although it is often not feasible, we also recommend that the J-SOAP-II be scored by two independent clinicians who then compare and discuss their scores. The agreed-upon scores should be used. When the available information is very limited, unclear, or incomplete, items should be scored “conservatively” (that is, in the direction of lower risk), and it should be noted that the resulting score may underestimate the risk.

Clinicians should, of course, study the manual before using J-SOAP-II. Lastly, it is strongly recommended that users of J-SOAP-II complete several training cases before using the J-SOAP on a real case. The importance of adequate training on practice cases cannot be overstated.

7. How can I use J-SOAP scores in treatment planning?

As noted previously, the purpose of the J-SOAP-II is to facilitate risk assessment and risk management. J-SOAP-II may be particularly useful for informing and guiding treatment and risk management decisions. For example, if a youth has a relatively high score on Scale 1 but a

relatively low score on Scale 2, the youth may require more sex offense-specific treatment interventions and less of a focus on delinquency interventions. In fact, mixing such a youth with more “hard-core” delinquents may do more harm than good.

In contrast, a youth who has a relatively high score on Scale 2 but a relatively low score on Scale 1 may have sexually offended as part of a more general pattern of antisocial behavior. In cases such as this, the sexual offense may not reflect serious issues involving management of sexually deviant or sexually coercive behavior. This type of youth may require delinquency-focused treatment interventions, perhaps with some limited psychoeducational interventions that address appropriate sexual boundaries, nonabusive sexual behavior, impulse control, and healthy masculinity.

Juveniles who have high scores on Scale 1 and Scale 2 may well require more intensive supervision, perhaps in a secure residential placement, and need sex-offense specific treatment as well as delinquency-focused interventions. Low scores on Scales 1 and 2, on the other hand, may suggest that the offending behavior was more situational and requires only limited interventions, such as psychoeducational approaches that address human sexuality, appropriate sexual behavior, social skills training and dating skills. Specific interventions, of course, depend on the overall picture of risk and needs.

Scoring Guidelines

The J-SOAP-II items are scored using a 0 to 2 scale, with 0 always associated with the apparent absence of the item and 2 always associated with the clear presence of the item. Thus, “0” implies the apparent absence of the risk factor described by the item, and “2” implies the clear presence of the risk factor as described by the item. A score of “1” implies the presence of some information that suggests the presence of the item, but the information is insufficient, unclear, or too sketchy to justify a score of “2.”

As noted in FAQ 6, to enhance accuracy and reliability, assessments should be based on multiple sources of information whenever possible. Unless otherwise noted in the item description, scores should be based on all available evidence, including self-report, and documentation in the records. If available information is limited, incomplete, or unclear, items should be scored in the direction of lower risk (favoring the absence rather than the presence of the item), and it should be noted that the resulting scores may be underestimates. As previously noted, J-SOAP-II is not an exhaustive list of risk variables and is not a substitute for assessing other potentially risk-relevant variables on a case-by-case basis.

Scores are obtained by summing the items on each of the four scales and then adding the four scale scores to derive the overall J-SOAP-II score. Each scale score is then divided by the total possible score for that scale to determine the relative “proportion of risk” rated as present for each of the four scales. For example, if the total for all eight items on Scale 2 was 8, the Scale 2 score would be reported on the Summary Form as 50% (8/16). Similarly, the overall J-SOAP-II score is divided by the total possible score (i.e., 28 items x 2 points each = 56).

Scoring Instructions

Section I. Static Risk Assessment

Scale 1. Sexual Drive/Preoccupation Items

Item 1: Prior Legally Charged Sex Offenses

Description: This item is simply the total number of prior charged sexual offenses that involved physical contact. Conviction is not necessary. Do not count the current, governing, or index sexual offense(s).

Scoring:

0 = None.

1 = 1 offense.

2 = More than 1 offense.

Item 2: Number of Sexual Abuse Victims

Description: This item looks at the number of victims the juvenile is known to have ever sexually abused. In making this judgment, use any reliable source. A legal charge/conviction is not required. “Victim” is defined as anyone who has been sexually abused in a manner involving physical contact.

Scoring:

0 = Only 1 known victim.

1 = 2 known victims.

2 = 3 or more known victims.

Item 3: Male Child Victim

Description: This item assesses the juvenile's history of sexually abusing a male child. A "child" victim is defined here as someone who is 10 years old or younger and is at least 4 years younger than the juvenile. If the juvenile was age 14 or older at the time of the offense, the victim was 10 or younger. If the juvenile was 13, the victim was 9 or younger. If the juvenile was 12, the victim was 8 or younger. If the child victim was older than 10, this item may still be scored if there was clear evidence of physical force or violence.

Scoring:

0 = No known male child victims.

1 = 1 male victim (only 1 known).

2 = 2 or more known male victims.

Item 4: Duration of Sex Offense History

Description: This item looks at the total amount of time the juvenile has been known to commit sexual contact offenses (i.e., from the first known sexual contact offense to the current [governing or index] sexual contact offense). In making this judgment, include all credible reports and self-report. Do not limit scoring to legally charged offenses.

Scoring:

0 = Only 1 known sexual offense and no other history of sexual aggression (i.e., the governing or index offense is the only known sexual offense).

1 = There are multiple sex offenses within a brief time period (6 months or less). The multiple sex offenses may involve multiple assaults on the same victim or multiple victims.

2 = There are multiple sex offenses that extend over a period greater than 6 months and involve 1 or more victims.

Item 5: Degree of Planning in Sexual Offense(s)

Description: This item looks at the degree of forethought, planning, and premeditation that took place prior to the sexual assaults. It concerns the individual's modus operandi (MO): everything the individual did to commit the offense. In general, the more detail and forethought involved in planning an offense, the more complex the MO. With highly impulsive, opportunistic offenses, the MO will be negligible. When there are multiple known sexual assaults, score for the assault that reflects the greatest degree of planning. This item should also be scored when a high degree of manipulation and deception has been used to gain access to the victim's.

Scoring:

- 0 = No planning. All known sexual offenses appear to have been impulsive, opportunistic, sudden, and without any apparent forethought prior to the encounter.
- 1 = Mild degree of planning. Some clear evidence that the individual thought about or fantasized about the sexual offense before the encounter. Some degree of grooming or "setting up" the victim may reflect mild planning.
- 2 = Moderate-Detailed planning. There must be a clear modus operandi. The offenses may appear "scripted," with a particular victim and crime location targeted. Planning also may be evident when there is a high degree of manipulation and/or a significant amount of grooming to gain access to the victim. The major difference between Mild and Moderate-Detailed planning is the extent and degree of planning and the amount of time invested in planning. The distinction is quantitative rather than qualitative.

Item 6: Sexualized Aggression

Description: This item captures the degree or level of gratuitous or expressive aggression in the sexual offenses. Gratuitous or expressive aggression is aggressive behavior that clearly goes beyond what was required to complete the sexual offense.

Scoring:

- 0 = No gratuitous or expressive aggression. No evidence that the individual intentionally physically hurt the victim or demeaned or humiliated the victim; no evidence that the individual used force or aggression beyond what was required to complete the sexual offense.
- 1 = Mild amount of expressive aggression. For example, as evidenced by swearing or cursing at the victim, threatening the victim, squeezing, slapping, pushing, or pinching the victim.
- 2 = Moderate-High amount of expressive aggression. For example, as evidenced by punching, kicking, cutting, burning, or stabbing the victim; causing physical injuries that require medical attention; or intentionally humiliating or degrading the victim.

Item 7: Sexual Drive and Preoccupation

Description: This item measures “hypersexuality” (i.e., the strength of the sexual drive and preoccupation). This is a behaviorally anchored item that focuses on evidence of an excessive amount of sexual activity (exceeding what might be considered normative for youths of that age) or excessive preoccupation with sexual urges or gratifying sexual needs. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, paraphilias (exposing, peeping, cross-dressing, fetishes, etc.); compulsive masturbation; chronic and compulsive use of pornography; frequent highly sexualized language and gestures; and indiscriminant sexual activity with different partners out of the context of any relationship. Consider all credible and reliable evidence, self-reported as well as documented in the records.

Scoring:

0 = Normative/Minimal. 1 or 2 instances of sexualized behavior.

1 = Moderate. Sexualized behaviors have been observed and noted on 3 to 5 separate occasions.

2 = High. Sexualized behaviors have been observed and noted on 6 or more separate occasions.

Item 8: Sexual Victimization History

Description: This item assesses the juvenile’s own history of sexual victimization. In this context, excessive force refers to force that clearly exceeded what was necessary to gain compliance.

Scoring:

0 = None known.

1 = The juvenile was a victim of sexual abuse. There is no evidence of any form of sexual penetration or excessive force or physical injury to the juvenile.

2 = The juvenile was a victim of sexual abuse. Score 2 if there is evidence of sexual penetration or excessive force or physical injury.

Scale 2. Impulsive/Antisocial Behavior Items

Item 9: Caregiver Consistency

Description: This item measures the consistency and stability of caregivers in the life of the juvenile before the age of 10. Multiple changes in caregivers or changes in living situations with different caregivers and the number of different caregivers are critical. A “change” must last for at least 6 months to be considered (for example, if the individual spends a month living with his aunt and uncle, it would not be considered a change of caregivers).

Scoring:

0 = Lived with biological parents until his current age or until age 10.

1 = 1 or 2 changes in caregivers (e.g., from biological parents to step or foster parents).

2 = 3 or more changes in caregivers before age 10.

Item 10: Pervasive Anger

Description: This item includes (1) repeated instances of verbal aggression and angry outbursts, (2) threatening and intimidating behavior, and (3) nonsexual physical assaults directed at multiple targets across multiple settings—anger directed at parents, peers, police, teachers, animals, etc. The essential point is that the behavior must reflect anger across persons and situations. Although destroying property may be an expression of anger, the destruction of property does not necessarily result from anger.

Scoring:

0 = No evidence.

1 = Mild. Occasional outbursts and inappropriate expressions of anger or a pattern of anger expressed at an apparently narrow range of targets (e.g., anger only expressed at peers).

2 = Moderate-Strong. Long-standing pattern of repeated instances of poorly managed anger directed at multiple targets.

Item 11: School Behavior Problems

Description: Score this item for kindergarten through eighth grade only. School behavior problems include school failure not due to cognitive difficulties. Examples may include chronic truancy, fighting with peers and/or teachers, or other evidence of serious behavioral problems at school that require corrective intervention. Fighting should only be considered if there has been physical contact (e.g., punching, kicking, shoving) and not if there has only been yelling or arguing.

Scoring:

0 = None (no clear evidence of school behavior problems).

1 = Mild (a few apparently isolated instances).

2 = Moderate-Severe (clear evidence of multiple instances of behavior problems that may include behaviors resulting in suspensions or expulsion from school).

Item 12: History of Conduct Disorder Before Age 10

Description: Score this item for behavior before the age of 10. Score for a persistent pattern of behavioral disturbance characterized by (1) repeated failure to obey rules, (2) violating the basic rights of others, and (3) engaging in destructive and aggressive conduct at school, at home, and/or in the community.

Scoring:

0 = No evidence.

1 = Mild-Moderate (1 or 2 different criteria present).

2 = Strong (all 3 criteria present).

Item 13: Juvenile Antisocial Behavior (Ages 10–17)

Description: Score this item for behavior between the ages of 10 and 17. Score for nonsexual delinquent behavior such as: (1) vandalism and destruction to property; (2) malicious mischief, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, habitual truancy; (3) fighting and physical violence; (4) owning or carrying a weapon (other than for sport and hunting); (5) theft, robbery, burglary; and (6) motor vehicle-related (reckless driving, operating to endanger, operating under the influence). Scoring for this item is not limited to legally charged offenses. Consider all credible and reliable evidence, self-reported as well as documented in the records.

Scoring:

0 = None/Minimal (no more than a single incident).

1 = Moderate (2 or 3 different criteria present. Moderate also may be scored if there is a single very serious episode or multiple incidents involving one type of behavior).

2 = Strong (4 or more different criteria present or multiple incidents involving 2 or 3 types of behavior).

Item 14: Ever Charged or Arrested Before the Age of 16

Description: Score current offenses as well as previous charges/arrests for sexual and nonsexual offenses occurring before age 16. The juvenile must have been charged and/or arrested; conviction is not necessary.

Scoring:

0 = No.

1 = Once.

2 = More than once.

Item 15: Multiple Types of Offenses

Description: Scoring for this item is limited to legally charged offenses. Check as many different types of offense categories as apply and score according to the total number of categories checked.

- ☐ a. Sexual Offenses (such as rape, indecent assault, gross sexual assault, unlawful sexual contact, open and gross lewdness).
- ☐ b. Person Offenses—Nonsexual (such as assault, assault and battery, assault causing bodily harm, robbery, kidnapping, attempted murder, manslaughter, murder, terrorizing).
- ☐ c. Property Offenses (such as theft, burglary, possessing burglary tools, larceny, breaking and entering, criminal trespass, malicious destruction of property, arson, receiving/possessing stolen property, embezzlement, extortion of property).
- ☐ d. Fraudulent Offenses (such as fraud, forgery, passing bad checks, using stolen credit cards, impersonation, identity fraud, counterfeiting).
- ☐ e. Drug Offenses (drug trafficking and other clearly drug-related crimes not scored elsewhere; score simple possession of drugs under Conduct Offenses).
- ☐ f. Serious Motor Vehicle Offenses (such as operating to endanger, operating under the influence, reckless driving, chronic speeding, leaving the scene of an accident, vehicular homicide).
- ☐ g. Conduct Offenses (such as disorderly conduct, running away, vagrancy, malicious mischief, possession of alcohol and/or drugs, resisting arrest, habitual truancy, habitual offending).
- ☐ h. Other Rule Breaking Offenses (no clear victim but the law has been broken, such as escape from legal custody, failure to appear, conspiracy, accessory before or after the fact, possession of a firearm without a permit, obstruction of justice, violation of conditions of probation or other release, violation of a protection/ restraining order, prostitution).

Scoring:

0 = 1 type.

1 = 2 types.

2 = 3 or more types.

Item 16: History of Physical Assault and/or Exposure to Family Violence

Description: This item assesses the juvenile's own history of having been physically abused and/or exposed to violence within the home by a caregiver (biological, adoptive, foster, or step family). Exposure to family violence includes visual or auditory exposure to physical assaults on family members. It is not necessary for both physical abuse and exposure to violence to be present to score this item.

Scoring:

0 = No/Unknown.

1 = Yes. There is clear evidence that the juvenile was the victim of physical abuse by any caregiver. The documented history must indicate that the physical injuries did not warrant medical attention. Exposure to violence may include exposure to threats of violence and physical altercations involving pushing, shoving, and slapping, but no injuries requiring medical attention.

2 = Moderate/Severe. The physical abuse was frequent or very severe, resulting in serious injuries ordinarily requiring medical attention, including black eyes, broken bones, and severe bruising. Score for exposure to violence if the exposure was frequent or if the violence was very severe, resulting in serious injuries ordinarily requiring medical attention. The term "ordinarily" reflects the fact that the victims of violence may not receive medical attention but, in your estimation, the severity of the injury deserved such attention.

Section II. Dynamic Risk Assessment

Scale 3. Intervention Items

WHEN RATING THE ITEMS IN SCALE 3, TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION ALL DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR, NOT JUST SEX OFFENDING. IF THE JUVENILE HAS ONLY COMMITTED SEX OFFENSES, SIMPLY RATE ITEMS BASED ON THOSE SEX OFFENSES.

Item 17: Accepting Responsibility for Offense(s)

Description: Accepting full responsibility for one's offense(s) means no redirecting or assigning some or all of the responsibility for the offenses to others (i.e., the individual does not attribute some of the responsibility to the victim, to friends or other kids, to society, the police, the courts, or others). Any statements suggesting other than full responsibility should be scored as 1 or 2.

Scoring:

- 0 = Accepts full responsibility for sexual and nonsexual offenses without any evidence of minimizing.
- 1 = Accepts some (but not total) responsibility. Although occasional minimizing may be present, individual does not deny offending.
- 2 = Accepts no responsibility, or there is full denial. Option 2 also is scored when there is partial denial and/or significant or frequent minimizing.

Item 18: Internal Motivation for Change

Description: The focus of this item is the extent to which the individual truly experiences offending as out of character and appears to have a genuine desire to change his behaviors to avoid any recurrences.

Scoring:

- 0 = Appears distressed by his offenses and appears to have a genuine desire to change.
- 1 = There is some degree of internal conflict and distress, mixed with a clear desire to avoid the "consequences" of reoffending.
- 2 = No internal motivation for change. The juvenile does not perceive a need to change. He may feel hopeless and resigned about life in general, or he may deny ever committing offenses and therefore maintains he does not need to change and/or does not need treatment. Also score 2 if motivation for change is solely external (e.g., to avoid arrest, incarceration, or residential placement).

Item 19: Understands Risk Factors and Applies Risk Management Strategies

Description: This item concerns the individual's knowledge and understanding of factors and situations associated with his offending and the individual's awareness of risk management strategies and utilization of such strategies.

Scoring:

- 0 = Good understanding and demonstration of knowledge of risk factors and risk management strategies. Knows triggers, cognitive distortions (thinking errors), and high-risk situations. Knows and uses risk management strategies.
- 1 = Incomplete or partial understanding of risk factors and risk management strategies. Demonstration of knowledge may be present but inconsistent.
- 2 = Poor or inadequate understanding of risk factors and risk management strategies. Cannot adequately identify triggers, cognitive distortions (thinking errors) and offense-justifying attitudes, high-risk situations, or risk management strategies.

Item 20: Empathy

Description: This item assesses the youth's capacity for empathy in multiple situations. An attempt should be made to distinguish between statements that appear to reflect genuine feelings and statements that are primarily cognitive and reflect attitudes (e.g., socially desirable responses or genuinely held but strictly intellectual statements).

Scoring:

- 0 = Appears to have a genuine capacity for feeling empathy for his sexual abuse victims and can generalize to others in a variety of situations.
- 1 = There is some degree of expressed empathy; however, these statements appear to be internalized at a strictly intellectual level or are intended primarily to "look good" or respond in a socially acceptable way.
- 2 = There is little or no evidence of empathy and clear evidence of callous disregard for the welfare of others.

Item 21: Remorse and Guilt

Description: This item assesses the extent to which the juvenile expresses thoughts, feelings, and sentiments that reflect remorse for offending and offense-related behavior. This item attempts to assess feelings of regret, guilt, or self-reproach. An attempt should be made to distinguish between statements that appear to reflect genuine feelings and statements that are primarily cognitive and reflect attitudes (e.g., socially desirable responses or genuinely held but strictly intellectual statements about “feeling bad”).

Scoring:

- 0 = Appears to have genuine remorse for his victims and can generalize to other victims. Importantly, remorse appears to be internalized at an affective (emotional) level and is expressed or demonstrated without prompting.
- 1 = There is some degree of remorse or guilt; however, there are possible egocentric motives (e.g., shame or embarrassment, to avoid incarceration). Score 1 when the remorse appears to be internalized at a strictly cognitive (thinking) level.
- 2 = There is little or no evidence of remorse for victims.

Item 22: Cognitive Distortions

Description: This item assesses distorted ideas, beliefs, or attitudes that justify sexual offending and delinquent behavior. Examples include “She looked older than she was,” “He started it,” and “I didn’t hurt anyone.” Rate this item only for the presence of distorted attitudes. This item should not be influenced by ratings of item 17 (accepting responsibility) and 21 (remorse or guilt).

Scoring:

- 0 = Expresses no distorted thoughts, attitudes, or statements about sexual offending and delinquent behaviors.
- 1 = Occasional comments, attitudes, or statements reflecting cognitive distortions.
- 2 = Frequent comments, attitudes, or statements reflecting cognitive distortions.

Item 23: Quality of Peer Relationships

Description: This item assesses the nature and quality of the juvenile's peer relationships, the extent to which his time is occupied by nondelinquent social activity, and the extent to which his peer associations are age appropriate and nondelinquent.

Scoring:

- 0 = Socially active, peer-oriented, and rarely alone; often with friends in structured and unstructured social and/or sports activities; friends are nondelinquent.
- 1 = A few casual (nondelinquent) friends, some involvement in structured or unstructured activities; or a mix of social activity with delinquent as well as nondelinquent peers.
- 2 = Withdrawn from peer contact and socially isolated; or no friendships, just "acquaintances"; or most peers are delinquent.

Scale 4. Community Stability/Adjustment Items

SCORE THE REMAINING FIVE ITEMS FOR THE PAST 6 MONTHS. OMIT THIS SECTION IF THE JUVENILE IS INCARCERATED IN A CORRECTIONAL FACILITY OR A SECURE RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAM.

- **If a juvenile has recently been discharged from a correctional facility or secure residential treatment program where he has resided for more than 6 months and is now being assessed in the community, he must have been in the community for at least 3 months in order to score these five items.**
- **If the juvenile has been incarcerated or has been placed in a secure residential treatment program, he must have been in the community for at least 2 months prior to incarceration in order to score these five items.**

Item 24: Management of Sexual Urges and Desire

Description: This item assesses the extent to which the juvenile manages his sexual urges and desires in socially appropriate and healthy ways. This item does not assess strength of sexual drive (as in item 7). This item assesses the appropriateness of the individual's sexual behavior. Consider all credible and reliable evidence, self-reported as well as documented in the records. If the governing or index offense occurred within the 6-month window that applies to all Scale 4 items, do not include it when scoring this item.

Scoring:

- 0 = Well-managed expression of sexual urges and desires; all sexual intimate relationships are age appropriate and noncoercive; no evidence of unwanted, sexualized touching or hostile/demeaning sexualized remarks.
- 1 = Sexual urges and desires are managed appropriately most of the time, with no more than two instances of inappropriate sexual behavior.
- 2 = Sexual urges and desires are poorly managed. Juvenile engages in inappropriate sexual behavior, frequently gratifying sexual urges in deviant or paraphilic ways. This behavior has been noted on three or more occasions. Examples might include chronic masturbation or compulsive use of pornography. Score 2 for sexual promiscuity (numerous sexual partners out of the context of a relationship). Any instance of coercive sexual behavior is automatically scored 2 unless it is the governing or index offense.

Item 25: Management of Anger

Description: This item assesses the appropriateness of one's expression of angry feelings. Appropriate expressions are defined here as verbal, nonabusive, and nonviolent expressions of anger. This item does not assess the "pervasiveness" of one's anger (as in item 10). Rate how well the individual manages and expresses feelings of anger in his relationships, at work and with his friends and acquaintances.

Scoring:

0 = No evidence of inappropriate anger. Anger consistently is expressed in appropriate ways.

1 = Anger managed appropriately most of the time, with no more than four instances of inappropriate anger

2 = Anger poorly and inappropriately managed, with five or more instances of inappropriate anger.

Item 26: Stability of Current Living Situation

Description: This item assesses the stability (or instability) of the living situation where the youth is residing at the time of the assessment. If the juvenile is living with his family (birth, foster, or adoptive), this item assesses family stability and is based on the overall adequacy and consistency of the primary family environment. Consider such factors as size of family, number of relocations, and number of changes in the family due to separations, divorce, death, unemployment, and other losses, as well as additions of new members. Consider substance abuse, pornography use, child abuse and neglect, frequent changes in sexual partners, poor or loose boundaries around sexuality, serious illness, psychiatric difficulties, chronic fighting or angry outbursts, family violence, and/or criminal behavior.

Instability may also be indicated by frequent changes in the juvenile's living situation, or when the juvenile is in a high-risk living situation (such as a shelter) or lives in a high-risk location (e.g., near a bar or a playground). Scoring should reflect the stressfulness of the living situation. Score this item, as appropriate, for youths living in group homes or nonsecure residential settings.

When scoring this item, consider the number of different sources of instability and the frequency of the instability.

Scoring:

0 = Stable. No significant sources of disruption or instability.

1 = Moderate instability. Sources of instability are intermittent. Any very serious sources of instability, even if intermittent, should be scored a 2 (e.g., presence of sexual abuse perpetrated by others or violence in the living situation).

2 = Severe instability. Sources of instability are frequent and chronic occurring at least one or two times a week.

Item 27: Stability in School

Description: This item assesses the stability (or instability) of the youth's behavior in school. For example, instability would be evidenced by truancy, repeatedly coming to school late, suspensions or expulsions, and use of alcohol or drugs at school. If the youth is not in school, score this item for the stability of his day, e.g., the stability of the youth's behavior at work. For the most part, the exemplars of instability are consistent across settings. For example, in the work setting, instability may be evident in failing to come to work, coming to work late, or being fired. If the juvenile is not in school or not in work, score 1.

Scoring:

0 = Stable/Minimal (no more than a single incident).

1 = Unstable (with no more than two or three incidents).

2 = Highly Unstable (with four or more incidents).

Item 28: Evidence of Positive Support Systems

Description: This item considers the relative presence or absence of support systems that the youth has available to him in the community and that he uses for positive support. Support systems may include (1) apparently supportive family members, extended families, foster families, (2) friends, or (3) significant others, such as therapists, juvenile probation officers, and social service caseworkers. Positive supports also may be indicated by participation in (4) organized after-school sports and activities and (5) involvement in organized religious activities.

Scoring:

0 = Considerable support systems (three or more of the above apply).

1 = Some support systems (one or two of the above applies).

2 = No known support systems or only negative supports.

Juvenile Sex Offender Assessment Protocol-II Scoring Form

1. Sexual Drive/Preoccupation Scale

1.	Prior Legally Charged Sex Offenses	0	1	2
2.	Number of Sexual Abuse Victims	0	1	2
3.	Male Child Victim	0	1	2
4.	Duration of Sex Offense History	0	1	2
5.	Degree of Planning in Sexual Offense(s)	0	1	2
6.	Sexualized Aggression	0	1	2
7.	Sexual Drive and Preoccupation	0	1	2
8.	Sexual Victimization History	0	1	2
	<u>Sexual Drive/Preoccupation Scale Total</u>			

2. Impulsive/Antisocial Behavior Scale

9.	Caregiver Consistency	0	1	2
10.	Pervasive Anger	0	1	2
11.	School Behavior Problems	0	1	2
12.	History of Conduct Disorder	0	1	2
13.	Juvenile Antisocial Behavior	0	1	2
14.	Ever Charged or Arrested Before Age 16	0	1	2
15.	Multiple Types of Offenses	0	1	2
16.	History of Physical Assault and/or Exposure to Family Violence	0	1	2
	<u>Antisocial Behavior Scale Total</u>			

3. Intervention Scale

17.	Accepting Responsibility for Offense(s)	0	1	2
18.	Internal Motivation for Change	0	1	2
19.	Understands Risk Factors	0	1	2
20.	Empathy	0	1	2
21.	Remorse and Guilt	0	1	2
22.	Cognitive Distortions	0	1	2
23.	Quality of Peer Relationships	0	1	2
	<u>Intervention Scale Total</u>			

4. Community Stability/Adjustment Scale

24.	Management of Sexual Urges and Desire	0	1	2
25.	Management of Anger	0	1	2
26.	Stability of Current Living Situation	0	1	2
27.	Stability in School	0	1	2
28.	Evidence of Positive Support Systems	0	1	2
	<u>Community Stability Scale Total</u>			

Juvenile Sex Offender Assessment Protocol-II Summary Form

Static/Historical Scales

1. Sexual Drive/Preoccupation Scale Score: _____/16 = _____
(Add Items 1–8 [range: 0–16])
2. Impulsive-Antisocial Behavior Scale Score: _____/16 = _____
(Add Items 9–16 [range: 0–16])

Dynamic Scales

3. Intervention Scale Score: _____/14 = _____
(Add Items 17–23 [range 0–14])
4. Community Stability Scale Score: _____/10 = _____
(Add Items 24–28 [range: 0–10])

Static Score (Add items 1–16) _____/32 = _____

Dynamic Score (Add items 17–28) _____/24 = _____

Total J-SOAP Score (Add items 1–28) _____/56 = _____