

# **The Dangerous Sex Offender**

**A REPORT**  
**of the**  
**PANEL OF MEDICAL ADVISORS ON HEALTH AND WELFARE**  
**to the**  
**JOINT STATE GOVERNMENT COMMISSION**

**General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania**

**1963**

**The Joint State Government Commission was created by Act of 1937, July 1, P. L. 2460, as last amended 1959, December 8, P. L. 1740, as a continuing agency for the development of facts and recommendations on all phases of government for the use of the General Assembly.**

# JOINT STATE GOVERNMENT COMMISSION OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1961-1963

---

## OFFICERS

HARRIS G. BRETH, *Chairman*  
HIRAM G. ANDREWS, *Treasurer*

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

### SENATE MEMBERS:

ANTHONY J. DiSILVESTRO  
*President Pro Tempore*

CHARLES R. WEINER  
*Majority Leader*

JAMES S. BERGER  
*Minority Leader*

WILLIAM J. LANE  
*Majority Whip*

ALBERT R. PECHAN  
*Minority Whip*

ISRAEL STIEFEL  
*Chairman, Majority Caucus*

ROBERT D. FLEMING  
*Chairman, Minority Caucus*

### HOUSE MEMBERS:

HIRAM G. ANDREWS  
*Speaker*

STEPHEN McCANN  
*Majority Leader*

ALBERT W. JOHNSON  
*Minority Leader*

JAMES J. DOUGHERTY  
*Majority Whip*

EDWIN W. TOMPKINS  
*Minority Whip*

ANTHONY J. PETROSKY  
*Chairman, Majority Caucus*

NORMAN WOOD  
*Chairman, Minority Caucus*

### *Member Ex Officio:*

HARRIS G. BRETH, *Commission Chairman*

---

GUY W. DAVIS, *Counsel and Director*

PAUL H. WUELLER, *Associate Director in Charge of Research and Statistics*

ANTOINETTE S. GIDDINGS, *Administrative Assistant*

# JOINT STATE GOVERNMENT COMMISSION OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1963

---

## OFFICERS

BAKER ROYER, *Chairman*  
CHARLES R. WEINER, *Vice Chairman*  
WILLIAM Z. SCOTT, *Secretary*  
W. STUART HELM, *Treasurer*

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

### SENATE MEMBERS:

M. HARVEY TAYLOR  
*President Pro Tempore*  
JAMES S. BERGER  
*Majority Leader*  
CHARLES R. WEINER  
*Minority Leader*  
ALBERT R. PECHAN  
*Majority Whip*  
WILLIAM J. LANE  
*Minority Whip*  
WILLIAM Z. SCOTT  
*Chairman, Majority Caucus*  
ISRAEL STIEFEL  
*Chairman, Minority Caucus*

### HOUSE MEMBERS:

W. STUART HELM  
*Speaker*  
ALBERT W. JOHNSON  
*Majority Leader*  
ANTHONY J. PETROSKY  
*Minority Leader*  
MORTON H. FETTEROLF, JR.  
*Majority Whip*  
JAMES J. DOUGHERTY  
*Minority Whip*  
NORMAN WOOD  
*Chairman, Majority Caucus*  
K. LEROY IRVIS  
*Chairman, Minority Caucus*

### *Member Ex Officio:*

BAKER ROYER, *Commission Chairman*

---

GUY W. DAVIS, *Counsel and Director*

PAUL H. WUELLER, *Associate Director in Charge of Research and Statistics*

ANTOINETTE S. GIDDINGS, *Administrative Assistant*

# TASK FORCE ON HEALTH AND WELFARE

## Senate Members

GEORGE J. SARRAF, *Chairman*                      WILLIAM VINCENT MULLIN  
LEROY E. CHAPMAN                                      JOHN T. VAN SANT  
RAYMOND P. SHAFER, *Legislative Advisor*

## House Members

HAROLD G. MILLER, *Vice Chairman*                      JAMES C. SIMMONS\*  
SARAH A. ANDERSON                                      CHARLES D. STONE  
A. V. CAPANO    THOMAS F. SULLIVAN  
H. J. MAXWELL    JOSEPH P. UJOBAL  
EUGENE S. RUTHERFORD                                      GUS P. VERONA  
H. JACK SELTZER    LEROY A. WEIDNER  
DAVID M. BOIES,\* *Legislative Advisor*

---

\* Deceased

**PANEL OF MEDICAL ADVISORS  
ON HEALTH AND WELFARE**

**LEO MADOW, M.D., *Chairman***  
**Philadelphia**

**MELVIN S. HELLER, M.D.**  
**Philadelphia**

**M. L. JOSEPH, M.D.**  
**Pittsburgh**

**HARRY M. MARCOLIS, M.D.**  
**Pittsburgh**

# CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of Transmittal.....	ix
Recommendations of the Panel of Medical Advisors.....	xi

## Part I.

<b>The Cost of Sex Offenses.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Costs to Victims.....	1
Costs to Government.....	3
Costs to Offenders.....	3

## Part II.

<b>The Characteristics of Sex Offenders.....</b>	<b>5</b>
The Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders.....	6
Offenders Sentenced Under the Barr-Walker Act.....	10
Relationship Between Previous Offenses and Subsequent Sex Offenses—An Examination.....	11

## Part III.

<b>A New Approach to the Sex Offender Problem....</b>	<b>14</b>
Research Toward the Development of a Diagnostic Index	14
Establishment of a Research Institute on Sexual Deviation	15
Program of the Proposed Research Institute on Sexual Deviation.....	16
Establishment of a Central Sex Offenders' Records Division.....	19

## Appendices

Appendix I. A Comparison of Minimum and Maximum Penalties for Certain Sex Offenses in Pennsylvania and Other States .....	21
Appendix II. Derivation of Cost Estimates .....	25
Appendix III. Reference Tables on Characteristics of Paroled Sex Offenders .....	33

## Text Tables

Table 1. Percentage Distribution of Paroled Sex Offenders by Age and by Age of Victims .....	7
Table 2. Percentage Distribution of Socio-Economic Status of Paroled Sex Offenders, by Offense Category, and of Pennsylvania Male Population, 1960 .....	9
Table 3. Percentage Distribution of Previous Adult Convictions of Paroled Sex Offenders, by Type of Offense and Length of Statutory Maximum Sentence for Sex Offenses .....	12

## Appendix Tables

Table I-1. A Comparison of Minimum and Maximum Penalties for Certain Sex Offenses in Pennsylvania and Other States .....	22
Table III-1. Percentage Distribution of Paroled Sex Offenders, by Use of Force, Offense Category and Age of Victim .....	34
Table III-2. Percentage Distribution of Paroled Sex Offenders, by Age and Offense Category, and of Pennsylvania Adult Male Population, 1950 and 1960 ....	35
Table III-3. Percentage Distribution of Paroled Sex Offenders by Birthplace and Offense Category .....	36
Table III-4. Percentage Distribution of Paroled Sex Offenders by I.Q. Range and Offense Category .....	37
Table III-5. Percentage Distribution of Paroled Sex Offenders by Educational Attainment and Offense Category .....	38
Table III-6. Percentage Distribution of Paroled Sex Offenders, by Offense Category and Number of Sibs ..	39
Table III-7. Percentage Distribution of Paroled Sex Offenders by Loss of One or Both Parents During Childhood .....	40



## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

*To the Members of the General Assembly of the  
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:*

Senate Resolution No. 81, Session of 1961, directs the Joint State Government Commission to “. . . study and investigate the problems relating to compulsive disorders, . . . such as excessive use of tobacco, prostitution, certain sex offenses and other psychopathic behavior, . . .” Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 113, Session of 1961, requests the Joint State Government Commission “to study the problems of sex offenders in Pennsylvania . . . to prevent the reoccurrence of [sex] offenses . . . [and avoid] such tragedies . . . [by] means of trying to discover such latent tendencies during the formative school years. . . .”

To facilitate a thorough evaluation of the characteristics of sex offenders, of the effectiveness of present legislation, and of contemporary treatment and prevention of sex deviancy, the Joint State Government Commission appointed a panel of medical advisors.

The Panel of Medical Advisors undertook a comprehensive review of various aspects of the sex offender problem, including an examination of (1) the characteristics and behavior patterns of paroled sex offenders; (2) sentencing procedure under the Act of 1952, January 8, P. L. 1951 (known as the Barr-Walker Act); and (3) the cost of sex offenses in Pennsylvania. Based on this initial survey, the Panel of Medical Advisors prepared a series of recommendations “to develop improved preventive diagnostic and therapeutic means of management of the sex offender.”

I have the honor to transmit the report and recommendations of the Panel of Medical Advisors.

BAKER ROYER, *Chairman*

*Joint State Government Commission  
Capitol Building  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania  
May 1963*



## **Recommendations of the Panel of Medical Advisors**

The recommendations relating to Commonwealth policy in handling and treatment of the sex offender are predicated on the following criteria for effective handling of the problem:

1. It is necessary to develop improved preventive, diagnostic, and therapeutic means of management of the sex offender.

2. Inasmuch as public concern has been aroused primarily by serious and violent sex crimes, priority must be given to the aggressive sex offender who is an obvious menace to the community rather than to the non-aggressive offender.

3. To the general public, the crimes of sex offenders frequently seem particularly heinous for many reasons. Nevertheless, violation of the civil liberties and constitutional rights of alleged sex offenders must be avoided; the alleged sex offender is entitled to all safeguards to his civil liberties provided by the Pennsylvania and United States Constitutions, and all policies regarding the sex offender must consider this.

4. In view of the need for more scientific information on the etiology, prediction, prevention, and treatment of sex offenses, a long-term program of research, treatment, and prevention is essential; a short-term policy would be unrealistic.

The Panel recommends:

1. That the sum of \$50,000 be appropriated to the Joint State Government Commission for the purpose of contracting with a qualified person, persons, or institution to undertake research to determine whether a validated medical and psychological questionnaire can be developed for use with school children; that questions be included which are designed to detect dangerous latent sexual behavior, and that the feasibility be explored of using the resulting version of this diagnostic index in conjunction with school health examinations.

2. That a central sex offenders' records division be established.

At present the records relating to the arrest and subsequent disposition of sex offenders are dispersed among many judicial and correctional agencies, and there is the necessity of compiling such records for a proper program of research and the establishment of an effective program of control and treatment of sex offenders. This records division should function with the advice of and in cooperation with a Technical Advisory Board, in the Pennsylvania State Police, Bureau of Criminal Identification, wherein the records of arrest and subsequent judicial, penal and parole disposition of all sex offenders should be kept in a current state and readily available for the use of any interested State agency. The existing agencies engaged in collection of relevant data should extend their cooperation to the proposed central sex offenders' records division.

3. That a Commonwealth diagnostic, research, and training institute on sexual deviation be established in either the Pittsburgh or Philadelphia area, utilizing the materials developed in recommendations 1 and 2 in conjunction with the study and treatment of selected convicted sex offenders. This is a necessary step toward the development of an enlightened program of control and treatment of the sex offender and evaluation of the present statutes relating to sex offenses, including the Barr-Walker Act (see pages 10 and 11).

4. That the functions of this institute should include:

a. A study of the behavior and background of known sex offenders.

b. Establishment of means of early recognition and diagnosis of the dangerous sex offender.

c. Establishment of pilot programs of therapy.

d. Training and educational programs for interested groups, including selected police personnel.

e. Provision of facilities for clinical evaluation of sex offenders which may be helpful to the judges in determining the most satisfactory disposition of these cases.

f. Evaluation of research on sexual behavior and sexual deviation, and sponsorship of lectures by outstanding contributors in this field.

5. That the proposed institute shall be a Commonwealth-owned institution, under the authority of an independent administrative board to be appointed by and directly responsible to the Governor.

## THE COST OF SEX OFFENSES

A very practical, though often overlooked, consideration in any effort to solve the problem of the sex offender is that of the total costs associated therewith, including the costs to victims, government, and to offenders. Thus, sex offender policy may be viewed as the incurring of selected governmental costs in an attempt to minimize the total costs of sex offenses. The following sections present an analysis of the total costs and their components.

### *Costs to Victims*

In considering the cost of sex offenses, it is of primary importance to examine the costs of such offenses to the victims involved. There is currently no adequate measure of over-all costs to victims, due in part to:

1. The incompleteness with which offenses are reported to the police, since (among other reasons) some offenses are committed by mutual agreement of the participating parties; and
2. The lack of consensus as to the seriousness of some types of sex offenses, as evidenced by the substantial variation in penalties from state to state. (See Appendix I.)

Costs to victims may include loss of life (in the case of sex-homicide), nonfatal physical and psychological injuries, possible loss of income, support of resulting offspring, and legal fees. There is inadequate basis for estimating these costs, but they may be related to frequency by type of offense and by use of force, for which estimates are presented in the following discussion.

1. The frequency of sex-homicides in Pennsylvania is not known due to their being reported in combination with other homicides, rather than as sex offenses. The frequency of homicide accompanied by rape or attempted rape has been estimated for the United States at between 0.025 and 0.1 per 100,000 population per year.<sup>1</sup> (Compara-

<sup>1</sup> This estimate is based on data presented by Edwin Sutherland, "The Sexual Psychopath Laws," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 40, (1950), pp. 543-554.

A second study of arrests for sex offenses indicated that the frequency of rape-homicide is approximately .05 per 100,000 population in Philadelphia, based on data supplied by M. Amir, unpublished doctoral dissertation manuscript, University of Pennsylvania, 1963.

ble death rates are about 5 per 100,000 for all criminal homicides and about 21 per 100,000 for motor vehicle fatalities.)

2. The frequency of forcible rape, assault with intent to rape, and attempted rape, combined, in terms of the number of offenses known to the police in Pennsylvania, has been estimated at 8.3 per 100,000 population during 1960, and 6.9 in 1961. (This excludes statutory rape, but includes offenses committed by juveniles.)<sup>2</sup>

3. The frequency of Pennsylvania convictions in 1960 was, for rape (including statutory rape, but excluding offenses committed by juveniles) 3.4 per 100,000 population; commercial vice 2.4 per 100,000 population; and other sex offenses 13.3 per 100,000 population.<sup>3</sup>

4. Among adult male sex offenders who receive sentences of two years or more and at some time during their sentence are under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole, 14 percent used physical force or verbal threats; 31 percent did not use physical force or verbal threats, but their victims were under age 16; 19 percent did not use physical force or verbal threats, and their victims were aged 16 or over, and 13 percent did not use force but the exact age of the victim was not reported. In 23 percent of the cases the use of force was either denied by the offender or undetermined in the report.<sup>4</sup>

5. The Barr-Walker Act of 1952, January 8, P. L. 1851, (which provides for an indeterminate sentence of one day to life) has been cited as an aid to protecting society from dangerous and violent offenders. During the first ten years after its passage, 94 sex offenders were sentenced under this act. A study of Barr-Walker commitments by the Pennsylvania Board of Parole has found that, in 74 percent of these instances, the offenders sentenced used no force in committing the crime for which they were convicted.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> U.S., Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reports, 1960 and Uniform Crime Reports, 1961.

<sup>3</sup> Based on data from Pennsylvania Department of Justice, Bureau of Correction, Pennsylvania Judicial Statistics, 1960.

<sup>4</sup> Joint State Government Commission Survey of paroled sex offenders (see Part II and Appendix III for further details).

<sup>5</sup> Pennsylvania Board of Parole, A Ten-Year Study of Barr-Walker Cases, (1962).

### *Costs to Government*

In view of the fact that most law enforcement accounts are not subdivided according to type of offense, it is not feasible to obtain precise estimates of governmental costs on account of sex offenders. The following are rough estimates whose derivation is described in Appendix II.

1. The estimated costs of investigating sex offenses and apprehending suspected sex offenders are approximately \$1 million per year in Pennsylvania.
2. The annual costs for conviction of sex offenders in Philadelphia were approximately \$760 thousand in 1961, exclusive of judges' salaries. Similar data for the remainder of the state are not known, due to the fact that judicial costs for both civil and criminal cases are reported jointly.
3. The annual costs for confinement of sex offenders in Pennsylvania are roughly \$2.4 million, excluding (a) expenditures on capital account, (b) state aid and county payments to private institutions for juveniles, and (c) confinement costs for sex offenders committed to Farview Mental Hospital.
4. The annual costs for diagnosis and treatment of sex offenders in Pennsylvania are not currently known due in part to the diverse diagnostic and treatment facilities which may deal with the sex offender.
5. Annual costs for probation and parole of sex offenders in Pennsylvania are estimated at \$280 thousand.

### *Costs to Offenders*

It seems relevant to consider costs to offenders, since such policies as additional prevention efforts might yield benefits to society as a whole which would include a reduction in costs to offenders. Costs to offenders include the following, for which there is no adequate basis for estimate: loss of life (in case of sex-homicide), loss of freedom, civil damages arising from a sex offense (including support), fines, and legal fees. However, it is estimated that (see Appendix II):

1. There are an estimated 1,300 adult man-years and at least 238 juvenile-years of confinement for sex offenses per year in Pennsylvania.

2. Loss of earnings by Pennsylvania adults during confinement is estimated at between \$1.5 million and \$3.7 million annually. In addition, earnings following release may be less than they would have been in the absence of sex offense.

3. There are approximately 550 adult man-years of parole annually for sex offenders under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole, plus, very roughly, 625 man-years of probation and parole under the jurisdiction of county probation and parole officers.



## Part 2

# THE CHARACTERISTICS OF SEX OFFENDERS

In any discussion of the sex offender it is useful to distinguish two fundamental categories: (1) persons who engage in illegal sexual behavior and *are not* apprehended, convicted, and sentenced for such behavior, and (2) persons who engage in illegal sexual behavior and *are* apprehended, convicted, and sentenced for such behavior. Data are available only for the second group. Whether any given individual who engages in illegal sexual behavior is apprehended, convicted and sentenced is dependent not only on the type of act committed, but also on his other personality characteristics and environmental conditions, including socio-economic status. Individual sexual behavior is a complex pattern, representing differences in general psychological characteristics, biological potential, relationship between the individual and his parents in early life, sexual experiences during youth, socio-economic level, group mores, and police enforcement. Laws regulating sexual behavior express some of the differences in group mores regarding sexual behavior; there is considerable variation with respect to sex offenses under the laws of various states throughout the United States. (See Appendix I.) Furthermore, while no all-inclusive study of human sexual behavior has been made, at least one recent study has indicated that while some types of sexual behavior are acceptable in some socio-economic groups in the United States, this same conduct is considered undesirable by other groups.<sup>6</sup>

In considering the characteristics of the whole range of sex offenders, it should be observed that they do not constitute a single psychiatric entity. They actually vary from normal to a disabling psychosis. The prognosis of the sex offender, with or without treatment, also varies. For example, a 17-year old boy was convicted of statutory rape because he had had intercourse with his 15-year old girl friend. When her father learned of this he had the boy arrested. Psychiatric examination of this young man revealed no obvious psychiatric dis-

<sup>6</sup> See Alfred C. Kinsey, et al., *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1948).

order. In contrast to this, there was the case of the 34-year old man who heard a voice tell him to attack sexually and murder his next door neighbor. Psychiatric examination of this man revealed that he had been hospitalized 5 years previously for a schizophrenic psychosis and at present was having auditory hallucinations. In other words, the sex offender may or may not be mentally ill, and, if mentally ill, may or may not be amenable to existing treatment.

Two sources of data on the convicted sex offender are examined here: (1) a survey of paroled sex offenders, and (2) studies of offenders sentenced under the Barr-Walker Act.

### *The Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders*

The Joint State Government Commission has made a survey of paroled male sex offenders under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole.<sup>7</sup> These are not necessarily representative of all convicted sex offenders, since:

1. Offenders with sentences of less than two years do not come under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole, and
2. Not all offenders receiving sentences of two years or more come under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole; some come under the jurisdiction of county probation or parole officers, and some are never paroled.

Convicted male sex offenders who receive sentences of two years or more and who at some time come under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole present the following characteristics (the following percentages are from weighted data obtained from the Joint State Government Commission systematic random sample of 273 paroled sex offenders):

#### 1. Offense

Of the paroled sex offenders, 28 percent were convicted of sodomy, 40 percent of rape, including statutory rape, 15 percent of assault and battery with intent to ravish, and 17 percent of miscellaneous sex offenses.

<sup>7</sup> Data supplied by Pennsylvania Board of Parole. The survey utilized a 50 percent systematic sample of all male sex offenders on parole as of March 1962.

## 2. Age

(a) The median age of this group of convicted and paroled sex offenders at time of sentence was 29 years and 5 months. Distributed according to offense categories, the median ages of the sex offenders were as follows: sodomy, 32 years and 10 months; rape, 24 years and 2 months; assault with intent to ravish, 28 years and 4 months; and miscellaneous,<sup>8</sup> 41 years and 2 months. (See Appendix III, Table 2.)

(b) The age of the convicted and paroled offender as compared to the age of the victim in sex offenses is presented in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**  
**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PAROLED SEX OFFENDERS**  
**BY AGE AND BY AGE OF VICTIMS**

<i>Age of Offender</i>	<i>Age of Victims</i>						<i>Total</i>
	<i>1-5</i>	<i>6-10</i>	<i>11-15</i>	<i>16-20</i>	<i>21 and Over</i>	<i>Other<sup>1</sup></i>	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
16-20	1.27%	1.34%	6.19%	2.92%	1.09%	8.72%	21.53%
21-25	0.03	2.29	4.84	2.45	6.11	3.85	19.57
26-30	..	1.69	2.59	0.73	2.42	5.35	12.78
31-35	..	0.45	3.75	2.47	1.32	4.39	12.38
36-40	0.19	0.39	5.08	0.34	0.86	2.32	9.18
41-45	0.57	0.88	2.67	2.56	0.75	1.83	9.26
46-50	..	1.02	1.39	0.29	0.87	1.93	5.50
51-55	0.15	0.58	1.07	0.21	..	1.44	3.45
56-60	..	..	1.42	0.41	..	0.83	2.66
61 and over	..	0.73	0.30	..	0.77	1.89	3.69
Total	2.21	9.37	29.30	12.38	14.19	32.55	100.00

<sup>1</sup> Includes victims of various ages not classified in above categories, victims whose age was not given in the offense history, and those offenders whose offense did not involve a victim.

SOURCE: Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders, 1962.

<sup>8</sup> "Miscellaneous sex offenses" includes incest, indecent assault, public indecency, pandering, corrupting the morals of minors, et cetera. While these offenses differ from each other with respect to etiology and effect, they have been combined here for statistical purposes.

### 3. Birthplace

The majority of the paroled sex offenders were native Pennsylvanians; 78 percent were born in Pennsylvania; 20 percent were born in another state of the United States; and 2 percent were foreign born. This compares with 81 percent, 12 percent, and 5 percent, respectively, for the male Pennsylvania population, as of 1960; the birthplace of 2 percent of the male Pennsylvania population is unknown.

### 4. I.Q.

No I.Q. scores were available for 37 percent of paroled sex offenders; most of these were incarcerated in county prisons which do not routinely collect these data. However, the offenders for whom information is available are slightly below the I.Q. distribution of the general population. (See Appendix III-4).

### 5. Socio-economic Status

Other characteristics of the convicted and paroled sex offenders, such as family size, educational attainment, and absence of parents during childhood (see Appendix III), are typical of the socio-economic status groups of which they are members, that is, primarily manual workers. The occupational distribution of paroled sex offenders is similar to that of all offenders convicted for all crimes. It has long been recognized by criminologists that a disproportionate percentage of all known criminals are found in those occupational categories which require less training, i.e., the semiskilled and unskilled groups.<sup>9</sup> W. Lloyd Warner and Paul Lunt, in extensive studies of a New England community, found that the two lowest socio-economic status groups, which roughly correspond to those in the operatives, private household workers, and laborers categories in the present study, accounted for 90 percent of all arrests, while those in the two top socio-economic status categories accounted for less than one percent of all arrests.<sup>10</sup> Sex offenders coming under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole are distributed by socio-economic status groups as shown in Table 2.

<sup>9</sup> Richard R. Korn and Lloyd W. McCorkle, *Criminology and Penology*, (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1959), p. 319.

<sup>10</sup> W. Lloyd Warner and Paul Lunt, *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941), pp. 373-377.

**TABLE 2**  
**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF PAROLED SEX OFFENDERS,**  
**BY OFFENSE CATEGORY, AND OF PENNSYLVANIA MALE POPULATION, 1960**

<i>Socio-Economic Category</i>	<i>Offenders</i>					<i>Pennsylvania Male Population 1960</i>
	<i>All Offenses</i>	<i>Sodomy</i>	<i>Rape</i>	<i>Assault and Battery With Intent to Ravish</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Professional and Technical	3.36%	1.02%	0.61%	1.73%	..	9.9%
Managerial, Proprietors, and Farm Owners	5.04	2.17	..	1.11	1.76%	11.1
Clerical and Sales	3.43	1.86	0.96	0.43	0.18	14.6
Craftsmen	15.64	3.02	6.91	2.94	2.77	21.6
Operative and Kindred	23.39	4.07	11.98	2.22	5.12	23.1
Private Household Workers	6.74	2.13	3.01	0.29	1.31	6.0
Laborers, including Farm Labor	39.53	13.05	14.74	6.12	5.62	9.4
Unknown	2.87	0.63	1.78	0.46	..	4.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>27.95</b>	<b>39.99</b>	<b>15.30</b>	<b>16.76</b>	<b>100.0</b>

SOURCE: Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders, 1962.

The fact that convicted sex offenders tend to be concentrated in those occupational categories requiring less training may be attributable at least in part to the following:

“. . . the administrative processes are more favorable to persons in economic comfort than to those in poverty, so that if two persons on different levels are equally guilty of the same offense, the one on the lower level is more likely to be arrested, convicted, and committed to an institution.”<sup>11</sup>

Wolfgang, *et al.*, in a study of 439 persons sentenced to death for first degree murder in Pennsylvania, found that those offenders whose sentence was commuted differed significantly from those executed with respect to race and to type of counsel; that is, Negroes and/or those with court-appointed counsel were more likely to be executed than were whites and/or those with private counsel.<sup>12</sup>

#### *Offenders Sentenced Under the Barr-Walker Act*

Further information on the characteristics of convicted Pennsylvania sex offenders is provided by examination of the offenders sentenced under the Barr-Walker Act.

The Bureau of Correction, in a 1957 study of the 45 Barr-Walker commitments in Bureau of Correction institutions, reported:

“There seem to be three types of sex offenders committed to date under the Barr-Walker Act. They may be broadly classified as ‘habitual sex offenders,’ ‘homosexuals with characterological problems,’ and the ‘casual, occasional personally maladjusted sex offender’ . . . From a qualitative basis, it can be said that a good 40 percent of Barr-Walker’s committed to date are in no way dangerous sex offenders.”<sup>13</sup>

A 1962 study by the Pennsylvania Board of Parole indicated that specific characteristics of the 94 sex offenders committed under the Barr-Walker Act during the 1952–1962 period include the following:<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Edwin M. Sutherland, *Principles of Criminology*, (Philadelphia: Lippincott Co., 1939), p. 179.

<sup>12</sup> Marvin E. Wolfgang, Arlene Kelly and Hans C. Nolde, “Comparison of the Executed and the Commuted Among Admissions to Death Row,” *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, Vol. 53 (1962), pp. 301–311.

<sup>13</sup> Pennsylvania Department of Justice, Bureau of Correction, *Characteristics of Barr-Walker Cases in Bureau of Correction (1957)*.

<sup>14</sup> Pennsylvania Board of Parole, *op. cit.*

1. Forty-seven were convicted of the crime of sodomy, 28 of rape or assault with intent to ravish, 14 of indecent assault, and 3 of incest.

2. Thirty-seven had no record of a previous offense of any type, while 56 had committed one or more previous sex offenses for which they were convicted prior to the instant sentence.

3. The Barr-Walker group tended to be a somewhat older group than the paroled sex offenders discussed above: 71 percent of the Barr-Walker commitments were 31 or over as compared to 48 percent of paroled sex offenders in the Joint State Government Commission sample who were 30 or over.

Over the ten-year period, 1952-1962, approximately 3,740 sex offenders were received by the Bureau of Correction. During the same period, 94 offenders (approximately 2.5 percent) were sentenced under the provisions of the Barr-Walker Act. Courts in 29 (43 percent) of the 67 counties sentenced one or more sex offenders under this act. Seven counties (10 percent) account for 60 percent of the cases sentenced under the act. The relatively limited utilization of this act may be attributable to factors previously noted by the Joint State Government Commission, which reported:

“Specific sex offender laws have in general been unsuccessful due to (1) the use of ill-defined terms in the legislation; (2) inadequate facilities for the diagnosis and treatment of sex offenders; and (3) inherent dangers to civil liberties in such legislation.”<sup>15</sup>

As noted above, there is no evidence to indicate that application of the Barr-Walker Act has discriminated between the “dangerous” and “nondangerous” sex offender.

#### *Relationship between Previous Offenses and Subsequent Sex Offenses—An Examination*

It has been alleged that sex offenders progress in the seriousness of offenses—from minor offenses to aggressive rape and rape-homicide. While no data are available on the offense histories of those convicted of rape-homicide, one analysis of this proposition—that sex offenders progress in seriousness of offense—is provided by consideration of the offense histories of convicted and paroled sex offenders in the Joint State Government Commission survey.

<sup>15</sup> Sex Offenders. Report of the Joint State Government Commission (1951).

Previous adult convictions of convicted and subsequently paroled sex offenders are shown in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3  
 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PREVIOUS ADULT  
 CONVICTIONS OF PAROLED SEX OFFENDERS, BY  
 TYPE OF OFFENSE AND LENGTH OF  
 STATUTORY MAXIMUM SENTENCE  
 FOR SEX OFFENSES

<i>Previous Adult Convictions by Type of Offense</i>	<i>Percent of Offenders</i>
(1)	(2)
No previous convictions	52.28%
Previous non-sex offense conviction only	28.01
1 previous sex offense conviction	15.31
maximum less than for instant offense	(4.86)
maximum not less than that for instant offense	(10.45)
2 or more previous sex offense convictions	4.40
maximum less than for instant offense	(2.05)
maximum not less than that for instant offense	(2.35)
Total	100.00

SOURCE: Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders, 1962.

As shown in Table 3, 52.28 percent had no previous adult convictions for any type of offense; 28.01 percent had been convicted of one or more non-sex offenses only; and 20.71 percent of one or more sex offenses. Those convicted of a sex offense with a lesser maximum penalty than the instant sex offense comprised 6.91 percent.

A second means by which the allegation of progression from one type of sex offense to another can be examined is through consideration of convicted parole violators returned to prison during the 1946-1956 period.

The data were classified by the Board of Parole according to type of offense. Three of the offense categories were sex offenses: (a) rape, (b) sodomy, and (c) assault and battery with intent to ravish, which account for about 41 percent, 32 percent, and 15 percent, respectively, of sex offenders released or paroled. The estimated



frequency with which parolees committed criminal homicide (first or second degree murder or voluntary or involuntary manslaughter) while on parole during 1946-1956, by type of offense for which they were on parole, is shown below:

<i>Offense For Which Paroled</i>	<i>Estimated Number Paroled During 10 Years</i>	<i>Number Committing Criminal Homicide While on Parole 1946-1956</i>	<i>Frequency of Committing Criminal Homicide While on Parole</i>
Assault with Intent to Ravish	340	2	.63 of 1%
Robbery	3,880	19	.49 of 1%
Criminal Homicide	1,151	5	.43 of 1%
Larceny	3,104	6	.19 of 1%
Burglary	6,469	12	.18 of 1%
Assault	1,439	2	.14 of 1%
Rape (Including Statutory)	930	1	.12 of 1%
Sodomy	720	0	.00 of 1%
Forgery	642	0	.00 of 1%

SOURCE: Pennsylvania Board of Parole.

It should be kept in mind that these homicides include *all* criminal homicide, and do *not* therefore provide an index of rape-homicides.

The differences shown may be due in part to differing lengths of time on parole, for which there is no measure by type of offense. Since the above table relates only to homicides committed while on parole, the total frequency of homicides during the remainder of the lives of the offenders could be expected to be higher than those shown in the table. However, the above data are indicative of the comparative rates, by type of offense.

A further observation may be made relative to the conjecture that convicted minor sex offenders become major sex offenders: In view of the fact that the number of known rape-homicide offenders is probably less than one-half of one percent of the total number of convicted sex offenders, the probability of a convicted sex offender committing rape-homicide is probably less than half of one percent on the average, although, as noted above, this probability varies by type of sex offense.

## A NEW APPROACH TO THE SEX OFFENDER PROBLEM

One of the primary reasons for lack of success in dealing with the dangerous sex offender is that no extensive programs of research have been conducted with a view to developing effective treatment policies. Since sex offenders vary widely with respect to psychiatric characteristics—ranging from normal to psychotic—institutions established for specific purposes, such as mental hospitals or correctional institutions, do not have adequate specialized facilities for the various types of sex offenders. In addition, such research as has been conducted regarding sex offenders has been short-term, not providing the concise scientific knowledge necessary for sound and effective policy.

The program of research, identification, and treatment outlined in this section should provide a sound, scientific approach to the diagnosis and treatment of dangerous sex offenders.

### *Research Toward the Development of a Diagnostic Index*

As a first step toward further identification of the factors which generate dangerous sex offenses, it is recommended that a research program be instituted to see whether a validated diagnostic index, such as the Cornell Medical Index, can be developed for use with school children.<sup>16</sup> In the judgment of the Medical Advisory Panel on the School Health Program, such an instrument can be devised and would facilitate increased efficiency in the school health program.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Cornell Medical Index Health Questionnaire Manual, revised 1953 (New York City: Cornell University Medical College). The Cornell Medical Index, a paper and pencil diagnostic test capable of detecting a number of different illnesses, including allergies, epilepsy, diabetes, infected tonsils, rheumatic fever, mental illness, and orthopedic defects, has been developed for use with adults by Cornell University Medical College. The efficiency of this technique has been found to be high; it has been reported that "the interpreters of the CMI, identified almost all (94 percent) of the diagnostic categories in which disease was found in hospital investigation. In addition, physicians could often infer (in 87 percent of these categories) what specific diseases were present." Page 5, *ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> See School Health Services, Report of the Joint State Government Commission (1955).

In research on development of this diagnostic instrument for use with school children, the feasibility of including items which are designed to detect dangerous latent sexual tendencies should be studied. Inasmuch as any questions developed which deal with dangerous latent sexual tendencies need to be validated over a period of time, it is recommended that any data obtained from these specific questions be carefully studied by a competent research staff of the proposed institute with reference to the children's subsequent behavior. These data should be used for research purposes *only* until their reliability and validity in accurate diagnosis of such latent dangerous behavior has been firmly established.<sup>18</sup> It is estimated that the cost of such initial developmental research will be approximately \$50,000.

#### *Establishment of a Research Institute on Sexual Deviation*

It is recommended that a Commonwealth diagnostic, research and training institute on sexual deviation be established in either or both the Pittsburgh or Philadelphia metropolitan areas. The reasons for these locations are as follows: (1) to draw upon the resources of a metropolitan center, including university personnel and graduate students from various disciplines, whose studies would bear a direct relationship to the causal factors of sexual deviancy; and (2) to obtain part-time workers and consultants more easily than is possible when an institution is beyond a 30-minute limit of commuting during the rush-hour period.

The primary purpose of the recommended institute should be the long-term study of selected, convicted sex offenders. Out of this longitudinal study, one can anticipate a greater knowledge of the psychodynamics of the various types of sex offenders and the ingredients which have gone into their personality structure. This study of the sex offender is anticipated as an inter-disciplinary one, drawing upon the combined medical, sociological, and penological approaches.

The proposed institute should be a Commonwealth-owned institution, under the authority of an independent administrative board appointed by and directly responsible to the Governor. In appointing such board, it is recommended that the Governor select representatives from such areas of specialization as: family law, criminal law, psychiatry, neurology, and the social sciences. In addition, there should be lay representation.

<sup>18</sup> The use of medical questionnaires to ascertain latent deviate sexual tendencies has undergone pilot research in the State of California. See California Department of Mental Hygiene, *California Sexual Deviation Research*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (March 1954), pp. 146-147.

The board of directors of the proposed institute should appoint the director of the institute, who should be a qualified physician, licensed to practice medicine in Pennsylvania. He should be qualified in the field of psychiatry. It is anticipated that the director should be appointed on a part-time basis, at a salary of not less than \$20,000 per year. He should be encouraged to publicize facts as determined by research at the institute.

### *Program of the Proposed Research Institute on Sexual Deviation*

The functions of this institute should include:

1. A study of the behavior and background of known sex offenders.
2. Establishment of means of early recognition and diagnosis of the dangerous sex offenders.
3. Establishment of pilot programs of therapy.
4. Training and educational programs for interested groups, including selected police personnel.
5. Provision of facilities for clinical evaluation of sex offenders which may be helpful to judges in determining the most satisfactory disposition of these cases.
6. Evaluation of research on sexual behavior and sexual deviation, and sponsorship of lectures by outstanding contributors in this field.

It is anticipated that the study of behavior of known sex offenders can provide much valuable and needed information with reference to the early life patterns of sex offenders. Of particular interest is elucidation of the differences in family background, developmental patterns, and personalities of the predatory, dangerous offender, in contradistinction to the sexual deviate who constitutes a lesser or no threat to the community. It has been estimated that approximately \$1 million is expended by the Commonwealth annually in the detection and apprehension of sex deviates, an unknown percentage of whom constitute a burden to themselves and families rather than an immediate threat to the community. Increased ability to differentiate between the non-aggressive sex deviate and the predatory aggressive sex offender will reduce governmental costs now incurred in apprehension of the non-aggressive sex deviate.

The study of parents of convicted sex offenders will provide much needed information which will be used not only in the on-going diagnosis of men received within the institute, but may also be disseminated under a program of enlightened community education.

Of particular importance is early recognition and diagnosis of the dangerous sex offender. There is an urgent need to develop useful and reliable rating scales with reference to dangerousness. One such scale which can be further investigated under such a research program would attempt to rate the following factors with reference to the reliability and validity of detecting sex deviates:

1. General unpredictability of behavior
2. Degree of bizarreness in personality
3. Tendencies toward sadism as determined not only from a description of the crime, but from a detailed developmental study of the individual's background and history
4. A description of the victim, and his or her "psychology"
5. The "innocent" victim as compared to the "contributing" victim
6. Age and sex of the victim
7. Marital sexual relationships of the offender
8. Early experiences of the offender with "mother figures," and underlying attitudes toward women
9. Known suicidal attempts, episodes of assaultiveness, alcoholic excesses, or other indications of known emotional instability
10. Degree of revulsion produced by the crime
11. Nature and extent of "premeditation" versus impulsiveness
12. Physical appearance of defendant and defendant's "self-image"
13. Nature of so-called "character" witnesses available to the defendant and type of relationship he has had with them
14. Socio-economic factors
15. Number of victims
16. Complete medical history
17. Unknown, and to be determined, factors

The proposed institute would make a contribution in the development of other tests, rating scales and modifications of known diagnostic procedures which will lend themselves particularly to predic-

tion and early detection of both the dangerous and nondangerous sex deviate. Of particular interest are modifications of the current Cornell Medical Index, as well as modifications of the Thematic Apperception Test.

Of importance is a more thorough study of the psychology of the victim, since there is an apparent interaction of certain types of victims and certain types of sex offenders. (See Appendix III-1.) Material obtained in such studies should be used in a nonalarmist but effective program of community education. Studies in the psychology of the victim will also provide helpful material to those involved in the problems of detection and apprehension of sex offenders.

At the diagnostic training and research institute, various pilot programs of therapy can be conducted and evaluated under controlled conditions.

From such studies by the institute, data will be developed which will be helpful in dealing with the management problems of the sexually deviated individual in State correctional institutions. The problem of sexual deviation in correctional institutions constitutes one of the most hazardous and costly aspects of keeping large numbers of offenders under the same roof. Such a problem also has considerable application to management of large numbers of men in the armed forces.

The training and educational program of the diagnostic research and training institute will include seminars for selected police personnel. The research findings of the institute can be of immense help in providing programs for selected officers to augment their knowledge in the detection and apprehension of the predatory sex offender and in the differentiation of this type of sexual deviate from the nonpredatory sex offender.

A panel of experts in the field of sexual deviation should be appointed by the director of the institute to evaluate research on sexual behavior and sexual deviancy, and should offer outstanding contributors an opportunity to visit the institute and deliver a series of lectures describing their findings. Such a small investment can provide the Commonwealth institute with a maximum of good publicity, particularly in professional circles, and serve to further attract gifted young people to Pennsylvania for work in this field.

Finally, the institute should offer facilities for part-time contribution to its program on the part of the public. This can come not only in the form of specifically supporting grants for selected areas of research, but, more importantly, as an adjunct to selected pilot therapy projects. One of the things which is known about the treatment of the offender is that what few good results are obtained through therapy appear to rest heavily on the establishment of a meaningful one-to-one relationship with another individual who represents the moral fiber of the community. That is to say, the inmate who makes progress with treatment eventually is able to relate to a therapist whose moral values and concepts, though differing from his own, become acceptable to the inmate because of the strength of the relationship which he has formed. An explanation of the possible contributions which can be made by certain selected citizens, on a limited pilot basis, may demonstrate an avenue of treatment in an area where treatment facilities are now pitifully inadequate and hopelessly costly.

#### *Establishment of a Central Sex Offenders' Records Division*

In view of the fact that there are no readily available data which describe the frequency of arrest for sex offenses and subsequent disposition of those arrested, it is recommended that a central records division on sex offenses be established.<sup>19</sup> This division should be established in the Pennsylvania State Police, under the guidance of an advisory board composed of professional personnel in the fields of penology and criminology, since, at the present time, the State Police receive routinely the data necessary for compilation of these statistics. Establishment of such a central records division on sex offenses will provide much needed information on the frequency, detailed type, and judicial outcome of sex offenses—data which are necessary for a thorough program of research and for treatment and control of sex offenders.

<sup>19</sup> White Uniform Crime Reports, compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U. S. Department of Justice, present offenses known to the police, offenses cleared by arrests, and persons charged, these data include, for sex offenses, only "forcible rape." Similarly, arrest data are not presented for all sex offenses, and are therefore of limited use.





## **APPENDIX I**

### **A Comparison of Minimum and Maximum Penalties for Certain Sex Offenses in Pennsylvania and Other States**

TABLE I-1

A COMPARISON OF MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM PENALTIES  
FOR CERTAIN SEX OFFENSES IN PENNSYLVANIA  
AND OTHER STATES

<i>Offense</i>	<i>Pennsylvania Penalty</i>	<i>Greatest Maximum Penalty in Other States</i>	<i>Least Maximum Penalty in Other States</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. Sodomy	Minimum: determined by sentencing judge but may not exceed one-half statutory maximum, Maximum: 10 years and/or \$5,000 fine or Under Barr-Walker Act: 1 day to life.	Life imprisonment (Colorado, Georgia and Nevada)	Not a crime (New Hampshire and Vermont)
2. Rape	Minimum: determined by sentencing judge but may not exceed one-half statutory maximum, Maximum: 15 years and/or \$7,000 fine or Under Barr-Walker Act: 1 day to life.	Death (Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia & West Virginia)	5 years and/or fine (Rhode Island)
3. Statutory Rape	Minimum: determined by sentencing judge but may not exceed one-half statutory maximum, Maximum: 15 years and/or \$7,000 fine.	Death when victim under 18 years (Texas)	If victim over 7 years of age and consents, not a crime (Delaware)

TABLE I-1 (Cont'd)

<i>Offense</i>	<i>Pennsylvania Penalty</i>	<i>Greatest Maximum Penalty in Other States</i>	<i>Least Maximum Penalty in Other States</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4. Incest	Minimum: determined by sentencing judge but may not exceed one-half statutory maximum. Maximum: 5 years and/or \$2,000 fine or Under Barr-Walker Act: 1 day to life.	50 years (California, New Mexico)	3 years (Oregon); other than father-daughter, \$500 and/or 12 months (Virginia)
5. Adultery	Minimum: determined by sentencing judge but may not exceed one-half statutory maximum. Maximum: 1 year and/or \$500 fine.	5 years (Connecticut)	Not a crime (Louisiana, New Mexico, Tennessee)
6. Fornication	Minimum: determined by sentencing judge but may not exceed one-half statutory maximum. Maximum: \$100 fine.	5 years (Oregon)	Not a crime (California, Delaware, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington)

SOURCES: Robert C. Bensing, "A Comparative Study of American Sex Statutes," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 42, (1951) pp. 57-72.



## **APPENDIX II**

### **Derivation of Cost Estimates**



## COSTS TO GOVERNMENT

### 1. *Costs of Investigation and Apprehension*

For the Criminal Division of the Pennsylvania State Police, the average cost per investigation (including non-sex offenses) was \$87 in 1962; and the number of investigations per arrest, for major crimes, was 2.6.<sup>1</sup> Assuming that cost per investigation for sex offenses is similar to that for all offenses, and that investigations per arrest for sex offenses is similar to that for major crimes, the cost per arrest is estimated at  $\$87 \times 2.6 = \$226$ .

A comparable estimate of cost per arrest was obtained for the City of Philadelphia. Total 1961 costs for apprehension and police investigations of sex offenses were estimated at \$738,465. This is regarded as a minimum figure; it is the judgment of key personnel in the Police Department that sex charges, while small in the over-all total, are a time consuming group. During this period there were 3,923 arrests for sex offenses, indicating an average cost per arrest of \$195, as a minimum.<sup>2</sup>

During 1960, 4,440 persons were processed by the Pennsylvania Judiciary on sex offense charges.<sup>3</sup> Assuming that the number processed in 1960 is approximately equal to the number arrested in the same year, and taking the investigation and apprehension cost per arrest to be about \$225, the total cost for investigation and apprehension is estimated at  $4,440 \times \$225 = \$1.0$  million.

### 2. *Costs of Conviction*

For Philadelphia it is reported that approximately \$0.76 million (7 percent) of total judicial expenditures were incurred on account

<sup>1</sup> Special tabulation prepared for Joint State Government Commission by the Criminal Division, Pennsylvania State Police.

<sup>2</sup> Data supplied to Joint State Government Commission by the Office of the Director of Finance, City of Philadelphia.

<sup>3</sup> Pennsylvania Department of Justice, Pennsylvania Judicial Statistics, 1960.

of sex offenses, excluding confinement costs of persons awaiting trial (which are included under confinement costs), and excluding judges' salaries.<sup>4</sup> In the remainder of the state total county judicial expenditures in 1961, as reported to the Department of Internal Affairs, were \$21.1 million, for criminal and civil procedures combined.<sup>5</sup> No data were available to indicate what portion of this is attributable to sex offenses.

### 3. *Costs of Confinement*

The average maintenance cost per inmate of Bureau of Correction institutions was \$5.04 per day, or \$1,840 per year, during the period August 1961 through July 1962; 733 sex offenders were in confinement in these institutions as of March 1962, excluding patients in the Farview Mental Hospital.<sup>6</sup> Thus, costs of confinement of sex offenders in State correctional institutions are approximately  $\$1,840 \times 733 = \$1.3$  million per year, excluding expenditures on capital account.

In county prisons, the weighted average maintenance cost per inmate was \$3.49 per day or \$1,274 per year as of July 1962. The total number of inmates in county prisons, as of July 1962, was 6,876.<sup>7</sup> While it is not known how many of these were sex offenders, it is known that of a total of 8,179 persons committed to county prisons during 1960, 674, or 8.24 percent were sex offenders. If it is assumed that average duration of confinement is the same for sex offenders as for all offenders (which is approximately true in State prisons),<sup>8</sup> then sex offenders would constitute about 8.24 percent of the total 6,876 prisoners, or about 567. Multiplying 567 by the annual maintenance cost of \$1,274, total estimated confinement costs of sex offenders in county prisons is about \$0.7 million, excluding expenditures on capital account.

<sup>4</sup> Data supplied by the Office of the Director of Finance, City of Philadelphia, May, 1962.

<sup>5</sup> Pennsylvania Department of Internal Affairs, *Local Government Financial Statistics, 1961*.

<sup>6</sup> Data supplied to the Joint State Government Commission by the Pennsylvania Department of Justice, Bureau of Correction.

<sup>7</sup> Data supplied by the Pennsylvania Department of Justice, Bureau of Correction.

<sup>8</sup> In State prisons, average duration of confinement is about 4.0 years for sex offenders and 4.3 years for all offenders.



About 2,500 juveniles are confined in public institutions, and, on the basis of limited data,<sup>9</sup> it is estimated that roughly 9.5 percent or 238 are sex offenders. In State institutions, daily maintenance costs per person vary from \$5.22 at Camp Hill to \$11.49 at youth development centers.<sup>10</sup> Relatively few (287) are confined in the highest cost institutions. Data were not currently available regarding maintenance costs in county institutions for juveniles, but as noted above, costs in county prisons for adults were less than in State prisons for adults. If an over-all average of \$5 per day, or \$1,825 per year, in county and State institutions, combined, is assumed, total confinement costs for juvenile sex offenders are estimated at  $238 \times \$1,825$ , or about \$0.4 million per year, excluding expenditures on capital account, and excluding State and county payments to private institutions for juveniles.

Summing the \$1.3 million for State prisons, \$700 thousand for county prisons and \$400 thousand for juvenile institutions, estimated total confinement costs of sex offenders in Pennsylvania are \$2.4 million per year, exclusive of expenditures on capital account, confinement of the criminally insane, and payments to private institutions for juveniles.

#### 4. *Costs of Diagnosis and Treatment*

There is no adequate basis for estimating diagnosis and treatment costs.

#### 5. *Costs of Probation and Parole*

The average annual cost of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole, per parolee under its jurisdiction, was \$236 in 1962.<sup>11</sup> As of March 1962, there were 546 sex offenders under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole.<sup>12</sup> Assuming that parole costs are the same for sex offenders as for all offenders, annual parole costs were about  $\$236 \times 546 = \$0.13$  million for sex offenders under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole.

<sup>9</sup> Data supplied by Department of Public Welfare, Office of Services to Children and Youth.

<sup>10</sup> Data supplied by the Pennsylvania Department of Justice, Bureau of Correction and by the Department of Public Welfare.

<sup>11</sup> Pennsylvania Board of Parole, *Annual Statistical Report, 1962*.

<sup>12</sup> Joint State Government Commission Survey.

Local government expenditures for probation and parole totaled \$1.65 million in 1961.<sup>13</sup> Of the total 8,313 persons receiving probation or suspended sentence in 1960, 777 or 9.3 percent were sex offenders. Assuming that this percentage applies to probation only, annual probation and parole costs for sex offenders were approximately \$0.15 million at the local level.

Adding this to State parole costs of \$0.13 million, total annual costs for probation and parole of sex offenders in Pennsylvania are estimated at \$0.28 million.

## COSTS TO OFFENDERS

### 1. *Man-Years of Confinement*

As noted in subsection 3 (pages 28 and 29), the number of sex offenders in confinement at a point in time were 733 adults in State prisons, an estimated 567 adults in county prisons, an estimated 238 juveniles in public institutions, and an unknown number of juveniles in private institutions. Thus, during the course of a year, there are an estimated total of 1,300 adult man-years of confinement and at least 238 juvenile-years of confinement for sex offenses.

### 2. *Loss of Earnings During Confinement*

Earnings while on parole of all parolees under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole averaged \$1,160 per parolee during 1962.<sup>14</sup> This is likely to be less than their earning power prior to confinement because of the stigma associated with being an ex-convict.

Based on the occupation and past employment stability of the paroled sex offenders in the Joint State Government Commission survey, and the median earnings in their occupations, average earnings prior to confinement were estimated at \$2,833 per year.

It is therefore estimated that the annual loss of earnings of adult sex offenders during confinement is between \$1,160 multiplied by 1,300 man-years of confinement,<sup>15</sup> or \$1.5 million, and  $\$2,833 \times 1,300$ , or \$3.7 million.

<sup>13</sup> Pennsylvania Department of Internal Affairs, Local Government Financial Statistics, 1961.

<sup>14</sup> Pennsylvania Board of Parole, Annual Statistical Report, 1962.

<sup>15</sup> See subsection 1, above.

### 3. *Man-Years of Probation and Parole*

As noted in subsection 5 (page 29), there were 546 sex offenders on parole, as of March 1962, under the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Board of Parole, with annual parole costs of \$0.13 million.

Having estimated local probation costs for sex offenders at \$0.15 million, or 115 percent of State parole costs, the estimated average number of sex offenders on local probation is 115 percent of 546, or 628, assuming local probation costs per person on probation are approximately equal to Pennsylvania Board of Parole costs per parolee.



## **APPENDIX III**

### **Reference Tables on Characteristics of Paroled Sex Offenders**

**TABLE III-1**  
**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PAROLED SEX OFFENDERS, BY USE OF FORCE,**  
**OFFENSE CATEGORY AND AGE OF VICTIM**

<i>Offense Category</i>	<i>No Force</i>			<i>Denial of Use of Force, and Unknown</i>			<i>Total</i>	
	<i>Force</i>	<i>Victims</i>	<i>Victims</i>	<i>Victims'</i>	<i>Victims</i>	<i>Victims</i>		<i>Victims'</i>
<i>(1)</i>	<i>Victims All</i>	<i>Less Than</i>	<i>More Than</i>	<i>Exact Age</i>	<i>Less Than</i>	<i>More than</i>	<i>Exact Age</i>	<i>(9)</i>
	<i>Ages</i>	<i>16 Years</i>	<i>16 Years</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>16 Years</i>	<i>16 Years</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	
Sodomy	2.32%	6.73%	8.88%	5.46%	1.90%	1.51%	1.15%	27.95%
Rape	7.28	14.53	6.24	1.61	5.12	1.17	4.04	39.99
Assault and Battery with Intent to Ravish	3.58	1.60	1.86	2.63	1.68	1.14	2.81	15.30
Miscellaneous	0.45	8.40	1.87	2.96	0.50	2.10	0.48	16.76
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.63</b>	<b>31.26</b>	<b>18.85</b>	<b>12.66</b>	<b>9.20</b>	<b>5.92</b>	<b>8.48</b>	<b>100.00</b>

SOURCE: Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders, 1962

**TABLE III-2**  
**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PAROLED SEX OFFENDERS, BY AGE AND OFFENSE CATEGORY,**  
**AND OF PENNSYLVANIA MALE POPULATION, 1950 AND 1960**

Age Group	<i>Sex Offenders</i>					<i>Pennsylvania Male Population</i>	
	<i>All Offenses</i>	<i>Sodomy</i>	<i>Rape</i>	<i>Assault and Battery with Intent to Ravish</i>	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	1950	1960
						(1)	(2)
17-19	14.60% <sup>a</sup>	9.97%	20.58% <sup>b</sup>	8.86%	13.36%	5.77%	6.05%
20-24	22.97	10.81	35.58	28.26	8.41	10.57	7.83
25-29	14.93	19.45	11.90	27.19	3.44	11.40	8.52
30-34	9.71	15.55	5.50	6.76	12.70	10.97	10.12
35-39	11.76	8.40	12.11	24.02	5.27	10.60	10.85
40-44	10.33	13.11	4.12	1.51	28.47	9.55	10.43
45-49	5.46	9.65	3.25	1.51	7.32	8.49	9.94
50-54	3.52	2.91	2.17	1.89	9.29	8.00	8.73
55-59	2.14	5.08	0.94	..	2.05	7.21	7.67
60 and over	4.58	5.07	3.85	..	9.69	17.44	19.86
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.00</b>

<sup>a</sup> Includes 0.7% age 16

<sup>b</sup> Includes 1.8% age 16

SOURCE: Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders, 1962, and U. S., Bureau of the Census, *United States Census of Population, 1960.*

**TABLE III-3**  
**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PAROLED SEX OFFENDERS**  
**BY BIRTHPLACE AND OFFENSE CATEGORY**

<i>Offense Category</i>	<i>Pennsylvania</i>	<i>U. S. Other than Pennsylvania</i>	<i>Foreign Born</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Total</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Sodomy	22.17%	4.37%	1.41%	..	27.95%
Rape	29.70	10.29	..	..	39.99
Assault and Battery with Intent to Ravish	11.23	3.92	0.15	..	15.30
Miscellaneous	15.22	1.54	..	..	16.76
<b>Total</b>	<b>78.32</b>	<b>20.12</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>..</b>	<b>100.00</b>

SOURCE: Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders, 1962.



**TABLE III-4**  
**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PAROLED SEX OFFENDERS**  
**BY I.Q. RANGE AND OFFENSE CATEGORY**

Offense Category	I.Q. Range									Total
	Less than				More than					
	60	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-99	100-109	110-119	120	Unknown	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Sodomy	1.95%	0.17%	1.58%	4.11%	3.11%	4.52%	2.13%	1.00%	9.37%	27.94%
Rape	0.19	4.04	2.80	6.90	4.53	7.20	1.24	0.82	12.27	39.99
Assault and Battery with Intent to Ravish	..	0.82	1.41	2.34	0.86	1.37	0.23	0.24	8.03	15.30
Miscellaneous	..	..	0.32	3.11	1.32	2.91	1.57	..	7.54	16.77
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.14</b>	<b>5.03</b>	<b>6.11</b>	<b>16.46</b>	<b>9.82</b>	<b>16.00</b>	<b>5.17</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>37.21</b>	<b>100.00</b>

SOURCE: Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders, 1962

**TABLE III-5**  
**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PAROLED SEX OFFENDERS**  
**BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND OFFENSE CATEGORY**

<i>Offense Category</i>	<i>Years of School Completed</i>								<i>13 and over</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>None</i>	<i>1-4</i>	<i>5-6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9-11</i>	<i>12</i>				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	
Sodomy	0.77%	2.15%	1.97%	7.47%	5.00%	6.47%	1.59%	2.23%	0.30%	27.95%	
Rape	..	2.77	6.04	5.06	5.72	13.09	4.85	0.46	1.99	39.98	
Assault and Battery with Intent to Ravish	0.66	1.31	0.62	1.89	1.54	5.96	0.28	1.50	1.54	15.30	
Miscellaneous	0.48	1.46	1.25	2.27	2.47	5.15	0.97	1.43	1.29	16.77	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1.91</b>	<b>7.69</b>	<b>9.88</b>	<b>16.69</b>	<b>14.73</b>	<b>30.67</b>	<b>7.69</b>	<b>5.62</b>	<b>5.12</b>	<b>100.00</b>	

SOURCE: Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders, 1962

**TABLE III-6**  
**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PAROLED SEX OFFENDERS**  
**BY OFFENSE CATEGORY AND NUMBER OF SIBS**

<i>Offense Category</i>	<i>Number of Sibs</i>								<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Total</i>
	<i>Only Child</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5-9</i>	<i>10 and over</i>			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
Sodomy	3.92%	2.92%	4.02%	3.34%	2.80%	6.87%	3.66%	0.41%	27.94%	
Rape	5.00	2.34	6.99	3.57	2.37	16.13	3.59	..	39.99	
Assault and Battery with Intent to Ravish	1.55	2.87	1.78	1.31	1.11	5.91	0.77	..	15.30	
Miscellaneous	3.08	1.44	1.85	2.36	2.52	5.07	0.04	0.41	16.77	
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.55</b>	<b>9.57</b>	<b>14.64</b>	<b>10.58</b>	<b>8.80</b>	<b>33.98</b>	<b>8.06</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>100.00</b>	

SOURCE: Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders, 1962

**TABLE III-7**  
**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PAROLED SEX OFFENDERS**  
**BY LOSS OF ONE OR BOTH PARENTS DURING CHILDHOOD**

<i>Parental Loss<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Age at Loss of Parent</i>					
	<i>Total</i>	<i>0-5</i>	<i>6-12</i>	<i>13-17</i>	<i>17 and Over</i>	<i>Age Unknown</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
No loss of parents	52.96%	..	..	..	..	..
Loss of father	25.94	13.98%	3.53%	4.59%	..	3.84%
Loss of mother	3.73	5.04	2.84	0.81	0.04%	..
Simultaneous loss of both parents	12.37	4.62	4.46	0.58	..	2.71
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>23.64</b>	<b>10.83</b>	<b>5.98</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>6.55</b>

<sup>1</sup> Includes loss of parent(s) by reason of death, divorce, separation, desertion, transfer to care of others.  
 SOURCE: Joint State Government Commission Survey of Paroled Sex Offenders, 1962