

RISK FACTORS AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS OF JUVENILE CRIMINALS AND THEIR FUNCTIONING AT A REFORMATORY

Prof. Habil. Dr. Józef K. Gierowski

Institute of Forensic Research,
Department of Psychology
9 Westerplatte Street
31-033 Krakow, Poland
Phone (0048)12 422 87 55
e-mail: kgierowski@ies.krakow.pl

Agnieszka Idziak

Institute of Forensic Research,
Department of Psychology
9 Westerplatte Street
31-033 Krakow, Poland
Phone (0048)12 422 87 55
e-mail: aidziak@ies.krakow.pl

Stoigniew Rumszewicz

Jagiellonian University
Department of Psychology
3 Mickiewicza Street
31-120 Krakow, Poland
Phone (0048) 12 634-13-05
e-mail: wert74@poczta.onet.pl

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify groups of youth criminals with specific profiles of risk factors. Next, we aimed to trace relationships between these risk factors and selected personality traits of the minors by shaping their styles of interpersonal functioning. The research covered 96 minors aged 16-21, inmates of corrections institutions who were accused of aggressive crimes. These persons took psychometric tests using the SAVRY checklist and Stanik's IPS Scale. An analysis of results helped to identify three groups of juvenile criminals with respect to the intensity and configuration of risk factors: 'seriously unadjusted group', 'disturbed personality group' and 'sociopathic group'. Research results point to some essential statistical differences between the isolated groups with respect to all the four domains provided by the SAVRY. A thorough review of the correlation between the risk factor groups and the juveniles' styles of social functioning indicated significant differences between historical, social and protective factors. A qualitative analysis of the results shows intensified occurrence in, particularly, the 'seriously unadjusted group', of features such as hostility, suspicion, and tendency to rebel against external orders.

Keywords: juvenile criminals, risk factors, styles of social functioning.

Introduction

Psychological examination of juveniles during the last decades revealed that the characteristic feature of population of juvenile delinquents is a huge psychological differentiation of its members. Findings from many studies are showing that the specific criminal behaviour can be influenced both by situation variables and the past, complex circumstances and developmental factors (Beelmann, Bliesener & Loesel, 2000; Czarnecka-Dzialuk, 1993; Domachowski, 1984; Farrington, 1991; Korcyl-Wolska, 2001; Loesel, 2000; Majchrzyk, 2001; Urban, 1995, 2000). Disharmony in psychological development, considerable easiness in passing of a young person from the world of fancy, dreams or

imagination to the real world of adults are only examples of the phenomena and mechanisms which must be taken into consideration in the genesis of crimes perpetrated by juveniles (Boer, Hart, Kropp & Webster, 1997; Corrado, Roesch, Hart & Gierowski 2002; Hartman, Hollweg & Nedopil, 2001; Majchrzyk 2001; Pospiszyl & Żabczyńska 1985; Urban 2000; Webster, Hart, Eaves & Ogloff, 2001; Wójcik 1984).

Defined risk factors as well as diagnostic tools constructed for their estimation (such as: SAVRY, HCR-20, SVR-20, PCL-R) made the procedures of detecting the threat of criminal violence much more perfect (Dolan & Doyle, 2000; Gray, McGleish, Timmons & Snowden, 2003; Hare, 1999). However, their usefulness for aims and tasks realized by expert psychologists in everyday work turned out to be limited. Therefore there is an urgent need of such a conceptualisation of psychological mechanisms leading to juvenile criminality, which takes into account on the one hand isolated and co-existed risk factors, and on the other hand their functional connections with the structure and functioning of the examined patient's personality: coping with the stress, level and the structure of aggressiveness of a juvenile person, his/her styles of social functioning and the system of values (Gierowski, Idziak, Knurowska & Rajtar 2004; Gierowski, Kowanetz, Kuhny & Rumszewicz, 2004). A model of variables which would take into account both personal markers of criminality as well as a full catalogue of risk factors has not been worked out by any of the world-wide research centers examining the problem of juvenile criminality so far. The attempt of creating such a model undertaken by the authors of the present work is fragmentary in character, since it takes into account only the relations between the styles of interpersonal functioning of the examined people and risk factors leading to violent behaviour in them. The way in which people behave in interpersonal contacts, presented by their inclination to dominance, autonomy or submission, are consolidated with time assuming the form of a permanent feature of character. These tendencies characterise the capability of a given person to perform certain functions in interpersonal relations.

The aim of the current study is to operationalise the psychological model taking into account both the arrangement of risk factors as well as the social functioning of juveniles. The authors intended to select groups of perpetrators with defined profiles of risk factors of violent behaviour and to examine the relations between those factors and selected features of juveniles' personality, shaping styles of their interpersonal functioning. The scope of the study was specified by asking the following questions:

1. Do the juveniles differ in terms of intensity and configuration of risk factors and how are those relations distributed?
2. What are the relations between the factors of violent behaviour and the styles of functioning in social relations which are preferred by juveniles?
3. In what way the juveniles are characterised by different configurations of risk factors and function of personality features at resocialisation centers?

The most general hypotheses assumed that:

1. It is not particular factors that possess a diagnostic value, but their mutual configuration.
2. Interdependence between risk factors and styles of social functioning of the examined juveniles will be different and stronger in particular cluster (group of juveniles).

Method

Subjects

The examination was carried out on a sample of 96 juvenile boys, aged from 16 to 21, staying at resocialisation centers in Poland. They were mainly accused of homicide, rape, acts endangering life, grievous bodily harm, robbery, burglary, attempted crime. The mean age in the sample at the moment of the examination was 18.2 (SD 1.1).

Instruments

The following methods and tools were used in the research:

1. The SAVRY (Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth) – designed by American and Canadian scientists – R. Borum, P. Bartel and A. Forth in 2000, to diagnose the intensity and structure of risk factors. **The SAVRY** is designed to assess the probability of the occurrence of aggressive behaviour in juveniles. It was designed to assess youth between the ages of 12 and 18, although it may be applied to youth slightly younger or older than the target ages. The SAVRY consist 24 of risk factors and 6 protective factors, which are supposed to lessen the risk factors. The four categories of the SAVRY are as follows:

- **Historical factors:** Early Initiation of Violence, Past Supervision/Intervention Failures, History of Self-harm or Suicide Attempts, Exposure to Violence in the Home, Childhood History of Maltreatment, Poor School Achievement etc. The maximum score, which it is possible to obtain, is 20.

- **Social/Contextual factors:** Peer Delinquency, Peer Rejection, Stress and Poor Coping, Poor Parental Management, Lack of Personal/Social Support, etc. The maximum score, which it is possible to obtain in this group of risk factors, is 12.

- **Individual/Clinical factors:** Negative Attitudes, Substance Use Difficulties, Anger Management Problems, Psychopathic Traits, Poor Compliance and Low Interest/Commitment to School, etc. The maximum score, which it is possible to obtain, is 16.

- **Protective factors:** Prosocial Involvement, Strong Social Support, Strong Attachments and Bonds, Positive Attitude towards Intervention and Authority, etc. The maximum score, which it is possible to obtain, is 6.

The maximum score that can be obtained in the group of risk factors is 48. It is claimed that the higher a person scores on the risk factors, the higher the probability that this person will manifest violent behaviour in the future (Borum, Bartel & Forth, 2002). The category Additional Risk Factors was also included in the coding because the SAVRY is not necessarily exhaustive in identifying all potential violence risk factors in any given case.

2. The Interpersonal Relationships Scale (IPS) – designed in 1990 by J.M. Stanik. **This scale** gives a lot of significant information about functioning of an individual in an interpersonal perspective and constitutes a tool useful in diagnosing the lack of social adaptation, since it reveals a style of functioning preferred by an examined person in social relations. According to the conception of the author of IPS, fundamental styles of interpersonal functioning consist of two dimensions, which theoretically can be separated, i.e.: dominance-submission, love-hostility (Róžańska-Kowal & Rajska-Kulik, 2000; Stanik, 1994, 1997). Within those scales one can differentiate twelve detailed styles of managing, i.e.:

1. Managerial-autocratic style – this style embraces all forms of social activity, expressing leadership tendencies, the willingness of dominance and a sense of competence in co-operation with others.

2. Responsible-hyper normal style – comprises those forms of social activity which express positive feelings to the partner, where the friendly attitude has an element of dominance.

3. Cooperative-overconventional style – concerns those forms of social activity, which reveal a positive, marked by affiliation, attitude to the partner and readiness for compromise in the case of incompatible actions.

4. Docile-dependent style – it consists of acts of behaviour marked by submission and subordination in relation to others, readiness for new social contacts, expressing the willingness of being faithful, subject to others and protected by them.

5. Self-effacing-masochistic style – comprises types of behaviour marked by submission, leading even to withdrawal and social isolation. A characteristic component of this style is an implied meaning of hostility, even aggression.

6. Rebellious-destructive style – embraces hostile and anti-social types of behaviour, with the elements of helplessness towards others. Additional components of this style constitute: lack of trust, suspiciousness, and a tendency for rebelling against instructions.

7. Aggressive-sadistic style – manifests itself through frequent attacks in the form of physical and verbal aggression, aiming at hurting others physically or morally, fear, forcing others to total submission. A characteristic component of this style is, next to hostility towards oneself and others, an implied meaning of dominance, i.e. perceiving oneself as a person dominating in interpersonal relations over others.

8. Competitive-narcissistic style – types of behaviour characteristic of this style are marked by devaluation of another person, exaggerated emphasizing of one's own independence as a result of which this person gains self-confirmation.

9. Self-acceptance – results from a relatively constant self-esteem of a given person, especially in comparison with other people. What is significant for interpretation is the fact that the higher result a given person will obtain in that scale, the lower is his/her self-esteem.

10. Lying – reflects a constant tendency to presenting others too positive an image of one's own person.

11. Coping, realism – defines a high degree of self-acceptation and in social interactions aiming at the realisation of assumed objectives, presenting oneself as a resourceful, enterprising and optimistic person.

12. Pessimism, helplessness – this style is characteristic of people whose social activity is restricted, who are suspicious, stressful, fearful, marked by helplessness and pessimism.

Data analysis

In order to identify groups of juveniles characterised by a specific configuration of risk factors, grouping (cluster) analysis was used. The grouping procedure involved the use of the K-means clustering method. In order to check the differences between the groupings – for quantitative variables – an analysis of variation (ANOVA) was conducted. In cases of statistically-significant differences, Turkey's multiple comparison tests for unequal numbers was used, which made it possible to identify the specific differences between the group means. To identify correlations between specific variables in the various groups, Pearson's correlation coefficient ('r') was used. To identify differences between the groupings – for qualitative variables – the 'chi square' test was conducted.

Results

The data analysis identified 3 interpretable groupings, relating to specific risk factor profiles:

1. **Group 1** is characterised by the greatest intensity in the historical, social, and individual factors. This means that individuals forming this group either have committed aggressive acts or experienced someone else's violent behaviour. These individuals' social, interpersonal relations are disturbed; they present negative attitudes, and also function poorly in psychological and behavioural terms. The very low intensity of variables forming the protective factor indicates additionally the absence of factors which – through their favourable impact – could mitigate the adverse impact of other factors. This group was called the **seriously unadjusted group**. To this group were belong 26 of examined juveniles.

2. **Group 2** is characterised by the lowest intensity in variables forming the historical and social factors, while the intensity of variables describing the individual factor is average. What is characteristic is that very high scores in protective factors were recorded in this group. This group is formed by individuals who, despite having grown in relatively decent conditions as regards social environment and up-bringing, do not function well in social terms. This is probably caused by their disturbed personality. Additionally, the high ratio of protective factors indicates the existence of numerous variables which can reduce the likelihood of violent behaviour, and also reduce the impact of other – negative – factors. This group was called the **disturbed personality group**. To this group were belong 32 of examined juveniles.

3. **Group 3** is characterised by an average intensity in the historical and social factors and very low scores in the individual and protective factors. This indicates that the individuals forming this group may have experienced violence to a certain degree, and may also have committed aggressive acts themselves. Their social malfunctioning is primarily connected with the adverse developmental and environmental conditions rather than with an incorrectly-forming personality, especially in its profounder, intramental dimension. At the same time, those individuals are deprived – as a result of the low intensity of protective variables – of an opportunity to obtain societal support, or they are not susceptible to influences which could reduce the risk of violent behaviour. This group was called the **sociopathic group**. To this group were belong 38 of examined juveniles.

The resultant clusters (groups of juveniles) were compared in terms of the following variables:

- styles of social functioning,
- interpersonal relationships,
- functioning at a reformatory.

Tab. 1. Correlation between IPS and risk factors for group of examined juveniles

IPS STYLES	GROUP			
	Historical	Social	Individual	Protective
1	2	3	4	5
Managerial-autocratic	-0.08 (p=.427)	-0.07 (p=.529)	-0.09 (p=.400)	-0.03 (p=.739)
Responsible-hypernormal	-0.02 (p=.851)	0.03 (p=.807)	-0.10 (p=.334)	-0.02 (p=.867)
Cooperative-overconventional	-0.15 (p=.149)	-0.11 (p=.268)	-0.30 (p=.003)	0.09 (p=.389)
Docile-dependent	-0.07 (p=.530)	0.04 (p=.694)	-0.19 (p=.067)	0.11 (p=.284)
Self-effacing-masochistic	0.14 (p=.174)	0.15 (p=.141)	-0.11 (p=.302)	-0.12 (p=.260)

1	2	3	4	5
Rebellious-distructful	-0.05 (p=.665)	0.04 (p=.715)	0.16 (p=.112)	0.04 (p=.710)
Aggressive- sadistic	-0.03 (p=.766)	0.10 (p=.341)	0.06 (p=.588)	-0.13 (p=.212)
Competitive- narcissistic	0.09 (p=.396)	0.09 (p=.364)	0.04 (p=.720)	0.06 (p=.542)
Self-acceptance	0.27 (p=.008)	0.19 (p=.072)	0.02 (p=.869)	-0.11 (p=.267)
Lying	-0.09 (p=.364)	-0.25 (p=.014)	-0.13 (p=.211)	0.14 (p=.170)
Coping, realism	-0.17 (p=.095)	-0.19 (p=.064)	-0.07 (p=.504)	0.18 (p=.085)
Pessimism, helplessness	0.14 (p=.187)	0.16 (p=.130)	-0.01 (p=.929)	-0.07 (p=.518)

The obtained results point to the existence of negative correlations between individual factors and the Cooperative-overconventional style of social functioning. This means that a smaller intensity in individual risk factors, related to negative personality features, favours the development a positive, affiliative attitude to others in the examined juveniles and their readiness for compromise in interpersonal relations. The relations which are statistically meaningful have been shown between the intensity of historical risk factors and interpersonal functioning of the examined people. They point to the fact that greater intensity of those factors causes the decrease in self-acceptation of the examined people. This proves the fact that juveniles attaining good results in the range of historical risk factors to a considerable degree make their self-assessment dependent on outside factors, particularly the way of assessing them by other people. They also have a sense of not being able to influence the course of events and meet the requirements imposed by the environment.

Tab. 2. Means of SAVRY factors for particular cluster

Factors	Historical	Social	Individual	Protective	N
Cluster 1	14.30	10.00	12.44	0.48	27
Cluster 2	7.09	6.66	10.16	3.28	32
Cluster 3	10.37	8.66	8.32	0.18	37
All groups	10.38	8.37	10.07	1.29	96

An analysis of obtained results points to significant statistical differences between all the averages in the case of historical, social and individual factors. As regards a protective factor, no meaningful differences between group 1 (0.48) and group 3 (0.18) have been detected. As it had been expected, the greatest intensity of risk factors contained in SAVRY appeared in group 1, that is among people who have not been socially adapted and who have evinced and experienced violent behaviour in the past.

Tab. 3. Correlation of Historical Risk Factors with styles of social functioning in the various groupings

IPS STYLES	HISTORICAL RISK FACOTRS					
	Cluster 1		Cluster 2		Cluster 3	
Managerial-autocratic	-0.06	p=.768	-0.06	p=.738	-0.19	p=.270
Responsible-hypernormal	0.03	p=.901	0.20	p=.265	-0.02	p=.885
Cooperative- overconventional	0.04	p=.839	0.07	p=.706	-0.20	p=.238
Docile-dependent	0.14	p=.498	-0.07	p=.711	-0.12	p=.463
Self-effacing-masochistic	0.34	p=.086	0.19	p=.300	0.14	p=.412
Rebellious-distructful	-0.10	p=.630	0.03	p=.875	-0.16	p=.345
Aggressive-sadistic	-0.42	p=.032	-0.11	p=.565	-0.21	p=.202
Competitive-narcissistic	-0.04	p=.845	0.18	p=.323	-0.12	p=.485
Self-acceptance	0.41	p=.039	0.39	p=.029	0.07	p=.686
Lying	0.05	p=.793	-0.06	p=.745	0.35	p=.036
Coping, Realism	-0.11	p=.596	-0.08	p=.676	0.04	p=.822
Pessimism, helplessness	0.06	p=.767	0.08	p=.676	0.03	p=.867

The relations between isolated historical risk factors and styles of social functioning of examined juveniles are the most intense in the case of the first cluster that is a seriously unadjusted group. They are both positive and negative in character and point to the fact that the greater the intensity of historical risk factors in this cluster is, the lower the level of self-acceptation, lower self-confidence and tendency to dominance over others. Similar relations have been detected in the case of juveniles belonging to the group with 'disturbed personality': the results point to the existence of associations between the intensity of historical risk factors in those juveniles and reducing their self-esteem. This means that negative experiences in life, such as observing or experiencing violence at home, disturbances in the continuity of ties with parents intensify in the young person a conviction that he/she cannot meet the requirements imposed by oncoming stimuli and that he/she does not possess sufficient motivation and capabilities for undertaking actions aiming at the reduction of stressful situations. What is a consequence of this perceiving oneself in interpersonal relations as the one less resourceful and giving way to others in some respects, which can be proved by a negative correlation between a historical factors and the scale 7 of IPS.

Tab. 4. Correlation of Social Risk Factors with styles of social functioning in the various groupings

IPS STYLES	SOCIAL RISK FACTORS					
	Cluster 1		Cluster 2		Cluster 3	
Managerial-autocratic	-0.09	p=.670	-0.01	p=.970	-0.13	p=.448
Responsible-hypernormal	0.37	p=.065	0.21	p=.243	-0.22	p=.181
Cooperative-overconventional	0.09	p=.676	0.11	p=.545	-0.25	p=.133
Docile-dependent	0.15	p=.462	0.18	p=.319	-0.05	p=.787
Self-effacing-masochistic	0.37	p=.066	0.04	p=.842	0.20	p=.230
Rebellious-distructful	-0.19	p=.364	0.20	p=.270	0.11	p=.518
Aggressive-sadistic	0.00	p=.983	0.14	p=.430	-0.10	p=.550
Competitive-narcissistic	0.03	p=.884	0.09	p=.616	0.10	p=.551
Self-acceptance	0.43	p=.028	0.23	p=.214	-0.09	p=.615
Lying	-0.07	p=.723	-0.38	p=.034	-0.02	p=.926
Coping, realism	-0.19	p=.362	-0.05	p=.787	-0.06	p=.706
Pessimism, helplessness	0.00	p=.988	0.04	p=.818	0.24	p=.160

In this group the existence of positive correlations between the intensity of social factors and the level of self-acceptation of juvenile perpetrators has been detected. On the basis of those as well as the above mentioned results one may arrive at the conclusion that negative experience in life (related to historical factors) and incorrect environmental conditions (associated with social factors), in which a juvenile is growing, not only favour the development in him/her of the features of being socially unadapted, but also cause a considerable decrease in his/her self – esteem, the sense of the lack of confidence in his/her capabilities, of inability of influencing the course of events, including poor motivation for undertaking actions aiming at the improvement of his/her life. In the remaining two groups of juveniles similar connections have not been defined.

Tab. 5. Correlation of Individual Risk Factors with styles of social functioning in the various groupings

IPS SCALE	INDIVIDUAL RISK FACTORS					
	Cluster 1		Cluster 2		Cluster 3	
Managerial-autocratic	-0.13	p=.527	-0.14	p=.437	0.15	p=.362
Responsible-hypernormal	-0.06	p=.787	0.15	p=.413	0.13	p=.437
Cooperative-overconventional	-0.19	p=.355	-0.21	p=.255	-0.13	p=.446
Docile-dependent	-0.02	p=.935	-0.10	p=.590	-0.31	p=.061
Self-effacing-masochistic	-0.06	p=.788	-0.29	p=.111	0.19	p=.250
Rebellious-distructful	0.53	p=.005	-0.15	p=.422	0.28	p=.095
Aggressive-sadistic	0.27	p=.177	-0.15	p=.413	0.13	p=.456
Competitive-narcissistic	-0.08	p=.701	-0.14	p=.444	-0.08	p=.626
Self-acceptance	-0.22	p=.271	-0.05	p=.772	0.03	p=.880
Lying	0.07	p=.740	-0.11	p=.536	-0.10	p=.546
Coping, realism	-0.02	p=.910	0.00	p=.996	-0.10	p=.564
Pessimism, helplessness	0.12	p=.547	-0.27	p=.136	0.04	p=.807

Very few statistically significant relations, concerning only cluster 1 take place within individual factors. They concern positive interdependence between the rebellious-suspicious style of social functioning which is a component of the hostility syndrome contained in IPS and the discussed group of risk factors. Those results point to the lack in social relations of juveniles of behaviour types which are socially desired, concordant with standards that are binding, directed towards co-operation and concordant satisfying the needs. A dominant style of social relations in this group of juveniles are hostility, suspiciousness, lack of trust and iciness in feelings towards other people. Those people have a tendency to rebelling against external instructions, simultaneously emphasizing their hostile and destructive attitude towards the surrounding world. The obtained result confirms the fact that juveniles belonging to this group have serious personality disorders, function incorrectly in the social respect and do not undertake any attempts of correcting their behaviour. In the case of obtained results what is surprising is a small number of relations between individual factors and the styles of interpersonal functioning of the examined people, since it had been expected that the relations would be found in all the three isolated groups.

Tab. 6. **Correlation of Protective Risk Factors with styles of social functioning in the various groupings**

IPS STYLES	PROTECTIVE FACTORS					
	Cluster 1		Cluster 2		Cluster 3	
Management-authoritative	0.22	p=.275	-0.24	p=.177	0.12	p=.497
Responsible-hypernormal	-0.17	p=.406	0.05	p=.784	0.32	p=.052
Cooperative-overconventional	0.01	p=.972	0.11	p=.533	0.32	p=.053
Docile-dependent	0.07	p=.725	0.31	p=.090	0.20	p=.238
Self-effacing-masochistic	-0.26	p=.207	0.01	p=.961	-0.22	p=.185
Rebellious-distructful	0.15	p=.466	-0.02	p=.913	-0.31	p=.063
Aggressive-sadistic	-0.02	p=.924	0.03	p=.860	-0.41	p=.012
Competitive-narcissistic	0.22	p=.289	-0.02	p=.934	0.09	p=.595
Self-acceptance	-0.39	p=.050	0.12	p=.502	-0.24	p=.159
Lying	0.23	p=.254	0.04	p=.834	-0.11	p=.522
Coping, realism	0.07	p=.746	-0.02	p=.905	0.31	p=.066
Pessimism, helplessness	-0.04	p=.851	0.17	p=.367	-0.32	p=.055

The functional analysis of the results of IPS scales and the intensity of protective factors in particular cluster points to the fact that protective factors which can be found in juveniles contribute to the increase in their self-acceptation. What has also been obtained is a negative correlation between the intensity of protective factors in group 3 and the results in scale 7 IPS, being a component of the hostility syndrome. The above relations point to the fact that a greater intensity in protective factors contributes to the improvement in the self-esteem of examined juveniles, through the increase in confidence in one's own capabilities and motivation for undertaking actions aiming at the reduction in stressful situations. It also contributes to the development of a positive attitude to other people in a given person, subjective treatment of them and types of behaviour which are commonly accepted and directed towards help and co-operation. Those results induce therapeutic and resocialisation optimism, since they emphasis the possibility of shaping and correcting personality features and mechanisms through the activation of protective factors and manipulating them.

Functioning of juveniles at a reformatory

Juveniles from group 1 were characterised by the greatest intensity of aggressive behaviour of all the isolated groups, which concerned both other pupils and the personnel of the reformatory. The aggression evinced in this way was both verbal and physical in its character. Those juveniles showed also the greatest intensity of self-aggressive behaviour of all the groups, both in the form of self-mutilation as well as suicide attempts. Moreover, they were characterised by a passive attitude towards resocialisation actions, aggressive reactions to the punishments applied, the result of which was obtaining only minor improvement in their behaviour during their stay at a reformatory. This factor is definitely prognostically detrimental and allows us to allege that those people will in all likelihood perpetrate crimes also in their adult life. One may assume that what influenced such a way of functioning at a reformatory were already consolidated negative features of their personality, such as: general hostility and lack of trust towards others, accepting violence and aggression as a method of

solving problems, inability of building deep and satisfactory emotional relations with others. A characteristic feature of functioning at a reformatory of juveniles belonging to the disturbed personality group is first of all their positive attitude towards others (both personnel and the pupils) and aiming at building satisfactory relations with them. This is a factor prognostically positive, showing that creating a correct environment for those juveniles and ensuring them a proper system of support can bring positive resocialisation effects. Besides, juveniles from this group presented an approving attitude to the punishments applied, to which they reacted mainly with fear. They evinced hardly any aggressive behaviour towards colleagues and superiors as well as self-aggressive behaviour. They showed a positive, co-operative attitude towards resocialisation actions, and in the case of 60% of them a considerable improvement in their behaviour was noticed during their stay at a reformatory. Juveniles from the group 3 considerably more often than the members of the remaining groups presented a positive attitude towards colleagues and personnel at a reformatory, aimed at building correct relations with them. They evinced a positive, approving attitude to punishments and instructions given by superiors, to which they frequently reacted with fear. Furthermore, they presented more positive attitude towards contacts with other pupils, aimed at building correct, satisfactory relations with them. Only occasionally did they evince aggressive behaviour towards others, mainly in the form of verbal aggression. The majority of juveniles from this group presented a positive attitude towards resocialisation actions, in the case of 64.4% of them a considerable, positive improvement in their behaviour was ascertained during their stay at a reformatory.

Discussion

The obtained results show that it is reasonable to search for relations between the configuration of risk factors and variables describing the structure and functioning of juveniles' personality. The statistical analysis which has been carried out has confirmed the first one of the hypotheses which have been put forward by the authors assuming that the examined juveniles differ in terms of the intensity of risk factors and what has the diagnostic value are not particular factors, but their mutual configuration. This allowed us to isolate three groups of juveniles: a seriously unadjusted, a disturbed personality and a sociopathic group. The achieved results also point to the existence of differences between risk factors and the styles of social functioning of juveniles in the three isolated groups. Those relations are more frequent and stronger in particular groups in the whole population of the examined, which confirms the second one of the hypotheses put forward by the authors. In people from the seriously unadjusted group the greatest intensity of social functioning disturbances has been detected, which manifested itself through such features as: hostility, suspiciousness, lack of trust, tendency for rebelling against external instructions, frequent attacks of verbal and physical aggression, low self-esteem. The greatest intensity of those features has been detected in juveniles from the group 1, who achieved good results within historical risk factors. People from the seriously unadjusted group, in comparison with the members of other groups, had also the greatest problems with functioning at a reformatory, were characterised by a high aggression level towards both other pupils or the personnel and the attempts of self-destruction. What is typical is the fact that the increase in historical and social factors in the group of people seriously unadjusted and having personality disturbance is accompanied by the decrease in the self-esteem of the examined. This shows that the image of one's own 'ego' of the juveniles belonging to these two groups to a considerable degree depends on external factors and gaining approval from the surrounding world. Those people can be subject to detrimental influences from the side of others, which is not a prognostically positive factor. What is significant is the fact that the increase in the intensity of protective factors in group 1 is accompanied by the increase in self-esteem, which, despite numerous adversary conditions and pathogenic factors, can contribute to the development of socially accepted behaviour. This information is very important from the point of resocialisation and reeducation, because the application of a suitable therapeutic method, the creation of efficient social support and the elimination of the negative influence of demoralized peers could yield positive resocialisation and reeducation effects.

Conclusions

The authors are aware of the fact that the diagnosis presented by them was fragmentary in character, since it concerned mainly selected personality aspects and has been conducted on a relatively small number of examined people. This finds confirmation in few correlative relations, but justifies the reasons for continuing the process of the operationalisation of a variable model, taking into

account both a wide catalogue of risk factors as well as functioning of juvenile personality. The obtained results can also be helpful in everyday judicial and consultative practice, since they increase the correctness of the diagnosis, favour the personality description in its functional, dynamic and motivative dimension and provide the foundations for formulating more detailed, individual treatment and resocialisation instructions.

LITERATURE

1. **Beelmann A., Bliesener T. & Loesel F.** Dimension of Impulsivity and Their Relation to Antisocial Behavior in Male Adolescents // Czerederecka A., Jaśkiewicz-Obydzińska T. & Wójcikiewicz J. (eds). *Forensic Psychology and Law*. – Kraków: Institute of Forensic Research Publishers, 2000.
2. **Boer D. P., Hart S. D., Kropp P. R. & Webster Ch. D.** *Manual for the Sexual Violence Risk-20*. – The Mental Health Law & Policy Institute: Simon Fraser University, 1997.
3. **Borum R., Bartel P. & Forth A.** *Manual for the Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth, Version 1. Consultation Edition*. – University of South Florida, 2002.
4. **Corrado R., Roesch R., Hart S. & Gierowski J. K.** *Multi Problem Violent Youth*. – Amsterdam: IOS Press, Ohmsha, 2002.
5. **Dolan M. & Doyle M.** Violence risk prediction // *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2000. Vol. 177.
6. **Domachowski W.** *Z zagadnień psychologii społecznej*. – Warszawa: PWN, 1984.
7. **Douglas K. S., Webster Ch. D., Hart S. D., Eaves D. & Ogloff J. R. P.** *HCR-20 Violence Risk Management Companion Guide*. – The Mental Health Law & Policy Institute: Simon Fraser University, 2001.
8. **Farrington D.** Childhood aggression and adult violence: Early precursors and later outcomes // Pepler D. & Rubin K. (eds). *The development and treatment of childhood aggression*. – NJ: Erlbaum, 1991.
9. **Gierowski J. K. & Heitzman J.** Próba oceny wpływu środowiska rodzinnego na rozwój przyszłych zabójców // Gierowski J.K & Majchrzyk Z. (eds). *Psychopatologia zabójstw*. – Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PTP, Sekcja Psychiatrii Sądowej, 1992.
10. **Gierowski J. K., Idziak A., Knurowska J. & Rajtar T.** Risk factors, personality, sense of coherence and coping with stress in juvenile perpetrators // Czerederecka A., Jaśkiewicz-Obydzińska T., Roesch R. & Wójcikiewicz J. (eds). *Forensic Psychology and Law. Facing the Challenges of a Changing World*. – Kraków: Institute of Forensic Research Publishers, 2004.
11. **Gierowski J. K., Kowanetz M., Kuhny A. & Rumszewicz S.** Configuration of Risk Factors and Their Relationships with Selected Personality Traits // Czerederecka A., Jaśkiewicz-Obydzińska T., Roesch R. & Wójcikiewicz J. (eds). *Forensic Psychology and Law. Facing the Challenges of a Changing World*. – Kraków: Institute of Forensic Research Publishers, 2004.
12. **Gray N. S., McGleish A., Timmons D., MacCulloch M. J. & Snowden R. J.** Prediction of violence and self-harm in mentally disordered offenders: a prospective study of the efficacy of HCR-20, PCL-R, and psychiatric symptomatology. – *J. Consult Clin. Psychol.*, 2003.
13. **Hare R. D.** Psychopathy as a risk factor for violence // *Psychiatry*. 1999. Vol. 70.
14. **Hartman J., Hollweg M. & Nedopil N.** Quantitative Erfassung dissozialer und psychopatischer Persönlichkeit bei der strafrechtlichen Begutachtung // *Nervenarzt*. 2001. Vol. 5.
15. **Loesel F.** Risk/Need Assessment and Prevention of Antisocial Development in Young People: Basic Issues from a Perspective of Cautionary Optimism // Corrado R., Roesch R., Hart. S. D. & Gierowski J. K. (eds). *Multi-Problem Violent Youth. A Foundation for Comparative Research on Needs, Interventions and Outcomes*. – Amsterdam: IOS Press, Ohmsha, 2002.
16. **Majchrzyk Z.** *Nieletni, młodociani i dorośli sprawcy zabójstw*. – Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Psychiatrii i Neurologii, 2001.
17. **Pospiszył K. & Żabczyńska E.** *Psychologia dziecka niedostosowanego społecznie*. – Warszawa: PWN, 1985.
18. **Różańska-Kowal J. & Rajska-Kulik I.** Zastosowanie Skali Ustosunkowań Interpersonalnych (SUI) w diagnozie niedostosowania społecznego nieletnich dziewcząt i chłopców. – Katowice: Chowanna, 2000.
19. **Sonderstrom H., Sjödin A-K., Carlstedt A. & Forsman A.** Adult psychopathic personality with childhood-onset hyperactivity and conduct disorder: a central problem constellation in forensic psychiatry // *Psychiatry Research*. 2004. Vol. 121.
20. **Stanik J. M.** *Skala Ustosunkowań Interpersonalnych (SUI)*. – Kielce: Wydawnictwo Szumacher, 1994.
21. **Stanik J. M.** *Możliwości diagnozy różnicowej stanów reaktywnych za pomocą testu SUI // Postępy Psychiatrii i Neurologii*. 1997. Vol. 1.
22. **Urban B.** *Zaburzenia w zachowaniu i przestępczość młodzieży*. – Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ, 2000.
23. **Wolska A.** *Model czynników ryzyka popełnienia zabójstwa*. – Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego, 2001.
24. **Wolska A.** *Model czynników ryzyka popełnienia przestępstwa agresywnego*. – Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego, 2002.
25. **Wójcik D.** *Nieprzystosowanie społeczne młodzieży. Analiza psychologiczno-kryminologiczna*. – Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1984.

JAUNŲ NUSIKALTĒLIŲ RIZIKOS VEIKSNIAI IR TARPASMENINIO FUNKCIONAVIMO POBŪDIS ĮSTAIGOSE

Prof. habil. dr. Józef K. Gierowski, Agnieszka Idziak, Stoigniew Rumszewicz

Teismo ekspertizės institutas, Krokuvą, Lenkija

Jogailos universitetas, Krokuvą, Lenkija

Santrauka

Šio tyrimo tikslas – nustatyti jaunų nusikaltėlių grupes pagal tai, kokie rizikos veiksniai vyrauja kiekvienoje grupėje. Antra, siekėme nustatyti, kaip tie rizikos veiksniai susiję su jaunų nusikaltėlių asmenybės bruožais, nulemdami tarpasmeninio funkcionavimo pobūdį. Tyrime dalyvavo 96 jauni nusikaltėliai nuo 16 iki 21 metų, tyrimo metu esantys pataisos įstaigoje už padarytus agresyvius nusikaltimus. Jie buvo apklausti naudojant SAVRY metodiką ir J. M. Staniko IPS skalę. Rezultatų analizė pagal rizikos veiksnių intensyvumą ir išsėdystymą leido nustatyti 3 jaunų nusikaltėlių grupes: (1) stipriai neprisitaikiusių asmenų grupė; (2) „sutrikusios asmenybės“ grupė; (3) sociopatinė grupė. Tyrimų rezultatai rodo, kad yra statistiškai reikšmingi skirtumai tarp atskirų grupių ir SAVRY metodikos pagalba nustatytų keturių pagrindinių rizikos dimensijų. Rizikos veiksnių ir socialinio funkcionavimo koreliacinės analizės rezultatai rodo, kad tų ryšių stiprumas priklauso nuo istorinių, socialinių ir apsauginių veiksnių. Kokybinė duomenų analizė rodo, kad stipriai neprisitaikiusių asmenų grupėje stiprėja priešiškus, įtarumas bei tendencija maištauti prieš nustatytą tvarką.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: jauni nusikaltėliai, rizikos veiksniai, socialinio funkcionavimo stiliai.