

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of the Liberal Arts

**INSTRUMENTALITY, REACTIVITY AND PSYCHOPATHY IN SEXUAL
OFFENSES AGAINST CHILDREN: AN EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS**

A Thesis in

Psychology

by

Aref Jabbour

© 2007 Aref Jabbour

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

August 2007

The thesis of Aref Jabbour was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Peter A. Arnett
Associate Professor of Psychology
Thesis Adviser
Chair of Committee

Sandra T. Azar
Professor of Psychology

Eric Silver
Associate Professor of Crime, Law, and Justice and Sociology

Richard J. Hazler
Professor of Counselor Education

Melvin M. Mark
Professor of Psychology
Interim Department Head

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

Even though past investigations have examined psychopathy in various types of sex offenders and examined some of the motivational components of sexual offenses, there remained a gap in the literature in measuring and understanding complex motives of child molestation. This investigation examined levels of psychopathy as well as instrumentality (or goal-directedness) and reactivity (or spontaneity/impulsivity) in a group of 54 incarcerated child molesters. Results confirmed hypothesized significantly elevated scores in child molesters, compared to a normative sample, on certain subscales of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI), namely *Machiavellian Egocentricity*, *Coldheartedness*, *Carefree Nonplanfulness*, *Blame Externalization*, and *Impulsive Nonconformity*. The majority of the index child molestations were designated as instrumental in nature, highlighting the goal-oriented nature of child sexual abuse. *Carefree Nonplanfulness* and *Stress Immunity* correlated significantly positively and negatively, respectively, with instrumentality/reactivity designations, and *Carefree Nonplanfulness* emerged as the only significant factor of psychopathy to differentiate instrumentality and reactivity. Post-hoc analyses involving intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters demonstrated that intrafamilial offenders had significantly higher scores on the *Coldheartedness* and *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscales. In those analyses, *Coldheartedness* emerged as the only significant factor to discriminate between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molestation. Treatment implications for child molesters and future research directions are further discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	vi
Acknowledgements.....	vii
Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
General Information on Sexual Offending.....	1
Child Molestation.....	4
Intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse.....	4
Theories of and Contributing Factors to Child Molestation.....	6
Deviant beliefs/desires and cognitive distortions.....	6
Sexual offenders' implicit theories.....	10
Empathy deficits.....	13
Pathways Model of sexual abuse.....	16
Psychopathy.....	19
Psychopathy and Sexual Offenders.....	21
Instrumentality, Reactivity and Psychopathy.....	26
Instrumentality and Reactivity in Sexual Offenses.....	28
The Present Investigation.....	32
Hypotheses.....	35
Chapter 2. METHOD.....	37
Participants.....	37
Measures.....	37
Shipley Institute of Living Scale.....	37
PPI.....	38
Instrumentality/Reactivity.....	42
Procedure.....	43
Analytic Strategy.....	44
Chapter 3. RESULTS.....	46
Validity Considerations.....	46
Analytic Strategy: Preliminary Analyses.....	47
Demographics.....	47
Group characteristics.....	47
Analytic Strategy: Hypothesis-Testing Analyses.....	48
Psychopathy levels.....	48
Instrumentality and reactivity ratings.....	48
Correlations.....	50
Discriminant function analyses.....	51
Analytic Strategy: Post-Hoc Analyses.....	51
Demographics.....	52
Group characteristics.....	52
Correlations.....	53
Discriminant function analyses.....	54

Chapter 4. DISCUSSION.....	55
Psychopathy Levels.....	56
PPI subscales.....	56
Instrumentality and Reactivity Ratings.....	59
Psychopathy and instrumentality/reactivity.....	60
Correlational Analyses.....	62
Discriminant Analyses.....	63
Intrafamilial and Extrafamilial Sexual Offending.....	63
Psychopathy levels.....	64
Discriminant analyses.....	66
Post-hoc Findings.....	66
Considerations of Non-significant Findings.....	67
Conclusions and Future Directions.....	68
Limitations.....	70
References.....	73
Appendix A: Personality Styles Inventory.....	94
Appendix B: Instrumental-Reactive Coding Scheme.....	106

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographic and Descriptive Data for Participants.....	81
Table 2: Frequency Data for Victims' Gender, Number of Index Offense Victims, and Total Number of Sexual Offenses.....	82
Table 3: Frequency Data for Total Number of Sexual Offense Victims and Total Number of Nonsexual Offenses.....	84
Table 4: Descriptive Data for PPI Total and Subscale Scores.....	85
Table 5: Distribution Data for Instrumentality and Reactivity Ratings.....	86
Table 6: Demographic and Descriptive Data for Purely Instrumental vs. Some Reactive Offenders.....	87
Table 7: Descriptive Data for PPI Total and Subscale Scores in Offenders with Purely Instrumental and Some Reactive crimes.....	88
Table 8: Demographic and Descriptive Data for Intrafamilial vs. Extrafamilial Offenders....	89
Table 9: Descriptive Data for PPI Total and Subscale Scores in Intrafamilial vs. Extrafamilial Offenders.....	90
Table 10: Correlations between WAIS-R IQ Estimate, Age at Testing, Total Number of Sexual Offenses, Total Number of Nonsexual Offenses Number of Victims in Index Offense, Ages Of Victims, and PPI Total and Subscale Scores.....	91
Table 11: Correlations between WAIS-R IQ Estimate, Age at Testing, Total Number of Sexual Offenses, Total Number of Nonsexual Offenses Number of Victims in Index Offense, Ages Of Victims, and PPI Total and Subscale Scores (cont.'d).....	92
Table 12: Correlations between PPI Total and Subscale Scores with Intrafamilial vs. Extrafamilial Offense Designations and Purely Instrumental vs. Some Reactive Offenses.....	93

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank several people who have guided and supported me throughout the process of completing my doctoral dissertation. Thanks to my adviser and dissertation chair, Dr. Peter Arnett. You have been consistently supportive and motivating in my quest to conduct my independent research with incarcerated individuals. You also provided just the right amount of feedback and advice to ensure I accomplish my tasks well and on time. Finally, thank you to Dr. Jack Walmer, who introduced me to the field of correctional psychology, and has been a supportive and informative mentor.

I would also like to thank my dissertation committing, consisting of Dr. Sandra Azar, Dr. Eric Silver, and Dr. Richard Hazler. You too have been very supportive and understanding of my quest to conduct my innovative research within an incarcerated sex offender population. Thanks, Sandy for asking the right questions, motivating me to approach various points in my study with fresh perspectives. Thank you Eric for providing your input connecting some of the loose ends of my study, and finally thank you Richard for bringing your expertise in working with this population and for requesting more comprehensive statistical approaches.

I also have to thank Jean Courter for her practical and administrative help. You are the puppet master that runs the machine that is the Psychology Department.

Thank you to my very good friend Desmond Oathes and my best man Brian Sharpless. My graduate school experience would not have been the same without our long conversations, frequent cinematic outings, and trials of various fine liquors. You are complex, intriguing, motivated and highly intelligent individuals. I will forever be fortunate to have you as friends.

The love and support of my parents, Kareem and Daad, and sister Nadine, provided me the reliable backdrop on which I could always depend throughout my life. Thank you for your emotional, monetary, and culinary support. I would also like to thank my aunt and godmother, Reda Riley and her husband Alan. You too have been part of the fabric of my supportive family backdrop.

Finally, and most meaningfully, I would like to thank my wife and love of my life, Sarah. I met you at the beginning of a transitional period in my life and in my graduate career. You have been a constant source of emotional, professional and personal inspiration. Your liveliness, complexity, intelligence and unparalleled beauty have been beacons guiding me through one of the most tumultuous periods of my life. I appreciate your constant perspective that everything will work out. That is a rare and unique characteristic that defines your strength of character and has illuminated my life.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

As some of the most psychologically and physically destructive antisocial acts (Flora, 2001), sexual offenses refer to criminal actions against another person to manipulate, coerce or force him/her into engaging in sexual acts, in the process of displaying anger, control, domination, hostility, power, as well as obtaining sexual gratification. Sexual offenses are crimes with inappropriate sexual behaviors, including touching, fondling, indecent exposure, and penetration, when one party does not or is incapable of giving informed consent, and can range from voyeurism to the sexual abuse of children. Most cultures possess some definitions of which sexual behaviors are inappropriate, unacceptable, illegal or immoral (Flora).

Past investigations have examined levels of psychopathy in various types of sex offenders (e.g. Porter, Fairweather, Drugge, Herve, Birt, and Boer, 2000), linked psychopathy to sexual violence (Porter et al., 2000; Woodworth and Porter, 2002) and examined some motivational components of sexual offenses (Van Ness, 1984; Brown & Forth, 1997; Smith, 2000). Nevertheless, there remains a significant gap in the literature in defining and understanding complex motives of sexual offending against children. The present investigation intends to assess levels of psychopathy in intra- and extrafamilial child molesters in a state correctional institution, and more importantly to examine the motivating components of sexual offenses against children, in terms of the instrumentality and reactivity constructs, as defined in Woodworth et al., 2002.

General Information on Sexual Offending

In the United States, laws designed to control dangerous sex offenders were initially passed as part of the government's efforts to define and preserve a common social morality

(Pratt, 1998). In turn, such efforts initially led to significant antagonism toward homosexual behavior, because social beliefs had linked homosexual conduct with pedophilia. After the government shifted its role of preserving sexual morality to preventing harm to others, sexual psychopath laws no longer targeted individuals involved in consensual homosexual behavior (Pratt).

Sexual crimes are gaining greater exposure and awareness in the United States, partly as a result of widespread legislative measures, exemplified by Megan's Law, as well as extensive and dramatized media coverage of the occurrence of sexual offenses, and the pursuit of sexual offenders (LaFond & Winick, 1998). Megan's Law was adopted initially in New Jersey then nationally in 1995, following the sexual assault and murder of a 7-year-old girl committed by three sexual offenders released from prison. Megan's Law requires all sexual offenders to register with local authorities and provide information regarding places of residence and employment. Nonspecific identifying information of sexual offenders is then available to the public.

Flora (2001) estimates that there are around 234,000 sexual offenders in some form of correctional care in the U.S. at any one time. Furthermore, since 1994, there has been a 15% annual growth rate of the number of persons sentenced for violent sexual assaults. Conservative estimates indicate that 1 in 8 males and 1 in 4 females report experiencing some form of sexual assault in childhood (Flora). On the other hand, anywhere between 10 to 25% of women report being victims of adulthood rape (Porter et al., 2000). Specifically, around 61% of sexually assaulted women were younger than 18 at the time of the rape, 30% were younger than 11, and about 80% knew the offender. Despite such sobering statistics, however, only about 16% of rape offenses are reported to the police (Flora).

Past efforts to predict the perpetrating of sexual offenses have been limited by undue reliance on individuals' historical variables, such as the pattern of past offenses. Individual offense histories cannot be used to decide if risk status has changed, but are more useful for establishing current risk status (Rice, Quinsey and Harris, 1991). Some of the established risk factors for *general* recidivism include youth, unstable employment, substance abuse, procriminal attitudes and association with other criminals. Nonsexual criminals *rarely* recidivate with sexual crimes, and whereas sexual offending is socially deviant, not all sexual offenders have deviant sexual interests.

In their meta-analysis of sexual offending recidivism studies, Hanson and Bussiere (1998) summarized that among sexual offenders, deviant sexual interests are prevalent among those who offended against strangers, used overt force, had male victims (in the case of child molesters), and whose victims were much younger or much older. Hanson et al. also reported that sexual offenders do not usually meet criteria for major mental illnesses, but do demonstrate signs of low self-esteem, substance abuse, and assertiveness deficits. These investigators highlighted the importance of examining empirically the relationship between psychological distress variables and sexual recidivism, as psychological distress variables have *not* been related to nonsexual recidivism (Hanson et al.).

Some of the more robust predictors of sexual offending include the presence of prior sexual offenses, diversity of sexual crimes, presence of male victims, having offended against strangers, and beginning to sexually offend at an early age (Hanson et al., 1998). In addition, Hanson et al. reported that the single strongest predictor of sexual offending is the presence of sexual interest in children, including phallometric sexual interest in boys, indicating that certain male offenders are sexually aroused by stimuli depicting boys. However, phallometric

sexual interest in rape was *not* related to sexual offending recidivism. Whereas failure to complete treatment was a moderate predictor of sexual offending recidivism, being sexually abused as a child was *not* related to an increased risk of sexual offending. Furthermore, the presence of personality disorders, specifically Antisocial Personality Disorder, was moderately related to committing sexual offending, whereas general psychological problems or substance abuse were not reliably related to sexual offending recidivism.

Child Molestation

The paraphilic focus of pedophilia involves sexual activity with a prepubescent child, usually age 13 or younger (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Whereas female-oriented child molesters have a reported average of 20 different victims, male-oriented child molesters have a reported average of 150 distinct victims. Such statistics, however, do not consider the number of actual pedophilic *acts* perpetrated against the victims. Flora (2001) explores other characteristics of sexual offenders and comments that many usually have multiple paraphilias, such as a particular fetish along with pedophilia. About 12 to 21% of sex offenders are college educated and many of them are fully employed. Interestingly, a significant proportion of sex offenders are in stable romantic relationships, but are unable to demonstrate the insight and judgment into the detrimental effects of their sexually abusive actions.

Intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse. In explaining some of the defining characteristics of child sexual abuse, Porter, Fairweather, Drugge, Herve, Birt and Boer (2000) assert that child molesters are specifically motivated by the sexual aspects of their offenses, and most of their crimes are sexually violent. They explain that intrafamilial sexual abuse involves someone from the child's family, living in the same household, including

parents, siblings, other blood relatives and step-parents. Extrafamilial sexual abuse, on the other hand, is perpetrated by persons outside of the family, such as strangers, teachers and family friends.

Fischer and McDonald (1998) investigated more than 1000 substantiated cases of child sexual abuse to examine any significant differences between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse. In relation to victim age, intrafamilial victims were found to be about 3 years younger than extrafamilial victims at the time of first sexual abuse, which the authors hypothesized was due to the greater access intrafamilial offenders have to younger children compared to older ones, who are more likely to be engaged in activities outside of the home. Furthermore, Fischer et al. found that boys were younger than girls by about 2 years when first abused by both intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders. The investigators also found no practical difference in the level of intrusion of intrafamilial and extrafamilial sexual abuse, with both types of sexual abuse including a wide range of acts from indecent exposure to anal penetration. With reference to sexual abuse duration, the investigators discovered that intrafamilial sexual abuse lasts longer and progresses more quickly; attributing the findings to greater victim access and a reluctance to disclose the abuse. Consequently, there appears to be mixed findings regarding intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse, which could be elucidated by examining underlying motivating factors to the abuse.

The findings of Fischer et al. (1998) also confirmed past results demonstrating that extrafamilial sexual abusers more often use physical and verbal force than intrafamilial abusers. The authors, however, qualify their findings by reporting that extrafamilial offenders usually *choose* older victims who may be able to defend themselves, and by reporting that intrafamilial offenders use an increasing amount of force against their victims 11 and older.

Finally, Fischer et al. did not find any differences between intrafamilial and extrafamilial sexual offenders in relation to victim gender preferences.

In a later investigation of men who molested their sexually immature daughters, Rice and Harris (2002) found that compared to extrafamilial offenders, intrafamilial offenders were less sexually deviant, in the sense that they had lower phallometric preferences for child stimuli. Furthermore, intrafamilial child molesters had lower psychopathy levels, were less likely to have had sexual intercourse with their victims, inflicted less victim injury, and had lower rates of violent and sexual recidivism. Within the intrafamilial offenders, Rice et al. compared offenders who abused their biological daughters with those who abused their stepdaughters, and found that the former group of offenders was older, inflicted less injury and had lower psychopathy scores. Interestingly, the investigators found that offenders who sexually abused children within *and* outside their families (*mixed* group) were the most sexually deviant, indicating that they displayed the highest levels of phallometric preferences for child stimuli, compared to exclusively intrafamilial or extrafamilial offenders. Rice et al. surmised that such individuals hold deviant sexual interests in children whom they perceive to be viable sexual partners, regardless of their familial connections.

Theories of and Contributing Factors to Child Molestation

Deviant beliefs/desires and cognitive distortions. One fundamental explanation for why adults initiate sexual contact with children is pedophilia, or a preference for sexually immature children. Rice et al. (2002) cited numerous studies indicating that men who have sexual contact with children exhibit clear and reliable differences in their psychosexual adjustment, compared to men who direct their sexual attention to adults (e.g. Quinsey, 1986; Quinsey & Lalumiere, 1996). Rice et al. also reported that compared to other men, those who

have sex with children display much more sexual interest in children when assessed psychophysically. In other words, laboratory measures of sexual arousal consistently reveal child molesters' large relative preference for sexual activity with children (Chaplin, Rice, & Harris, 1995; Harris & Rice, 1996; Harris, Rice, Quinsey, & Chaplin, 1996; as cited in Rice et al., 2002).

For example, in one investigation, Rice et al., (2002) found that all participants in their samples of intrafamilial child molesters who victimized their genetic daughters only, offenders who sexually abused their stepdaughters or adopted daughters, those who offended against intrafamilial and extrafamilial victims, and those who molested only extrafamilial victims demonstrated an overall preference for stimuli depicting children in sexual situations. The investigators concluded that father-daughter sexual contact occurs when a man has a sexual interest in female children, and confirmed existing findings that child molesters abusing children within and outside their families display deviant sexual interests, namely in children.

Stermac and Segal (1989) sought to examine the nature and extent of cognitive distortions of men who have had sexual contact with children. Stermac et al. hypothesized that such individuals are more likely permissive and accepting of such behaviors than others in various comparison groups. Cognitive distortions include such notions that children are informed individuals and can consent to or refuse sex with an adult; that children are not under pressure to have sex with an adult; that children want sexual contact with adults; that sexual contact between adults and children is not harmful unless force is used, and that prohibiting sexual contact between adults and children represents an arbitrary social restriction.

Stermac et al. (1989) developed several vignettes with various degrees of sexual contact between children and adults, as well as escalating intensities of responses from the child victims. Levels of sexual contact varied from touching, to rubbing genital area over clothing, to fondling and caressing, to genital contact, whereas, the levels of the child's responses ranged from smiling, to passive/no response, to crying with resistance. The investigators found that across levels of sexual contact with children and ranges of responses of the hypothetical victims, child molesters rated more benefits to the child than the comparison groups. More specifically, child molesters' designations of benefits of sexual contact to the children did not vary with the degree of sexual contact.

Compared to the other groups, child molesters also perceived greater complicity on the children's parts in the initiation of the sexual contacts. Consequently, Stermac et al. (1989) determined that child molesters attributed less responsibility to adults for the initiation of sexual contact with children. In light of such findings, Stermac et al. then highlighted the importance of considering the contributory impact of cognitive distortions in initiating and maintaining adult sexual contact with children.

In a more detailed investigation of child molesters' cognitive distortions contributing to their offending processes, Hanson, Gizzarelli, and Scott (1994) examined the attitudes of incest offenders compared to a group of male batterers and a group of men not seeking any treatment. The authors formulated the *Hanson Sex Attitudes Questionnaire*, a 47-item questionnaire in which respondents designated their levels of agreement or disagreement with statements within distinct sections including: sexual entitlement, sexy children, frustration, affairs, sex/affection confusion, and sexual harm. The investigators concluded that incest offenders were more likely to perceive children as sexually attractive and sexually motivated,

as well as to minimize the harm caused by sexual abuse of children, and finally to endorse attitudes supportive of male sexual entitlement. In turn, Hanson et al. concluded that elevated levels of sexual entitlement in intrafamilial sexual offenders support a consideration of some incest offenders as egocentric and uninhibited men who believe that their sexual impulses must be fulfilled. Consequently, in order to fulfill their sexual urges, such individuals may distort information in their surroundings to justify and perpetuate their sexually abusive attitudes and actions.

Gee, Devilly, and Ward (2004) reported data indicating that significant percentages of adult males in the general population reported sexual fantasies with young girls. Furthermore, the authors cited research (e.g. Looman, 1995) indicating that child molesters fantasize about children under the age of 12 more than rapists, who commit sexual offenses against individuals legally designated as adults or at and beyond the age of consent, and nonsexual offenders, and that such fantasies are usually preceded by negative affective states. Gee et al. also commented that child molesters reported experiencing higher frequencies of intimate and exploratory fantasies, than nonsexual offenders.

Along with reporting such findings, Gee et al. (2004) intended to catalog the content of sexual offenders' fantasies at various stages of the offending process. According to the authors, sexual offenders initially engaged in general sexual fantasies, before gradually moving into nonspecific offense fantasies, where they may fantasize about sexual activity with a potential victim. Finally, sexual offenders gradually begin engaging in offense-specific fantasies, where they imagine offending against their actual victim(s). Gee et al. purported that offense-specific fantasies can emerge during the actual offense, or at a later time. The emergence of offense-specific fantasies then marks the beginning of a relapse cycle into

reoffending, during which the offender is fantasizing in greater detail, intensity and scope about offending, eventually leading to an actual reoffense (Gee et al.).

Sexual offenders' implicit theories. Ward (2000) examined the transformation of sexual offenders' cognitive distortions into implicit theories perpetuating the offending process. Ward briefly explained that sexual offenders' cognitive distortions stem from underlying causal theories about the nature of their victims. Consequently, such implicit theories are utilized to explain people's actions and to make predictions about the world. For instance, many child molesters hold beliefs legitimizing sexual involvement with children, see children in sexual terms, as wanting sex, and as not being harmed by sexual contact with an adult.

Implicit theories are believed to emerge from sexual offenders' early developmental experiences, as attempts to explain events within the family and the broader environment. More specifically, implicit theories may have become adaptive during an offender's developmental history when the individual sought to explain and predict abusive behaviors perpetrated against him/her. For instance, an offender may have interpreted his/her sexual abuse as an expression of care and love by the perpetrator(s). When the individual becomes an adult, however, such an interpretation is no longer adaptive or protective in nature, but, in the absence of more constructive and protective developmental experiences, the individual may continue to construe sexual contact with children as an expression of care and affection. In other words, whereas such personal theories may have proven useful to predict the violent actions of others in the past, these implicit theories are likely to result in hostile attributions and aggressive behaviors toward others, in a safe interpersonal environment, without any interpersonal violence (Ward, 2000). Therefore, such actions then lead to further rejection

experiences and solidify the foundation for more resentment toward others, increasing the possibilities of reoffending.

Some sexual offenders' implicit theories may be differentiated based on the degree to which they focus on the offender, the victim, or the world. For instance a sexual offender may believe the world is uncontrollable and unalterable. Consequently, emotions, sexual feelings and events just happen to people, and they are unable to have any personal influence on the world. On the other hand, another sexual offender may believe that the world is a dangerous place, and that others are likely to be abusive and rejecting to attain their own goals. Therefore, children may be perceived as threatening or as having treated the offender unfairly, which may lead the individual to retaliate against perceived wrongs by sexually abusing certain children. In other words, child molesters may believe themselves to be incapable of direct retaliation or dominance over adults, within their perception of an uncontrollable, unalterable and dangerous world. They may believe, however, that children could meet their needs to be loved and cared for, and will never exploit or reject them (Ward, 2000).

In an earlier investigation of child molesters' implicit theories, Ward and Keenan (1999) detailed certain implicit theories that these sexual offenders are likely to hold. For instance, the belief in *children as sexual objects* purports that children are sexual beings, who are motivated by a desire for pleasure. Thus, claims that children often initiate sex and know what they want assume that they have sexual feelings and preferences, and that expressing such desires is both legitimate and beneficial. Another implicit theory includes the notion of *entitlement*, where sexual offenders believe they are entitled to special considerations, as well as that the victims are likely to enjoy their basic roles of satisfying the offenders' sexual and

emotional needs. Within this implicit theory, offenders do not believe in the presence of binding universal moral truths or rules; whatever is possible to get away with is by definition legitimate and acceptable.

Ward et al. (1999) described another implicit theory including the belief in a *dangerous world*, where individuals are likely to behave in abusive and rejecting manners to promote their own interests, and offenders may believe that they are incapable of direct retaliation or dominance over others. Consequently, the offender may believe that adults are unreliable, whereas children are more dependable, reliable, accepting and able to be trusted. Offenders may believe that children can meet their expectations for love and caring and put their needs before their own. Furthermore, they believe that children understand their sexual desires and are happy to satisfy them.

The implicit theory of *uncontrollability* considers the world as uncontrollable and unpredictable, with the belief that individuals do not have any influence over various events (Ward et al., 1999). Therefore, sexual desires are considered external to the offenders, leading them to believe they are not responsible for their sexually abusive behaviors, or even to blame the victims for their experience of deviant sexual desires. The final implicit theory considers the *nature of harm*, and includes two general beliefs: (a) there are degrees of harm and (b) sexual activity in itself is beneficial and unlikely to harm a person. Within this theory, offenders may believe that because the victim(s) may have been harmed more, but were not, they view themselves as having concern for the well-being of the victim(s). Furthermore, offenders may believe that sex is inherently a beneficial experience, and any distressing effects derive from various external factors, such as society's reactions, rather than from the sexual experience itself.

In discussing the implications of the various implicit theories, Ward et al. (1999) contend that such theories guide the interpretations that people make of others' actions, and play a major role in the development of maladaptive interpersonal strategies and goals. Relatedly, if a person possesses distorted theories about children, that individual will likely fail to develop effective intimacy and social skills, and may also struggle to understand how other people function. Consequently, dysfunctional implicit theories lead such individuals to perceive the world in an offense perpetuating manner.

Empathy deficits. Some investigators (e.g. Marshall & Maric, 1996) have asserted that empathy usually serves to inhibit aggressive behaviors, presumably because the recognition of distress in others elicits vicarious distress in the offender, leading to compassionate concern for the victim. In defining the construct of empathy, Marshall, Hudson, Jones, and Fernandez (1995) pointed to the multidimensional nature of the construct, consisting of: 1) emotion recognition; 2) perspective taking; 3) emotion replication; and 4) response decision. The lack of empathy has consistently been characterized as one of the core components of psychopathy (Cleckley, 1988; Hare, 1993; 1996), thereby highlighting the relevance of discussing this construct in investigating the interplay of psychopathy and the motives for sexual offending.

Marshall et al. (1995) purported that sexual offenders most likely possess difficulties in recognizing the emotional experiences of others, as well as adopting the perspectives of others, in the process of developing empathic reactions. Consequently, sexual offenders against children may consider children as quite different from themselves in various respects, and may be unable to take on the perspectives of their chosen victims. In a related fashion, sexual offenders also seem to have a relatively limited emotional range or difficulties in accurately labeling their own feelings.

Marshall et al. (1995) reported that sex offenders may not be deficient in empathy toward all people, but may have problems experiencing empathy toward nonspecific victims of sexual abuse, and/or especially their own specific victims. In fact, Marshall et al. cited a previous, unpublished, study, Marshall, Fernandez, Lightbody and O'Sullivan (1994), which demonstrated that child molesters were, relative to nonoffenders, significantly less able to identify the emotions of nonspecific victims of abuse, and noticeably deficient at identifying the emotions of their own victims. Furthermore, Marshall et al. (1995) reported that in their unpublished study, Marshall et al. (1994) found that child molesters did not experience the emotions that matched the distress of their own victims, but were able to replicate the distress of nonspecific victims of sexual abuse. Consequently, the investigators concluded that child molesters seem to possess deficits in the stages of perspective-taking and emotion replication of their empathy model.

Almost all treatment programs for sexual offenders include some component of empathy training, in which offenders attempt to learn to integrate the victims' perspectives of the offenses into their own, and to develop significant degrees of compassion and sympathy for the victims (Hanson, 2003). Hanson elaborated upon two components of empathy: (1) the cognitive component, referring to the ability to identify intellectually the emotions and experiences of others, and (2) the emotional component, including the ability to perceive others' emotions and mirror those affective responses. In a previous investigation, Marshall et al. (1996) concluded that child molesters were deficient in both the cognitive and emotional components of empathy, the absence of both becoming a critical feature in allowing such offenders to sexually abuse children.

In the process of victim-empathy training for sexual offenders, clinicians are usually interested in guiding offenders to develop feelings of compassion, caring, or genuine sympathy for their victims, in light of the idea that the perception of suffering in others should arouse caring (Hanson, 2003). Webster and Beech (2000) investigated the nature of child molesters' affective empathy by analyzing a series of victim apology letters the offenders were asked to construct. The investigators found that many of the offenders in their sample subtly demonstrated the desire to induce self-doubt in their victims in the process of accepting responsibility for their actions. Webster et al. then purported that such attempts to promote diminished responsibility represented a significant impediment to empathy for the offenders' victims.

Some of the most interesting findings of Webster et al. (2000) included the varying themes of the victims' apology letters written by either intrafamilial or extrafamilial offenders. Intrafamilial offenders were found to minimize their behaviors, overtly reinstate the relationship with their victims, and reassert interpersonal control. On the other hand, extrafamilial offenders were more likely to directly blame their victims and exhibit overtly explicit offense detail in their letters. Webster et al. concluded that their findings demonstrated that child molesters' empathy deficits are not homogeneous, and could vary according to offense type. This review of the literature on empathy deficits in child molesters points to the pivotal role that such deficits play in initiating and perpetuating sexually abusive behaviors against children. Child molesters characterized as psychopathic most likely have a prominent inability to empathize with their victims, leading such individuals to use victims for their personal gain, and abandon/discard victims when their own needs are met (Sandoval, Hancock, Poythress, Edens, & Lilienfeld, 2000).

Pathways Model of child sexual abuse. In their efforts to develop a comprehensive theory of child sexual abuse, Ward and Siegert (2002) emphasized the presence of four problem clusters or symptoms typically found in sexual offenders against children, including: emotional regulation problems, intimacy/social skill deficits, deviate sexual arousal, and cognitive distortions. The investigators also reported that differences between offenders rely on the pervasiveness, severity, and direction of these problem areas, rather than whether or not they are absent or present. Ward et al. (2002) then outlined five etiological pathways that could potentially lead to sexual offenses against children, perpetrated by adults.

The first pathway, *intimacy deficits*, includes individuals with normal sexual scripts or schemas, who only offend at specific times, if a preferred sexual partner is unavailable. The main cause of the sexual abuse of a child within this pathway resides in intimacy deficits, and loneliness leading to a need to engage in sexual activities with another person. Furthermore, insecure attachment and subsequent problems establishing satisfactory relationships comprise the central causal mechanism underlying this pathway. Offenders within this pathway will often expect intimate relationships with adults to be unsuccessful, and consequently develop maladaptive interpersonal strategies to avoid such an outcome. Connolly (2004) described alienation from others as a common characteristic for these offenders, yet they consistently demonstrated a need to please and seek approval. As a result, such individuals will transfer their needs for sex and closeness to children, because of the offenders' perception of acceptance from children.

The second etiological pathway, *deviant sexual scripts*, focuses on the degree of dysfunction in offenders' relationship schemas and attachment styles. Within this pathway, individuals are likely to have learned to seek reassurance through sex, and equate sex with

intimacy; therefore, sexual contact is usually initiated to achieve interpersonal closeness, and feelings of vulnerability are misinterpreted as indicating sexual need (Ward et al., 2002).

Offenders with this pathway history may choose children as sexual partners as a matter of opportunity and sexual and/or emotional need. In fact, the onset of sexual offending is related to extreme feelings of rejection, disappointment or extreme loneliness, with low self-esteem, sensitivity to rejection and a craving for love and approval also characteristics of such offenders. Connolly (2004) found that offenders within this pathway often came from large families, with many opportunities for sexual play and experimentation, resulting in deficient capacities in differentiating trusting from exploitative relationships, intimate from physical relationships, and appropriate from inappropriate sexual relationships.

Individuals within the third etiological pathway, *emotional dysregulation*, may display problems identifying emotions, modulating negative emotions, or an inability to utilize social supports in times of emotional distress (Ward et al., 2002). Others may have problems regulating their anger, and subsequently sexually abuse children as a means of punishing partners. Strong negative affective states could result in a loss of control, which combined with sexual desire, leads an individual to use a child opportunistically to meet his sexual needs. Individuals following this pathway offend due to an inability to manage negative emotions effectively, and either become disinhibited or use sex as a soothing strategy. Such offenders usually prefer sex with age appropriate partners, but will sexually abuse a child under certain circumstances.

In the fourth etiological pathway, *antisocial cognitions*, individuals possess normal sexual scripts, but hold general pro-criminal attitudes and beliefs, with their sexual offending reflecting a general antisocial tendency. Sexual abuse of children may be further facilitated

by the presence of patriarchal attitudes toward children, and offenders' sense of their superiority and entitlement of sexual gratification from any available source (Ward et al., 2002). Such individuals usually disregard social norms prohibiting sexual contact with children, and tend to exploit any opportunities for sexual gratification.

The final pathway, *multiple dysfunctional mechanisms*, includes individuals who have developed distorted sexual scripts, and possess pronounced flaws in all other psychological mechanisms, such as emotional regulation, intimacy/social skills, deviant sexual arousal, and distorted cognitions. Individuals following this pathway likely exhibit several offense-related deficits, and comprise the group of "pure" pedophiles (Ward et al., 2002). Such offenders tend to idealize relationships, and maintain dysfunctional and destructive beliefs about children's sexuality and children's capacity for informed decision-making (Connolly, 2004). Offenders within this pathway will usually have intimacy difficulties within adult relationships, rendering them unable to relate to other adults in ways that build and maintain mature and stable adult relationships. Furthermore, their beliefs in the legitimacy and benefits of their abuse of children may have positive effects on their self-esteem.

An overview of the multitude of factors contributing to the incidence of child sexual abuse emphasizes the complex mix of characteristics and events leading some individuals to sexually offend against children. Ward et al. (2002) and Connolly (2004) highlight the importance of biological factors (e.g. sex drive and sexual impulsivity), along with social and cultural factors (such as sexual socialization and early sexual experiences) that transpire within the context of a potential offender's learning history. Furthermore, constraints and opportunities available within the person's life course interact with such mechanisms as deviant sexual arousal, intimacy deficits, emotion regulation difficulties and cognitive \

distortions, and a person's own pattern of vulnerability, leading to the potential incidence of inappropriate sexual contact with children.

Psychopathy

The construct of psychopathy describes a stable personality structure incorporating both antisocial behaviors as well as various antisocial personality traits, such as egocentricity, impulsivity, irresponsibility, shallow emotions, lack of empathy, guilt or remorse, manipulateness, pathological lying, and persistent violation of social norms. The *combination* of profound affective deficits and lack of respect for others and societal rules (Hare, 1996; Cleckley, 1988) serves to differentiate this construct from Antisocial Personality Disorder, which focuses more on antisocial behaviors. Psychopathic individuals comprise approximately 15-25% of all incarcerated individuals (Hare, 1993), and around 1% of the general population, but are responsible for a vastly disproportionate number of crimes.

The amalgamation of core antisocial personality traits as well as strong antisocial behavioral tendencies renders psychopathic individuals more likely to begin committing crimes at younger ages and to commit a variety of crimes (Hare & McPherson, 1984; Kosson, Smith, & Newman, 1990), including violent crimes (Forth, Hart, & Hare, 1990). Criminal psychopathic individuals are also more likely than nonpsychopathic offenders to engage in institutional crimes and to re-offend sooner, more often and more violently while on conditional release (Hare, 1998; Hart & Hare, 1997; Hart, Kropp, & Hare, 1988; Hemphill, Hare, & Won, 1998; Porter, Birt, & Boer, 2001; Serin, 1991). Whereas there appears to be a sharp decline in criminality around age 35-40 in many psychopathic individuals, the propensity to engage in *violent* and *aggressive* crimes decreases very little with age (Harris, Rice, & Cormier, 1991). Furthermore, the construct of psychopathy has been demonstrated to

be a robust and incrementally valid predictor of violence and violent recidivism, above and beyond the contributions of actuarial predictors of violence and recidivism (Hare, 1998; Harris et al., 1991).

To date, one of the most valid and reliable assessment tools for the construct of psychopathy is the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R) (Hare, 1991). Through the combination of a semistructured interview with an inmate as well as the careful review of prison documents for each inmate for corroborative information, each individual receives a score on two distinct factors within the checklist. Factor 1 assesses the presence of the core antisocial personality traits, such as the ability to manipulate others, callousness, lack of empathy and pathological lying. It is related to risk for recidivism and violence, and negatively correlated with self-report measures of empathy and anxiety. On the other hand, Factor 2 assesses the degree of involvement in impulsive and antisocial behaviors, focusing on the presence of poor behavioral controls, early behavioral problems, criminal versatility, and need for stimulation, and is related to criminal and antisocial behaviors, as well as substance abuse.

One of the potential limitations of the PCL-R is that it is both time and resource intensive, usually requiring upward of two hours for the clinical interview, and an equivalent amount, if not more, for the corroborative file reviews. Previous researchers (Hart, Hare, and Forth, 1994; Benning, Patrick, Hicks, Blonigen, and Krueger, 2003) have warned against the use of self-report measures of psychopathy, commenting that they may be susceptible to response biases and may not adequately measure the interpersonal and affective facets of the disorder. Lilienfeld and Andrews (1996), however, formulated the Psychopathic Personality Inventory (PPI) as a comprehensive self-report measure of psychopathic features, intended to

assess mainly the affective-interpersonal facet, but also tap into the antisocial behavior component of psychopathy.

Poythress, Edens, and Lilienfeld (1998) emphasized that the PPI differs from previous self-report psychopathy measures in a variety of ways. First, all of the PPI items focus on personality traits characteristic of psychopathy, in contrast to almost all self-report psychopathy measures, which include items assessing antisocial behaviors. Second, respondents to the PPI may be less likely to dissimulate, because the measure was intended to be sensitive enough to capture psychopathic features in noncorrectional populations. Third, the PPI contains validity scales designed to identify individuals who attempt to malingering or who respond inconsistently. Fourth, the PPI consists of eight factor-analytically derived subscales, which could enable researchers to examine correlates of the various facets of psychopathy. Some limitations of the PPI include that it is not as comprehensive as the PCL-R in assessing both psychopathic personality traits and behavioral characteristics, and could be subject to participant response biases, especially in incarcerated populations. Despite these limitations, given its advantages over the PCL-R in terms of ease of use and other advantages detailed above, the PPI will be used to assess psychopathy for the proposed study.

Psychopathy and Sexual Offenders

Several investigations have pointed to the great value of considering characteristics of psychopathy, such as criminal versatility, impulsivity, degree of empathy and victim types, in understanding various components of sexual offending, (Porter, Campbell, Woodworth, & Birt, 2003). A central feature of psychopathy is a profound affective deficit along with lack of respect for the rights of others and social rules. Psychopathic individuals tend to lack the emotional resources (i.e. most significantly empathy) that would usually prevent a person

from forcefully satisfying a deviant sexual urge or impulse. Psychopathy levels have proven very valuable in predicting sexual and violent recidivism among rapists and child molesters (Quinsey, Rice, & Harris, 1995). Quinsey et al. found that psychopathy significantly predicted sexual and violent recidivism within a sample of 178 incarcerated rapists and child molesters, with $r = .23$ between PCL-R-defined psychopathy and sexual recidivism, and $r = .33$ between psychopathy and violent recidivism.

Seto and Barbaree (1999) examined the interplay of psychopathy levels, treatment behavior, as well as recidivism among 283 sex offenders. The examiners assessed treatment behavior by considering such factors as attendance, level of participation, changes in victim empathy and quality of relapse prevention plans. In relation to psychopathy levels among different types of sex offenders, Seto et al. found that rapists were 3 times more likely to be classified as psychopathic, compared to intra- and extrafamilial child molesters. Furthermore, the investigators found that treatment behavior as well as psychopathy levels predicted serious recidivism. More importantly, offenders who were psychopathic and demonstrated positive treatment behaviors were five times *more* likely to commit a serious reoffense, after parole. Such findings highlight the integral part that psychopathy levels can play in assessing characteristics of sexual offenders, and predicting the likelihood of their reoffending seriously.

Despite the potential benefit of considering the role of psychopathy in investigating sexual offenses, only a few studies have investigated the relationship between psychopathy and sexual offending. For instance, Serin, Malcolm, Khanna and Barbaree (1994) sought to investigate the incidence of psychopathy in different types of sexual offenders, and to assess the relationship between a phallometric measure of sexual arousal and PCL-R-defined

psychopathy. Serin et al. found a significant, positive correlation of .37 between psychopathy and deviant sexual arousal in child molesters, including extrafamilial and incest offenders. The investigators also concluded that clinicians should consider psychopathy levels in assessing sexual offenders, and recidivism risk, as well as in determining the appropriate supervision requirements after release.

Brown and Forth (1997) investigated the relationship between psychopathy and the various subtypes of rapists, as classified by the Massachusetts Treatment Center: Rapist Typology 3; MTC:R3 (Knight & Prentky, 1990). The MTC:R3 includes nine distinct rapist subtypes differentiated on the bases of the meaning of aggression used in offending (instrumental vs. expressive), the motivations for offending (sexual, opportunistic, or anger), and the level of lifestyle impulsivity—criminality of offenders.

Brown et al. (1997) concluded that psychopathic individuals were twice as likely as nonpsychopathic participants to be classified as opportunistic and pervasively angry rapists. Furthermore, psychopathy was positively related to past nonsexual offenses, and negatively related to age of onset of criminal offending, number of sexual victims and intensity of negative emotions experienced before sexual offending. In this population of psychopathic and nonpsychopathic rapists, however, levels of psychopathy were not related to sexual offense history and age of onset of sexual offending. Such findings were deemed as consistent with the perception that rapes committed by psychopathic individuals represent an extension of a pre-existing diverse pattern of criminal offending, that includes a variety of criminal behaviors outside of sexual offending. Consequently, psychopathic individuals who commit rapes may not be motivated by the sexual gratification of forced sexual contact, but may have other motives or goal-directed factors leading to the sexual offense. In other words,

psychopathic individuals who rape may do so in the process of achieving other goals or committing other crimes, such as robbery, burglary, or obtaining drugs.

In a more recent and direct investigation of the levels of psychopathy in different types of sexual offenders, Porter et al. (2000) examined the incidence of PCL-R-defined psychopathy in extra- and intrafamilial molesters as well as rapists. Porter et al. found 6% of extrafamilial child molesters to be psychopathic, compared to 11% of intrafamilial molesters, and 36% of rapists. Consistent with previous findings (e.g. Seto et al., 1999), the investigators found higher PCL-R scores among rapists compared to both groups of child molesters. In relation to Factor 1 (interpersonal/affective component) differences, child molesters and rapists had similar scores. On the other hand, rapists had higher Factor 2 (antisocial behaviors/lifestyle component) scores than the child molesters.

To examine the interplay of psychopathic characteristics among the various sexual offenders, Porter et al. (2000) examined the correlations between the two factors of psychopathy within each offender group. Factors 1 and Factor 2 were not correlated in either of the child molester groups, but were significantly correlated within the rapist group. Consequently, Porter et al. highlighted the presence of an unclear relationship between child molesting and psychopathy. The investigators did point out that many child molesters in their sample scored high on Factor 1, raising the hypothesis that such psychopathic personality traits as callousness, manipulateness and lack of empathy in child molesters may be manifested mainly through sexual offending. Furthermore, Porter et al. asserted that, consistent with clinical observations and the lack of significantly elevated Factor 2 scores, child molesters seem to maintain relatively “normal” lifestyles while preying on children; a

theory reiterated by Rice et al. (2002) when discussing their findings of lower psychopathy scores in their samples of child molesters.

Finally, Porter et al. (2003) authored a chapter describing a psychological conceptualization of individuals who could be classified as sexual psychopaths. According to the authors, sexually psychopathic individuals, similar to other psychopathic persons, lack empathy or remorse for their actions, are motivated by thrill and sensation seeking, and not necessarily anger (or some paraphilia). Porter et al. confirmed previous investigators' (e.g. Seto et al., 1999; Porter et al. 2000) hypotheses concerning differences in the motivations of child molesters and rapists, reporting that child molesters are often motivated by deviant sexual preferences, with crimes focused around sexual themes; whereas rapists were motivated by anger, and are more likely to have extensive offense histories excluding sexual offenses.

In discussing the interplay of psychopathy and sexual violence, Porter et al. (2003) emphasized that psychopathy predicts violent and sexual recidivism in rapists and child molesters. Child molesting, however, is less clearly related to psychopathy, with child molesters being more "specialized" offenders focused on satisfying their deviant sexual desires. On the other hand, more rapists are psychopathic as a result of their varied/versatile criminal lifestyles, excluding their sexual offenses. Porter et al. concluded by describing the importance of validating the construct of psychopathic sexual offender, or sexual psychopath, describing an important first step as the detailed investigation of the *motivation* for sexual offending behavior in psychopathic and nonpsychopathic offenders.

Instrumentality, Reactivity and Psychopathy

Cornell, Warren, Hawk, Stafford, Oram, & Pine (1996) attempted to differentiate violent offenders who commit goal-directed and instrumental acts of aggression from those who commit acts of reactive aggression by investigating the role of psychopathy levels in the types of crimes committed. The investigators defined instrumental offenders as individuals motivated to commit violent crimes for clearly identifiable purposes other than to responding to provocation or frustration; on the other hand, reactive offenders were those who committed violent crimes consistently in reaction to disputes of interpersonal reactions with the victims. Furthermore, the instrumentality and reactivity of crimes were rated on the dimensions of *planning, goal-directedness, provocation, anger, victim injury, and victim relationship*. Cornell et al. (1996) found that PCL-R-defined psychopathic individuals were more likely to have committed instrumental violence than nonpsychopathic individuals, and instrumental violent offenders were more psychopathic than reactive or nonviolent offenders. Additionally, instrumental violence was most commonly related to self-reported lack of arousal or anger during the offense, and the victims of instrumental violence were typically strangers.

In a similar investigation, Woodworth et al. (2002) examined the characteristics of criminal homicides as a function of psychopathy. After reviewing the institutional records of their participants, the investigators rated homicides on the degree of instrumentality and reactivity. The investigators defined *purely reactive* homicides as those with strong evidence for high levels of spontaneity/impulsivity and a lack of planning surrounding the commission of the offense. Additionally, *reactive/instrumental* homicides included those where the homicide was unplanned/reactive with a secondary instrumental, opportunistic component,

such as when a perpetrator reactively or impulsively murders a victim then proceeds to rob them as well. *Instrumental/reactive* homicides include those in which a perpetrator committed a crime for an obvious external, opportunistic gain, such as in a robbery, and the homicide occurred as a reaction to unplanned events in the context of the crime. Finally, *purely instrumental* homicides were defined as those which were intentional, premeditated, motivated by clear external goals, such as drugs, money, sex or revenge, and not immediately following a strong affective reaction.

Woodworth et al. (2002) found that the majority of psychopathic individuals were much more likely than nonpsychopathic individuals to commit instrumental or cold-blooded homicides, which were goal-directed and not precipitated by intense emotional arousal. On the other hand, nonpsychopathic individuals were more likely to have committed their homicides reactively—i.e. impulsively and under intense emotional arousal. More specifically, Woodworth et al. found that Factor 1 levels (interpersonal/affective traits) of psychopathy played a significant role in predicting instrumentality in the crime, compared to Factor 2 levels (antisocial behaviors). In relation to the specific motives for instrumental violence, Woodworth et al. found that about 20% of the homicides were committed to obtain nonconsensual sex, 30% for revenge or retribution, 22% for monetary gain, 11% in a conflict over a female, 3% for drugs/alcohol, and about 6% for other reasons.

In discussing the implications of their findings, Woodworth et al. (2002) reported that future investigations could explore consistencies (or inconsistencies) between offenders' primary motivations (instrumental or reactive) for previous violent acts and motivations for current offenses, to help formulate a pattern of offending motivations. The investigators also emphasized that future research could attempt to generalize their results to other criminal

offenses. The investigations of Cornell et al. (1996) and Woodworth and Porter (2002), therefore, point to some distinct differences in the nature of violent crimes (instrumental vs. reactive) that incarcerated psychopathic and nonpsychopathic individuals are likely to commit. Consequently, the designation of instrumentality and/or reactivity of certain violent offenses may provide valuable information in explaining offending patterns, predicting likelihood of future offenses, and directing the goals of therapeutic interventions.

Instrumentality and Reactivity in Sexual Offenses

In light of investigations examining levels of psychopathy among various types of sexual offenders, and the influence of psychopathy levels on motivations (instrumental or reactive) for violent crimes, one logical extension could be to investigate instrumentality and reactivity in sexual offending. In an early investigation of precipitating factors to sexual offenses, specifically rapes, Van Ness (1984) examined whether the act of rape is precipitated by rage or similar powerful feelings, or if it involves a more instrumental character, in youth offenders. Van Ness concluded that all of the incidents investigated involved rapes committed during the course of other crimes (burglary or robbery), or perpetrated within a few hours of becoming aroused/angered by fights with others. Eighty percent of the rapists in the sample had a longstanding history of other violent behaviors, consistent with the conceptualization that rapists usually engage in a variety of antisocial behaviors.

Van Ness (1984) concluded that rape is an instrumentally violent act, and speculated that it could be potentially rewarding to the perpetrator in at least 8 ways: (1) to gain attention from others; (2) to deny or avoid accountability for one's actions; (3) to force property from others; (4) to gain control of situations; (5) to coerce others into doing things against their will; (6) to insult, threaten or demean the social status of another person; (7) to appear

powerful to an audience; and (8) to increase distance between oneself and others. Finally, considering the finding that many of the rapes investigated in this study were committed during the course of other crimes, an *instrumental/reactive* description of such rapes may serve useful in understanding the motivations of the perpetrators, and in informing potential treatment measures.

In a detailed investigation of factors for discriminating among rapists, Prentky and Knight (1991) highlighted the utility of differentiating instrumental and expressive aggression during the commission of rapes. Instrumental aggression, usually characteristic of most acquaintance rapes, was defined as that limited to the amount of aggression necessary to gain victim compliance. A display of anger is relatively absent, except in the process of suppressing victim resistance. On the other hand, in expressive aggression during rape, the sexual component of the sexual assault is secondary to or is in the service of hurting or humiliating the victim. The offender's behaviors are intended to injure, abuse, and degrade the victim.

Prentky et al. (1991) emphasized that the amount and quality of aggression expressed during sexual assaults is highly variable, and that the construct of aggression is not unidimensional. The authors further purported that in some acts of rape, the perpetrators may not be sexually motivated, but more instrumentally driven to demean, humiliate, or injure the victim. On the other hand, certain rapes may be committed by individuals who are more pervasively angry, with the sexual offenses reflecting reactive and random violence directed at whoever gets in the way of the perpetrator at the wrong time. Prentky et al. then concluded by emphasizing the advantages of future investigations assessing the motivational foundations for sexual offenses. The elucidation of motivational factors of sexual offenses should provide

valuable information on the true reasons why certain individuals sexually offend, which, in turn, could help prevent the incidence of such crimes, and further direct the treatment of the offenders.

More recently, Smallbone and Milne (2000) examined possible relations between trait anger and the type (instrumental or expressive) and level of aggression used in the commission of sexual offenses. Initially, Smallbone et al. reviewed evidence indicating that intrafamilial child molesters used more physical and verbal intimidation than extrafamilial molesters, but that the majority of sexual offenses against children did not result in physical injury. On the other hand, the authors reported that rapists tend to use more physical and verbal aggression in the commission of their sexual offenses.

In a similar discussion as that in Prentky et al. (1991), Smallbone et al. (2000) defined instrumental sexual aggression as incentive-motivated, and contingent on potential rewards, while not mediated by anger. On the other hand, expressive sexual aggression was defined as involving subjective anger, and instigated by perceived verbal or physical provocation, while likely mediated by anger. Their initial findings included some interesting results, such as the fact that intrafamilial molesters were least likely to have prior convictions for nonsexual offenses, and that 72% of rapists used verbal aggression against their victims compared to 20% of intrafamilial and 23% of extrafamilial molesters. In relation to physical aggression, intrafamilial molesters were the least likely to physically injure their victims, and rapists the most likely.

The association between trait anger and level of verbal aggression reported by Smallbone et al. (2000) indicated that sexual offenders who verbally threaten their victims in the commission of their offenses may be more likely to perceive situations as anger-provoking

and react angrily, than those offenders who do not overtly threaten their victims. In other words, once angered, verbally aggressive offenders may be more likely to express their anger outwardly, potentially through sexual abuse, and less likely to control their anger, compared to less verbally threatening offenders. The authors then purported that sexual offenders who are verbally aggressive in their offending may benefit from anger management interventions, designed to reduce expressive aggression. Finally, the authors concluded by warning against assuming unequivocally that all forms of sexual offending constitute aggressive behaviors. Such assumptions, Smallbone et al. contend, could lead to significant failures in identifying and distinguishing the extent of motivating factors in the commission of sexual offenses.

Using the classification scheme in the Massachusetts Treatment Center Rapist Typology Version 3 (MTC:R3; Knight et al., 1990), Smith (2000) categorized rapists into various motivational groups. The motivational descriptions provided in that paper could be reformulated within the instrumental and reactive paradigms for motivations of violent crimes, initially discussed in Woodworth et al. (2002). For instance, Smith described one perpetrator who in the process of burglarizing a house, was disturbed by the female owner and impulsively raped her. Such a sexual offense, could in turn be classified as *instrumental/reactive*, since the initial aim of the perpetrator was to rob the victim (instrumental component), but committed rape in reaction to being interrupted (reactive component).

Smith (2000) described another individual with a longstanding history of poor anger control and violence against men, who following an argument with a shopkeeper, encountered a pregnant woman, threatened her with a knife and attempted to rape her before being stopped by witnesses. This perpetrator's attempted rape and severe physical abuse of the victim could

be classified as *purely reactive*, considering the high level of spontaneity/impulsivity and a lack of planning surrounding the commission of the offense. Finally, Smith describes the case of another perpetrator with a history of low self-esteem and longstanding feelings of sexual frustration who went to a park, watched for any woman who appeared attractive to him and grabbed and attempted to rape her. Considering this individual's premeditated action, motivated by a clear external goal, in this case sex, not immediately following a strong affective reaction, his actions could be classified as *purely instrumental*.

The results of various investigations suggest the presence of a complex interplay of motivations for various sexual offenses. For instance, it seems as though rapists, who possess elevated scores across both PCL-R factors, may not be driven by intense emotional reactions to commit their crimes, and may be motivated by more opportunistic and instrumental goals, which may be non-sexual (e.g. Van Ness, 1984; Prentky et al., 1991; Smith, 2000; Smallbone et al., 2000). Furthermore, rapists with elevated scores on both PCL-R factors are more likely to reoffend overall, and not just sexually. In discussing implications of attitudes of incest offenders, Hanson et al. (1994) asserted that beliefs of sexual entitlement in these individuals may lead them to become opportunistic offenders who sexually abuse, especially if they perceived children as interested in and not harmed by sex with adults. Nevertheless, despite these emerging findings of instrumental and reactive components of sexual offenses, there have been no significant investigations examining such motivational factors of sexual offenses against children.

The Present Investigation

Even though investigations to date have examined levels of psychopathy in various types of sex offenders (e.g. Porter et al., 2000), linked psychopathy to sexual violence (Porter

et al., 2000; Woodworth et al., 2002), and examined some motives of sexual offenses (Van Ness, 1984; Brown & Forth, 1997; Smith, 2000), there remains a gap in the literature in investigating and understanding complex motives of sexual offending against children. Child molesters have been shown to possess elevated scores on Factor 1 (interpersonal/affective deficits), and relatively lower scores on Factor 2 (chronic antisocial lifestyle) (Porter et al., 2000), implying the presence of varied findings on the levels of psychopathy, and the breakdown of psychopathic characteristics within child molesters. To contribute to the assessment and especially the treatment of child molesters, and to further investigate levels of psychopathy in this population, an important direction for research in this area could be to elucidate motivations for the commission of these sexual offenses; a direction for research also emphasized in Porter et al. (2003).

The central purposes of the proposed investigation were to assess levels of psychopathy in intra- and extrafamilial child molesters in a state correctional institution, and more importantly, to examine the levels of instrumentality and reactivity of their index sexual offenses against children. Within the context of sexual offenses against children, instrumentality involves to the presence of planning and goal-directedness without emotional conflict, whereas reactivity entails spontaneity, impulsivity, emotional conflict, leading to sexual arousal which is then acted upon. Ratings of instrumentality, reactivity and psychopathy of child molesters could provide important information regarding the motivations for sexual offending in psychopathic and nonpsychopathic offenders. Considering the varied findings of psychopathy levels in child molesters, this investigation intended to shed further light on levels of this construct within this population. The assessment of instrumentality and reactivity in the child molester population, using

procedures outlined in Woodworth et al., (2002), could also contribute to the reliability and cross validation of these constructs.

Findings of this investigation may greatly inform efforts to manage and treat child molesters in prison and community settings. As mentioned in Woodworth et al. (2002), consideration of psychopathy and type of violence (instrumental or reactive) would be necessary in terms of treatment planning in the prison setting. For instance, if a nonpsychopathic child molester's crimes were classified as primarily reactive in nature, then psychotherapeutic interventions for that individual could be focused on providing him with coping skills to express and process negative experiences constructively, without engaging in sexual offenses to relieve tension, effect punishment, or as a reaction to intense emotional turmoil. Group and individual psychotherapy for such individuals could then be focused on providing them with various social skills, emotional identification and expression skills, distress tolerance techniques, and anger management skills.

On the other hand, if a psychopathic child molester's crimes were classified as primarily instrumental in nature, then intervention measures could be focused less on providing skills to deal with negative emotional experiences and directed more towards such measures as empathy training, morality awareness, and cognitive restructuring of situations which they deem as presenting them with opportunities to achieve their goals, including sexual gratification. Furthermore, psychotherapy could address the channeling of goal-directed and instrumental urges toward more appropriate and less destructive channels, besides forced sex.

The information regarding psychopathy levels in sexual offenders who target children, as well as the methodological classification of instrumentality and reactivity of sex offenses

against children obtained from this investigation, may contribute significantly to ongoing efforts to elucidate motivations for sexual offending. Consequently, more information available regarding the motivating factors to sexual offending against children, including psychopathy levels, could further contribute to the effective management and treatment of these individuals. Then with effective treatment and management techniques, informed by knowledge of the motivations of child molesters (i.e. instrumental vs. reactive), and psychopathy levels, we should be able to make important strides in curbing the devastating effects of sexual offenses against children.

Hypotheses

(1) Sexual offenders against children were hypothesized to have relatively elevated PPI total scores, compared to established norms. Such a finding could lend further credence to the contention that child molesters possess certain interpersonal/affective traits facilitating their commission of sexual offenses against children (see Porter et al., 2000).

(2) Sexual offenders against children will have elevated scores on the *Machiavellian Egocentricity*, *Coldheartedness*, *Social Potency*, *Carefree Nonplanfulness*, *Blame Externalization*, and *Impulsive Nonconformity* subscales of the PPI. These subscales tap personality characteristics that have been described in the sexual offending cycle, such as selfishness, acting without guilt, and rationalization and externalizing blame. The *Machiavellian Egocentricity*, *Coldheartedness*, *Social Potency* and *Impulsive Nonconformity* subscales are significantly correlated to Factor 1 (psychopathic personality traits) of the PCL-R, with $r = .56$, $r = .37$, $r = .37$ and $r = .31$, respectively (Poythress et al., 1998). The *Carefree Nonplanfulness* and *Blame Externalization* subscales were only moderately but not significantly related to the PCL-R Factor 1 (Poythress et al.). Consequently, considering cited

evidence of elevated Factor 1 scores in child molesters, and its positive correlation with four of the subscales discussed above, child molesters could then demonstrate elevated scores on these PPI subscales, and from a theoretical standpoint, to the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* and *Blame Externalization* subscales.

(3) Most of the index offenses of child molesters were hypothesized to be *instrumental* or *instrumental/reactive*, because these individuals are likely to have sought to achieve the goal of obtaining sexual gratification from their victims.

(4) Sexual offenders against children who are determined to have committed *instrumental* sexual offenses were hypothesized to have higher total psychopathy scores, than individuals who committed *reactive* offenses. Individuals who committed *instrumental/reactive* sexual offenses were hypothesized to have higher total psychopathy scores than individuals who committed *reactive/instrumental* offenses.

(5) Total psychopathy levels were hypothesized to be significantly positively correlated to instrumentality/reactivity ratings, with higher correlations between total PPI scores and offenses classified as *instrumental* or *instrumental/reactive* in nature.

(6) The PPI total scores were hypothesized to be able to accurately discriminate between sexual offenses that are *purely instrumental* or *purely reactive* in nature.

CHAPTER 2

Method

Participants

A total of 70 child molesters were initially identified and approached regarding participation; however, this investigation obtained data from 54 incarcerated child molesters, at the State Correctional Institution at Rockview, in Bellefonte, Pennsylvania. With the obtained consent of inmates to participate in the study, the principal investigator reviewed criminal records of the sex offenders and identified individuals who have committed sexual offenses against children, in line with descriptions provided by Porter et al. (2000). Demographic information pertaining to date of birth, sex, race and marital status were also gathered.

Measures

Shipley Institute of Living Scale. Estimates of IQ were gleaned using the Shipley Institute of Living Scale (SILS; Zachary, 1986). The SILS is a self-report measure of overall intellectual functioning, consisting of two subtests. The Vocabulary subtest instructs individuals to choose among four words the one that means the same thing as a first word; whereas the Abstraction subtest instructs participants to complete items by filling numbers or letters to complete various patterns. The Vocabulary subtest is a general measure of crystallized intelligence, or an individual's knowledge base, whereas the Abstraction subtest taps a person's problem solving and abstract thinking skills. Weiss and Schell (1991) reported the correlation between estimates of the WAIS-R IQ scores based on the procedure for the SILS and obtained WAIS-R scores to be .86. The SILS was included to provide a general assessment of participants' intellectual functioning, mainly to rule out any significant

differences in IQ between participant groups which could have influenced the obtained results.

PPI. The Psychopathic Personality Inventory is a 187-item questionnaire, in which respondents rate themselves on each item on a four-point scale (1 = false, 2 = mostly false, 3 = mostly true, 4 = true). The PPI yields a total score for psychopathy, as well as for eight-factor analytically derived subscales, measuring different facets of psychopathy (Poythress et al., 1998):

1. Machiavellian Egocentricity, 30 items (e.g. “I always look out for my own interests before worrying about those of the other guy” [True]), assesses narcissistic and ruthless attitudes in interpersonal functioning.
2. Social Potency, 24 items (e.g. “Even when others are upset with me, I can usually win them over with my charm” [True]), assesses one’s perceived ability to influence and manipulate others.
3. Coldheartedness, 21 items (e.g. “I have had ‘crushes’ on people that were so intense that they were painful” [False]), measures a tendency toward callousness, guiltlessness, and unsentimentality.
4. Carefree Nonplanfulness, 20 items (e.g. “I often make the same errors in judgment over and over again” [True]), assesses an attitude of indifference in planning one’s actions.
5. Fearlessness, 19 items (e.g. “Making a parachute jump would really frighten me” [False]), assesses the absence of anticipatory anxiety concerning harm, and a willingness to participate in risky activities.

6. Blame Externalization, 18 items (e.g. “I usually feel that people give me the credit I deserve” [False]), measures a tendency to blame others for one’s problems and to rationalize one’s misbehavior
7. Impulsive Nonconformity, 17 items (e.g. “I sometimes question authority figures ‘just for the hell of it’” [True]), assesses a reckless lack of concern regarding social mores.
8. Stress Immunity, 11 items (e.g. “I can remain calm in situations that would make many other people panic” [True]), measures an absence of significant reactions to anxiety-provoking events.

The PPI also includes three validity scales designed to measure the incidence of various response sets. The Unlikely Virtues Scale (Tellegen, 1982; as cited in Poythress et al., 1998) consists of 14 items and is a measure of impression management. Deviant Responding contains 10 items that seem bizarre (e.g. “When I am under stress, I often see large, red, rectangular shapes moving in front of my eyes”), but are not indicative of known psychopathology. Consequently, this scale is designed to detect individuals who are malingering, responding carelessly or randomly, or may be having difficulty comprehending items or instructions. Finally, the Variable Response Inconsistency scale consists of 40 pairs of items empirically moderately or highly ($r \geq .30$) intercorrelated, so that inconsistency in responding in a similar way to both items of a pair suggests careless or random reporting, or reading difficulties.

Lilienfeld et al. (1996) as well as Poythress et al. (1998) reported adequate psychometric properties for the PPI among several samples. Internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) for the PPI total score ranges from .90 to .93, and internal consistencies for the PPI

subscales range from .70 to .89. The test-retest reliability of the PPI, with a mean 26-day test-retest interval, is .95, and the test-retest reliabilities of the subscales range from .82 to .94.

Lilienfeld et al. examined the construct validity of the PPI in detail and found it to correlate positively and significantly with self-report, structured interview and peer-ratings indices of Cleckley (1988) psychopathic personality traits and antisocial behaviors. More specifically, Lilienfeld et al. demonstrated the convergent validity of the PPI with several measures of psychopathy, including the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-Revised (Hare, 1985) with $r = .91$; as well as its discriminant validity from self-report indices of depression, cyclothymia and schizotypy/psychosis proneness.

Poythress et al. (1998) as well as Benning et al. (2003) examined the interplay of the components of the PPI with those of the PCL-R in the process of further validating the PPI. Poythress et al. found that the PPI total score and the PCL-R total score were significantly positively correlated, with $r = .54$. Furthermore, Factor 1 and Factor 2 of the PCL-R were also significantly correlated with the PPI, with $r = .54$ and $r = .40$, respectively. Poythress et al. then concluded that the PPI, unlike existing questionnaires for psychopathy, appears useful in the differential diagnosis of psychopathy in incarcerated samples. The findings of Benning et al. expounded on such results, and demonstrated that factor analysis of the PPI yielded two dominant factors. One of these factors was characterized by traits related to Factor 2 of the PCL-R: impulsiveness, unconventionality, aggression and estrangement from others. The other factor was marked by characteristics linked to Factor 1 of the PCL-R: low trait anxiety, social dominance, and fearless risk taking. Benning et al. then concluded that the external correlates of the two PPI factors paralleled associations reported for the two PCL-R factors, indexing the affective-interpersonal and antisocial deviance features of psychopathy. Thus,

the PPI appears to be a useful self-report tool for assessing these facets of psychopathy.

A series of investigations demonstrated the validity of the PPI as a self-report measure of psychopathy in prison samples. Initially, Poythress et al. (1998) found the PPI to be significantly positively correlated with the PCL-R in a sample of 50 youth offenders, and that the PPI accurately classified PCL-R-defined psychopathy in 86% of cases. Sandoval et al. (2000) found significant positive correlations between PPI total scores and measures for aggression ($r = .60$) and borderline personality ($r = .45$), establishing the construct validity of the PPI. In addition, Sandoval et al. also found a significant negative correlation between PPI total scores and self-reported empathic tendencies ($r = -.45$) in their sample of 100 incarcerated individuals, lending support for the discriminant validity of the PPI. Finally, Edens, Poythress, and Watkins (2001), in their sample of 89 state correctional participants, established the construct validity of the PPI by finding positive correlations with certain subscales of the Personality Assessment Inventory (Morey, 1991), such as the Antisocial Features scale ($r = .68$) and the Aggression scale ($r = .57$). Furthermore, Edens et al. found that the PPI predicted various forms of nonviolent and physically aggressive institutional infractions better than chance (point biserial correlations ranging from .26 to .37).

In light of previously discussed findings of higher levels of psychopathic personality traits, compared to a history of general antisocial behaviors, in sexual offenders against children (see Porter et al., 2000), and considering the central focus on psychopathic personality facets in the PPI, this instrument was considered to be valuable in further elucidating the psychopathic personality traits of child molesters. Furthermore, the examination of instrumentality and reactivity in relation to PPI-measured psychopathy was hypothesized to facilitate the process of examining the differential correlates of various facets

of psychopathy, as mentioned in Poythress et al. (1998).

Instrumentality/Reactivity. The motivational factors of the participants' index sexual offenses were assessed using coding schemes derived from Cornell et al. (1996) in conjunction with those in Woodworth et al. (2002). Instrumentality and reactivity ratings were coded as follows on the basis of pertinent information in the offenders' files: **purely reactive**—strong evidence of high level of spontaneity/impulsivity, lack of planning, no goal other than to harm victim(s) following conflict/provocation, in reaction to intense emotional conflict, leading to sexual arousal which is then acted upon; **reactive/instrumental**—reactive and instrumental components, i.e. person reacted to a conflict or provocation resulting in emotional, and eventually sexual arousal by sexually assaulting the victim(s), but continued to offend in the process of achieving more goals (sex, drugs, money); **instrumental/reactive**—initial motivations were to get sexual gratification or other goals from victim(s), but became agitated/distressed and sexually aroused at various points and continued to offend or reactively; **purely instrumental**—no immediate emotional/situational provocation, committed sexual offense(s) for sexual gratification or other instrumental goal, intentional and motivated by clear external goals (e.g. sex, drugs, money).

The principal investigator interviewed the offenders to glean information regarding their motivations for and perspectives on their index sexual offenses, but the instrumentality and reactivity ratings were based most notably on information in their files, as such documented information is intended to be more objective. Woodworth et al. reported inter-rater reliability of the instrumentality/reactivity ratings ranging from .81 to .87, indicating a high level of reliability for the coding scheme (Please see Appendix B for coding scheme).

Procedure

Participants for the investigation were comprised of 54 sexual offenders whose index offenses involved the sexual abuse of children, and resulted in a conviction and incarceration in the state correctional institution. The sexual offenses included incest, indecent assault, involuntary deviate sexual intercourse, corruption of minors, sexual abuse of children, sexual assault, and rape. The principal investigator contacted potential participants and asked if they would be willing to participate in a study of the motivations behind sexual offending. Individuals who expressed interest were scheduled by the principal investigator to complete questionnaires as well as interviews.

The participants' informed consent was obtained before the start of their involvement in the study. Participants were asked to complete the test battery, including the SILS, and the PPI. Participants had the option to complete the battery of tests on two or three occasions if they noticed they required more time to complete all measures.

Upon completion of the various measures listed above the principal investigator then reviewed pertinent information in the offenders' files, including the Pre-sentence Investigation, and scheduled interviews with the offenders to code the sex offenses for which the inmates have been incarcerated on the bases of instrumentality and reactivity. The instrumentality and reactivity ratings were conducted while the principal investigator was blind to the participants' psychopathy levels, so as to preserve the objectivity and reliability of these ratings. When the inmate completed the interviews, he was released to return to his usual daily institutional routines.

Analytic Strategy

The sexual offenders' mean ages at the time of data collection as well as their mean ages at the time of committing the index offenses were compared for any significant differences, by using t-test analyses. Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) examined any significant differences in total psychopathy levels, and individual subscale scores, between individuals who committed *purely instrumental* or *purely reactive* sexual offenses against children, and between individuals who committed *instrumental/reactive* and *reactive/instrumental* offenses. MANOVA was used to decrease the incidence of type 1 error. The PPI scores were used continuously, as in the previous studies (e.g. Poythress et al., 1998), without specifically designating participants as psychopathic or nonpsychopathic.

MANOVA also examined any differences in scores on the Unlikely Virtues, Deviant Responding and Variable Response Inconsistency scales in the PPI between participants who committed *purely instrumental* or *purely reactive* sexual offenses against children, and between individuals who committed *instrumental/reactive* and *reactive/instrumental* offenses. Such analyses intend to assess the degree to which individuals who committed *instrumental* vs. *reactive* sexual offenses are likely to be focused on impression management, malingering or responding carelessly or randomly without responding consistently.

Point biserial correlations were calculated b/w the instrumentality/reactivity ratings and key control variables (age, IQ). Then, point-biserial correlations were calculated between the PPI total score and instrumentality/reactivity ratings, as well as between each PPI subscale and the instrumentality/reactivity assessments.

Discriminant function analyses (DFA) utilizing PPI total scores were conducted to assess the accuracy of these scores in predicting sexual offences as either *purely instrumental*

or *purely reactive* in nature. Additionally, based on the results of the point-biserial correlations, age and IQ were controlled for in the regression model. Then, DFA utilizing individual subscale scores was conducted to determine how well specific subscales can predict sexual offenses as either *purely instrumental* or *purely reactive*.

The analyses for this study intended to investigate the existence and magnitude of a relationship between psychopathy and the instrumentality/reactivity of sexual offenses against children. More specifically, correlations between PPI total score and the individual subscales with the instrumentality/reactivity ratings were intended to shed light on how psychopathy and its specific components as assessed by the PPI are related to motivations for the commission of sexual offenses against children. Finally, whether or not overall psychopathy scores, and subscale scores can classify sexual offenses as either purely instrumental or purely reactive was intended to shed further light on the role psychopathy plays in the incidence of child sexual abuse.

CHAPTER 3

Results

Validity Considerations

Considering the exploratory nature of this investigation in testing the viability of instrumentality and reactivity ratings of sexual offenses, issues arose regarding the validity of these ratings. Woodworth et al. (2002) calculated inter-rater reliability values for the ratings and found them to indicate high levels of reliability for the coding scheme. Inter-rater reliability for the instrumentality/reactivity ratings was not calculated in this investigation due to the inability of the principal investigator to take police reports, and other legal documents regarding the sexual offenses outside of the correctional institution. Consequently, the principal investigator's advisor was not able to code the instrumentality/reactivity of sexual offenses, utilizing objective legal documentation. Furthermore, the principal investigator could not recruit the help of coworkers at the correctional institution to conduct such ratings for reliability purposes.

Limitations to the validity of the PPI scores were related to the inability to determine the presence of invalid profiles based on elevated scores on the VRIN subscale. The principal investigator could not obtain the cutoff scores for invalid profiles from the author of the PPI, Scott Lilienfeld. Consequently, the validity of some of the PPI scores could have been compromised, ultimately affecting the final number of valid profiles in the analyses. Despite such validity limitations, various levels of analyses in this investigation demonstrated some illuminating findings regarding psychopathic traits in child molesters, precipitating motives to sexual offending, and differences in intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders.

Analytic Strategy: Preliminary Analyses

Demographics. The current investigation included 54 participants, with a mean age at the time of testing of 40 years (SD = 11.52), and an average age at the time of offending of 32 years (SD = 9.32). The average age of the index offense victims was 11 years (SD = 3.03), and the mean WAIS-R IQ estimate for participants was 93 (SD = 16.10) (See Table 1).

Twenty eight participants were never married, compared to 14 who were married, and 12 who were divorced or separated.

Group characteristics. Thirty four offenders committed their offenses against female victims, whereas 13 had male victims and 5 had both male and female victims. In relation to their sexual offending history, 19 offenders were convicted of committing one sexual offense, 15 were convicted of two offenses, 13 of three offenses, 2 of four offenses, 3 of five offenses, and 1 each of ten and eleven offenses. In relation to the number of victims of the offenders' index sexual offenses, 40 had one victim, 7 had two victims, 3 had three victims, 2 had four victims, 1 had five victims, and 1 had nine victims. On the other hand, when assessing the total number of sexual offense victims in the offenders' history, 37 had one victim, 8 had two victims, 4 had three victims, 2 had four victims, 1 had five victims, and 2 had nine victims (See Table 2 and Table 3).

As an assessment of the typicality of the offenders' sexual offenses compared to nonsexual offenses, this investigation also gathered information on the numbers of nonsexual offenses committed by the offenders, as measured by convictions documented in their files. Twenty one participants did not commit any nonsexual offenses, 9 committed one offense, 1 had two offenses, 15 had three offenses, 2 had four offenses, 4 had five offenses, and 1 each committed seven and eight nonsexual offenses (See Table 3).

Analytic Strategy: Hypothesis-Testing Analyses

*Psychopathy levels*¹. The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for the PPI total score was .92, and internal consistencies for the PPI subscales ranged from .79 to .91. The participants' scores were significantly higher than normative ones on the following scales: the PPI total score ($t(98) = 10.49, p < .01$), *Machiavellian Egocentricity* ($t(98) = 5.75, p < .01$), *Coldheartedness* ($t(98) = 12.25, p < .01$), *Impulsive Nonconformity* ($t(98) = 6.99, p < .01$), *Blame Externalization* ($t(98) = 5.64, p < .01$), and *Carefree Nonplanfulness* ($t(98) = 13.46, p < .01$; See Table 4 for means and standard deviations).

Instrumentality and reactivity ratings. Forty-four of the 54 participants were categorized to have committed *instrumental* sexual offenses. On the other hand, 5 individuals were classified to have committed *instrumental/reactive* offenses, and 5 individuals' offenses were categorized as *reactive/instrumental* (See Table 5).

A descriptive example of an *instrumental* sexual offense involved an individual who told his victim he was a police officer and that he would allow him to watch him perform his law enforcement duties if he complied with his demands. This offender then took the victim to an empty football field, placed a blanket on the bleachers, laid the victim on his stomach and anally raped him. Such a scenario demonstrates the presence of planning and goal-directed behaviors. On the other hand an *instrumental/reactive* offense involved an offender who had been drinking throughout the day, took his female victim to the park to look for money, decided later he wanted sexual gratification then forced her down on the floor and attempted to penetrate her; however, because the alcohol had affected his ability to become physiologically aroused, this offender became agitated and frustrated, and forced his victim to

¹ The normative sample for the PPI scores consisted of 46 males from an undergraduate institution. Scores were provided to the principal investigator through personal communications with Scott Lilienfeld.

perform fellatio on him and masturbate him. This scenario involves the instrumental motive for sexual gratification, along with a degree of emotional arousal affecting the process of offending. Finally, an example of a *reactive/instrumental* sexual offense involved an offender who had been using drugs and watching pornographic movies daily for several days, and who began to look at and fantasize about his stepdaughter sexually. This individual and the victim's mother were estranged one day, and the victim wanted to play, so he began to wrestle with her, became sexually aroused and attempted to penetrate her. When the victim screamed in pain, he ceased his attempts to penetrate her but engaged in oral sex with her. Consequently, this example demonstrates initial reactive/unplanned sexual contact, followed with instrumental and goal-directed actions to achieve sexual gratification.

As a result of the majority of offenses being classified as *instrumental*, a new dichotomous grouping variable was created, consisting of *purely instrumental* crimes (N = 44) and crimes with *some reactive* component (N = 10). The mean age at the time of testing of offenders with *purely instrumental* crimes was not significantly different from the mean age of offenders with *some reactive*, $t(52) = .36, p = .72$. *Purely instrumental* and *some reactive* offenders did not differ in their ages at the time of committing their offenses, with $t(52) = .54, p = .59$. The mean WAIS-R IQ estimate for *purely instrumental* offenders was not significantly different from the IQ estimate for offenders with *some reactive* crimes, $t(52) = 1.05, p = .30$. Offenders with *purely instrumental* and *some reactive* crimes did not differ in terms of the ages of their victims, $t(52) = .54, p = .59$ (See Table 6 for means and standard deviations).

The overall MANOVA comparing offenders with purely instrumental versus some reactive crimes on the PPI total and subscale scores was not statistically significant,

$F(9, 44) = 1.34, p = .25$. Univariate ANOVAs from this analysis indicated that offenders with *purely instrumental* offenses had significantly higher scores on the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale than offenders with *some reactive* crimes, $F(1, 52) = 9.91, p < .01$. Furthermore, individuals with *some reactive* offenses scored relatively higher than offenders with *purely instrumental* crimes on the *Stress Immunity* subscale, with $F(1, 52) = 5.50, p < .05$.

Participants with *purely instrumental* offenses also scored higher on the *Deviant Responding* subscale than individuals with *some reactive* crimes, $F(1, 52) = 6.55, p < .05$. Child molesters with *purely instrumental* and *some reactive* crimes did not differ on their PPI total scores, $F(1, 52) = 3.10, p = .08$ (See Table 7 for means and standard deviations).

Correlations. Point-biserial correlations were calculated between *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* designations (as the categorical variable), age, IQ, and PPI total and subscale scores. *Purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* designations, were not significantly correlated to age at testing, or IQ, with $r(54) = .05, p = .72$, and $r(54) = .14, p = .30$, respectively (See Table 10 and Table 11 for correlations).

Carefree Nonplanfulness and *Stress Immunity* correlated significantly with the *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* designations, with $r(54) = .40, p < .01$, and $r(54) = -.31, p < .05$, respectively. These correlations further corroborated the results of the MANOVA reported above. Upon further exploration of the pattern of correlations, the *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* designation was significantly positively correlated with the total number of sexual offenses that the offenders had been convicted of in their criminal histories, with $r(54) = .31, p < .05$. There was a statistical trend for PPI total scores to be significantly correlated to the *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* designations, with $r(54) = .24, p = .08$ (See Table 12).

Discriminant function analyses (DFA). The PPI total score as well as the subscale scores did not discriminate significantly between individuals who committed *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* crimes, in a simultaneous DFA, with Wilks $\lambda = .786$, Canonical Correlation = .462, $p = .17$. However, in a follow up stepwise DFA, the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale emerged as the only significant predictor of *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* crimes, with Wilks $\lambda = .840$, Canonical Correlation = .400, $p = < .01$.

In a logistic regression analysis, the PPI total and subscale scores correctly classified 87% of offenses as *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive*. However, results of a forward conditional regression analysis indicated that the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale was responsible for accurately predicting 85% of offenses as *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive*.

Analytic Strategy: Post-Hoc Analyses

It has been clearly accepted in the child sexual abuse literature that intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters represent two distinct groups (Barsetti, Earls, Lalumiere, and Belanger, 1998), with distinct research and treatment implications. Even though, as discussed earlier, Rice et al. (2002) found that intrafamilial offenders were less sexually deviant, as measured by phallometric preferences to child stimuli, compared to extrafamilial offenders, the current state of research findings on significant differences between these two groups of offenders is tenuous. There is mounting evidence that the distinction between these groups may be artificial (Studer, Aylwin, Clelland, Reddon, and Frenzel, 2002).

The findings of Barsetti et al. (1998) did not support the contention that intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders show different patterns of sexual interests; however, the investigators did find that both groups were equally likely to be classified as sexually deviant.

The results of Studer et al. (2002) also could not adequately distinguish between intrafamilial and extrafamilial sexual offenders based on erotic preference testing. Such lack of clear distinguishing factors between intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders in relation to sexual preference is echoed in the review of Muschang, Rouleau, Barsetti, and Lavallee (2004) who argue that more research is necessary to delineate the differentiating characteristics between intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders. Consequently, this investigation conducted post-hoc analyses to examine differences between intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders, in relation to psychopathy levels and psychopathic traits, which may ultimately inform research and treatment.

Demographics. In light of the rationale discussed above, and as a result of the skew of most of the offenses being classified as *instrumental*, another grouping strategy involving intrafamilial vs. extrafamilial offenses was developed. Twenty four participants committed intrafamilial sexual offenses, and 30 individuals committed extrafamilial offenses.

The mean age at the time of testing of intrafamilial offenders was 44 years (SD = 9.31) and was marginally different from the mean age of extrafamilial offenders of 38 years (SD = 12.50), $t(52) = 2.02, p = .05$. Intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders did not differ in their ages at the time of committing their offenses, with mean ages of 33 years (SD = 9.75) and 31 (SD = 8.96), respectively, with $t(52) = 1.01, p = .32$. The mean WAIS-R IQ estimate for extrafamilial offenders was not significantly different from the IQ estimate for intrafamilial offenders, with means of 96 (SD = 14.36) and 88 (SD = 17.34), respectively, $t(52) = -1.83, p = .07$ (See Table 8).

Group characteristics. Intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders did not differ in the total number of sexual offenses they had been convicted of, $t(52) = -1.08, p = .29$, the total

number of nonsexual offenses they had been convicted of, $t(52) = -.82, p = .42$, the number of victims for their index offenses, $t(52) = -.35, p = .73$, the total number of victims they offended against, $t(52) = .53, p = .60$, or the ages of their victims, $t(52) = -1.93, p = .06$, but did differ on the years since they committed their index offenses, $t(52) = 2.36, p < .05$.

The overall MANOVA comparing intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders on the PPI total and subscale scores was statistically significant, $F(12, 41) = 2.56, p < .05$. Univariate ANOVAs from this analysis indicated that intrafamilial offenders had significantly higher scores on the *Coldheartedness* subscale than extrafamilial offenders, $F(1, 52) = 7.85, p < .01$. Furthermore, intrafamilial offenders scored significantly higher than extrafamilial offenders on the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale, $F(1, 52) = 8.07, p < .01$. Intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders did not differ on the Unlikely Virtues, Deviant Responding and Variable Response Inconsistency scales (See Table 9 for means and standard deviations).

Correlations. Point-biserial correlations were calculated between intrafamilial and extrafamilial designations (as the categorical variable), age, IQ, and PPI total and subscale scores. Intrafamilial or extrafamilial designations, or relation of victims, were significantly correlated to age at testing, with $r(54) = -.27, p = .05$, but not to age at commission of offense, $r(54) = -.14, p = .32$, or IQ, $r(54) = .25, p = .07$.

The pattern of correlations confirmed some of the results of the MANOVA, and revealed some interesting results of the correlates of various PPI subscales. *Coldheartedness* and *Carefree Nonplanfulness* were correlated significantly negatively with the victim relation designations, with $r(54) = -.36, p < .01$, and $r(54) = -.37, p < .01$, respectively, confirming the results of the MANOVA reported above (See Table 12). Upon further exploration of the pattern of correlations, the age of the victims was significantly positively correlated to the

Blame Externalization subscale, $r(54) = .41, p < .01$, and significantly negatively correlated to the *Stress Immunity* subscale, $r(54) = -.33, p < .05$, and the *Coldheartedness* subscale, $r(54) = -.31, p < .05$. PPI total scores were not significantly correlated to the victim relation designations, with $r(54) = -.05, p = .70$ (See Table 10 through Table 12).

Discriminant function analyses (DFA). The significant negative correlation between age at testing and intrafamilial vs. extrafamilial designations was controlled for in the DFA analyses. The PPI total score as well as the subscale scores did not discriminate significantly between individuals who committed intrafamilial vs. extrafamilial sexual offenses, in a simultaneous DFA, with Wilks $\lambda = .738$, Canonical Correlation = $.512, p = .07$. In the first step of the follow up stepwise DFA, the *Coldheartedness* subscale emerged as a significant predictor of intrafamilial vs. extrafamilial victimization, with Wilks $\lambda = .866$, Canonical Correlation = $.450, p = < .01$. In the second step, the *Machiavellian Egocentricity* subscale was also a significant predictor of the intrafamilial vs. extrafamilial victimization, resulting in Wilks $\lambda = .797$, Canonical Correlation = $.450, p = < .01$.

When controlling for age at time of testing, the PPI total and subscale scores accurately classified 70% of crimes as intrafamilial vs. extrafamilial. However, results of the forward conditional regression indicated that *Coldheartedness* was the only significant predictor of intrafamilial vs. extrafamilial designations, with 65% accuracy.

CHAPTER 4

Discussion

Previous investigations have examined levels of psychopathy in various types of sexual offenders (e.g. Porter et al., 2000), related psychopathy to sexual violence (Porter et al., 2000; Woodworth et al., 2002), and examined some motives of and precipitants to sexual offenses (Van Ness, 1984; Brown & Forth, 1997; Smith, 2000). However, there remained a gap in the literature in investigating and understanding complex motives and precipitating factors of sexual offending against children. The current investigation was the first to relate psychopathy levels in child molesters to instrumental, or goal-directed, and reactive, or spontaneous, components of sexually offending against children.

One of the central findings of this investigation was that the majority of the index sexual offenses were categorized as *instrumental* in nature. This in turn highlights the sexually motivated drive of child molestation, further suggesting that child molestation is a sexually exploitive act committed mainly for the purpose of achieving sexual gratification. Higher scores on the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* in individuals categorized to have committed *purely instrumental* offenses suggest that such individuals were not concerned with the consequences of their actions, and were indifferent in planning their actions. Consequently, one implication is that, along with addressing child molesters' sexually deviant desires, treatment could focus on training these offenders to be increasingly aware of the consequences of their actions before they undertake them. This component of sex offender treatment could be related to empathy training, providing child molesters with the skills and alternative perspectives to recognizing the impact of their actions on their victims.

Comparisons of PPI-assessed psychopathic traits between intrafamilial and

extrafamilial child molesters also yielded some revealing findings. Significantly elevated scores on the *Coldheartedness* and *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscales within intrafamilial offenders suggest that molesters who offended within their family structure may be more callous, remorseless, and inconsiderate of the consequences of their actions. Intrafamilial offenders may not be motivated or interested in considering the consequences of their actions, and seem to possess core psychopathic traits that would facilitate their offending against victims within their families. Such findings point to the need for consideration of core psychopathic traits in treating intrafamilial child molesters. In other words, presence of elevated levels of callousness and remorselessness in such individuals may present challenges to effecting adequate changes in these offenders, with the goals of preventing recidivism.

Psychopathy Levels

Results of PPI total score comparisons confirmed the hypothesis that sexual offenders against children demonstrated significantly higher total psychopathy scores compared to established norms. Such a finding further confirms the contention that child molesters possess certain interpersonal and affective deficits that may facilitate their commission of sexual offenses against children (see Porter et al., 2000). In other words, these findings imply that incarcerated child molesters are more likely to possess certain psychopathic traits, as assessed by the PPI, compared to individuals in the community. In fact, comparisons of scores on specific subscales confirmed hypotheses predicting which subscales are likely to be elevated in child molesters compared to a normative sample.

PPI subscales. Results corroborated that sexual offenders against children had significantly elevated scores on the *Machiavellian Egocentricity* subscale, indicating that child molesters are more likely to possess certain narcissistic and ruthless attitudes in

interpersonal functioning. Such a finding seems to fit with the inherent exploitative and self-serving nature of child molesting. In relation to such a finding, Hanson et al. (1994) concluded that many incest offenders could be described as egocentric and uninhibited individuals who believe that their sexual urges must be fulfilled at all cost, and who can distort and minimize the harm caused by sexual abuse of children. Furthermore, elevated levels of egocentricity and narcissistic attitudes, as assessed by the *Machiavellian Egocentricity* subscale, could be indicative of the presence of the implicit theory of *entitlement*, as discussed by Ward et al. (1999), in which sexual offenders believe they are entitled to special considerations, and that whatever they can get away with is by definition legitimate and acceptable. Consequently, certain components of psychopathy could be related to some of the contributing theories to child molestation, including cognitive distortions and implicit theories.

Child molesters also possessed significantly elevated scores on the *Coldheartedness* subscale compared to established norms, indicating a relative heightened degree of callousness, guiltlessness and unsentimentality in incarcerated individuals who sexually offended against children. Such elevated characteristics in child molesters could be related in principle, and in implications, to cognitive distortions discussed in Stermac et al. (1989), indicating that child molesters attribute more responsibility to their victims in the initiation of sexual contact. To elaborate, child molesters with such elevated psychopathic traits as callousness and guiltlessness may be more likely to attribute less guilt to themselves and place more of the blame for their offending onto their victims.

Furthermore, the finding that individuals who sexually offended against children are likely to possess such psychopathic traits as coldheartedness and callousness, may help

explain some of the empathy deficits found in such individuals (Marshall et al., 1995).

Findings that child molesters may consider children as quite different from themselves and may have problems experiencing empathy toward their own specific victims (Marshall et al.) could be indicative of heightened levels of such psychopathic traits as those measured by the *Coldheartedness* subscale.

Child molesters' scores on the *Social Potency* subscale appeared to be only slightly elevated to those of the normative sample. However, the child molesters' scores on the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale were significantly higher than those of the normative sample. Elevated scores on this subscale, assessing attitudes of indifference in planning one's actions, may reflect the implicit theory of *uncontrollability* (Ward et al., 1999), in which sexual offenders may believe that their sexual desires are external to themselves, thus exonerating them from responsibility for their sexually exploitative behaviors. In other words, child molesters with elevated degrees of indifference in planning their actions may believe they have no control over their sexual desires or their acting upon them, or may not even care to plan their actions, while considering their consequences.

Significantly elevated scores on the *Blame Externalization* subscale in child molesters indicated that such individuals seem more likely than the normative sample to blame others for their problems and rationalize their misbehaviors. This particular facet of psychopathy, as assessed by the PPI, addresses one of the central contributing factors of sexual offending against children, namely shifting blame toward the victims. Stermac et al. (1989) concluded that child molesters perceived greater complicity from the child victims in the initiation of sexual contacts, indicating the presence of cognitive distortions in the initiation and perpetuation of child molestation. Furthermore, this subscale may also be related to the

implicit theory of *children as sexual objects*, which purports that children are sexual beings, motivated by a desire for pleasure. Consequently, if certain child molesters believe that children enjoy sexual contact with adults and may derive pleasure from such actions, they may be more likely to shift some of the blame onto their victims initiating and maintaining the inappropriate sexual contact.

Scores on the *Impulsive Nonconformity* subscale were significantly higher in child molesters compared to the normative sample, implying that individuals who sexually offended against children are more likely to possess a reckless lack of concern regarding social mores. This psychopathic trait may be commensurate to the implicit theory of *entitlement* in which sexual offenders believe they deserve special considerations, and that victims are likely to enjoy their basic roles of satisfying the offenders' sexual and emotional needs. Furthermore, in direct relation to the defining components of this subscale, the implicit theory of *entitlement* also stipulates that offenders do not believe in binding universal moral values, and that whatever is possible to get away with is legitimate and acceptable, by definition.

Instrumentality and Reactivity Ratings

Results directly confirmed the hypothesis that most of the index offenses of child molesters would be *instrumental*, indicating that such individuals are likely to have committed their crimes in order to achieve sexual gratification from their victims. Forty-four of the 54 participants were designated to have committed *purely instrumental* offenses, with 5 each designated to have committed *instrumental/reactive* and *reactive/instrumental* crimes. Such findings then suggest that child molesters are specifically motivated by obtaining sexual gratification from their victims and commit their crimes in such a goal-directed fashion.

Such results seem to corroborate the findings of previous investigators (e.g. Seto et al., 1999; Porter et al., 2000) indicating that child molesters are often motivated by fulfilling their deviant sexual preferences. Porter et al. (2003) concluded that child molesters comprise a “specialized” group of sexual offenders, focused on satisfying their deviant sexual desires. The current findings that a large proportion of child molesters, 21 out of 54 (39%), did not commit any nonsexual offenses tend to confirm this contention that such offenders are instrumentally focused on obtaining sexual gratification, and some may be less likely to engage in other antisocial activities. These results further emphasize that child molesters represent a distinct group of sexual offenders from rapists, with treatment focus on sexually deviant desires and not addressing pre-existing diverse patterns of criminal offending.

Psychopathy and instrumentality/reactivity. The current investigation could not test the hypothesis predicting differential psychopathy levels among individuals determined to have committed *instrumental*, *reactive*, *instrumental/reactive*, or *reactive/instrumental* sexual offenses as a result of the skew of the majority of offenses being classified as *instrumental*. However, the creation of a new dichotomous variable consisting of *purely instrumental* crimes and *some reactive* crimes yielded some interesting findings.

Even though individuals with *purely instrumental* and *some reactive* crimes did not differ on their total PPI scores, *purely instrumental* offenders had significantly higher scores on the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale. While counterintuitive, such a finding suggests that even though child molesters appear to be goal-oriented in obtaining sexual gratification, they may act without considering consequences of their actions. Another explanation for why individuals designated to have committed *purely instrumental* offenses had significantly elevated scores on the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale is that such individuals may have

been relatively carefree in committing their initial sexual offenses, but instrumental or goal-directed factors came into play to perpetuate their future sexual offenses. In other words, such individuals were less likely to consider the consequences of sexually exploitative actions, but continued to offend for instrumental or goal-oriented reasons.

Consequently, one implication is that, along with addressing child molesters' sexually deviant desires, treatment could focus on training these offenders to be increasingly aware of the consequences of their actions before they undertake them. This treatment component could be commensurate, in part, to empathy training which is usually a core component of sexual offender treatment.

On the other hand, child molesters with *some reactive* crimes had significantly higher scores on the *Stress Immunity* subscale. This finding suggests that individuals who invested relatively less planning in committing their crimes are more impervious to the experience of stress in anxiety-provoking situations. In other words, child molesters who committed their crimes with a relative degree of spontaneity or impulsivity may not have experienced significant amounts of stress or anxiety, something that may have prevented them from committing their crimes. Such individuals may have acted more reactively compared to the *purely instrumental* group, and done so in the relative absence of encumbering levels of anxiety or stress. Elevated scores on *Stress Immunity* imply the presence of a certain degree of emotional regulation skills, which may be used in cognitively based treatments of sexual offending. More specifically, if a certain subgroup of child molesters do not experience significant reactions to anxiety-provoking events, they may benefit from cognitive training to help them form better judgments in a variety of situations, especially ones in which they may sexually offend.

Child molesters with *purely instrumental* sexual offenses had significantly higher scores on the Deviant Responding scale of the PPI. This could indicate a heightened degree of malingering and random/careless responding in these individuals, or could be a result of the significantly larger proportion of child molesters with *purely instrumental offenses*.

Correlational Analyses

Correlational analyses between total PPI and subscale scores and *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* designations confirmed the findings reported above. *Carefree Nonplanfulness* and *Stress Immunity* correlated significantly positively and negatively, respectively, with the offense designations. However, the PPI total score did not correlate significantly with the *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* designations. Such varied findings highlight the previously discussed importance of elucidating the varied psychopathic personality traits in child molesters, as well as addressing the differential correlates of various facets of psychopathy, as mentioned in Poythress et al. (1998).

Detailed exploration of the correlations also indicated that *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* designations were significantly positively correlated to the total number of sexual offenses of which the child molesters had been convicted. Therefore, the greater the number sexual offenses the more likely they had been committed instrumentally. Such results are consistent with the contention that child molesters possess deviant sexual desires, upon which they act instrumentally.

Discriminant Analyses.

The hypothesis that PPI total scores will accurately discriminate between sexual offenses was not confirmed, likely due to the skew of offenses being classified almost exclusively as *purely instrumental*. However, even though PPI total and subscale scores

could not collectively discriminate between *purely instrumental* and *some reactive* crimes, the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale emerged as the single strong predictor of these designations. Consequently, this finding further highlights the implication that a central focus of treatment for these offenders could be to help them increase their awareness of the consequences of their actions before they undertake them.

Intrafamilial and Extrafamilial Sexual Offending

As previously discussed, the differentiation between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual offenders has yielded interesting findings regarding the ages of intrafamilial and extrafamilial victims, the use of force, and the progression of the abuse (Fischer et al., 1998), as well as levels of psychopathy in these groups of child molesters (Porter et al., 2000; Rice et al., 2002). Nevertheless, the findings of a series of investigations (e.g. Barsetti et al., 1998; Studer et al., 2002; Muschang et al., 2004) emphasize the tenuous state of research findings regarding differences between intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders. The earlier investigation of Frenzel and Lang (1989) highlighted the heterogeneous nature of the erotic preferences of extrafamilial and intrafamilial child molesters, and suggested the exploration of psychological differences between these two groups of sexual offenders, which may supplement information obtained through phallometric studies. Consequently, the present investigation conducted a series of post-hoc exploratory analyses to try to elucidate any informative differences between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters.

Psychopathy levels. The lack of significant differences on PPI total scores between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters may cast further doubts on any definitive differences between these two groups of child molesters, in relation to a global psychopathic personality structure, as measured by the PPI. Furthermore, the lack of significant differences

between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters on the Unlikely Virtues, Deviant Responding, and Variable Response Inconsistency scales indicates that these groups of offenders did not differ on their focus on impression management, malingering or responding carelessly or randomly without consistent responding.

Significantly elevated scores on the *Coldheartedness* subscale in intrafamilial offenders imply that, compared with extrafamilial offenders, these child molesters demonstrate greater tendencies toward callousness, remorselessness, and unsentimentality. Such findings may help expand upon the conclusions of Fischer et al. (1998) claiming that intrafamilial sexual abuse lasts longer and progresses more rapidly. Intrafamilial child molesters' apparent relatively increased callousness and remorselessness may facilitate their offending against family members for an extended period of time, with increased levels of sexual intrusion. It seems reasonable to contend that intrafamilial child molesters would need to demonstrate a significant degree of coldheartedness and callousness to disregard the safety and personal rights of their own family members or immediate members of their households.

Furthermore, intrafamilial child molesters' elevated scores on the *Coldheartedness* subscale may help explain the findings of Webster et al. (2000) when discussing their findings on victim-empathy training for sexual offenders, through the use of victim apology letters. Findings of elevated levels of callousness and remorselessness in intrafamilial child molesters may shed some light on why intrafamilial offenders in the Webster et al. investigation were found to minimize their offenses, and overtly reinstate the relationship with the victims. Consequently, it seems plausible to propose that heightened callousness and unsentimentality in intrafamilial offenders contributes to their denying the seriousness of their offenses and to

their attempts to emphasize their relationships with their victims. Such acts may not be as likely without the presence of some degrees of interpersonal coldness and unsentimentality.

Intrafamilial child molesters also demonstrated significantly elevated scores on the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale, compared to extrafamilial offenders. These findings imply that, along with relatively elevated levels of callousness and coldheartedness within intrafamilial child molesters, these individuals seem more likely to sexually offend with disregard to the consequences of their sexually exploitative behaviors. This significant difference between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters on the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale suggests the notion that extrafamilial offenders may be more inclined to plan their sexual offending, as a result of choosing victims outside of their families. Furthermore, elevated scores on the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale in intrafamilial offenders draws attention to the notion that intrafamilial sexual abuse can sometimes be explained by situational factors, such as family discord or marital dysfunction (Barsetti et al., 1998). Negative correlations between the *Coldheartedness* and *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscales and victim relation designations confirmed the elevated scores of these subscales in intrafamilial offenders. Elevations of these psychopathy subscales in intrafamilial offenders may be reflective of the findings of Porter et al. (2000) of nearly double the proportion of intrafamilial offenders being psychopathic (11%), compared to extrafamilial offenders (6%).

Discriminant analyses. The discriminant function analyses (DFA) within intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters confirmed the findings of the *Coldheartedness* subscale as a significant facet of psychopathy related to victim relation designations. Even though this subscale and the *Machiavellian Egocentricity* subscale effectively differentiated between

intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molestation, the *Coldheartedness* subscale emerged as the only significant predictor, after controlling for the effects of age at testing. These results further highlight the significance of callousness, remorselessness and interpersonal insensitivity as a component of psychopathy in child molestation.

Post-hoc Findings

Post-hoc correlation analyses demonstrated a significant positive relation between the ages of the victims and the *Blame Externalization* subscale, suggesting that child molesters are likely to blame others for their problems and rationalize their misbehaviors. More specifically, this finding implies that the older the victims, the more likely the child molesters are to shift blame on and attribute culpability and complicity to them. This finding may be informative in treatment modules of child molesters who may be engaging in counter-therapeutic blaming and minimizing behaviors. In other words, treatment providers may come to expect that child molesters will shift blame to their victims the older they are, and develop interventions that continue to highlight consequences of sexual offending and emphasize empathic concern and responses, regardless of the ages of the victims.

The negative association between the *Stress Immunity* subscale and victim ages suggests that the child molesters in this sample may not have experienced significant levels of stress in anxiety-provoking situations, namely sexually offending against their victims. More specifically, this finding implies that child molesters may have been increasingly able to remain relatively calm when molesting, the younger their victims were. Elevated levels on this subscale related inversely to victim ages may also be indicative of a degree of selective emotion regulation skills precluding some child molesters from being anxious when molesting their young victims, and could be related to the lowered levels of anxiety in some

psychopathic individuals, long theorized to be a defining component of psychopathy (Cleckley, 1988; Arnett, 1997; Arnett, Smith, & Newman, 1997).

Finally, the negative correlation between the *Coldheartedness* subscale and victim ages further informs the relationship between various facets of psychopathy and child molestation, in this sample. This finding suggests that the more callous, unsentimental and remorseless the child molester, the younger their victims were, indicating that molesting younger children is facilitated by the presence of one of the core interpersonal components of psychopathy, callousness. The inverse relation between coldhearted interpersonal functioning and victim ages makes intuitive sense, when considering the sexual preferences of true pedophiles who consistently molest children, usually significantly younger than them (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). It is reasonable to purport that true pedophiles would need to possess significant levels of callousness and remorselessness to continue molesting children.

Considerations of Non-significant Findings

The absence of any sexual offenses categorized as *purely reactive* further highlights the sexually exploitive nature of child molestation. Nevertheless, with larger samples, future investigations may be able to find child molesters who clearly committed their sexual offenses reactively. Even though PPI total scores were not significantly correlated to the *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* designations, certain subscales within the PPI were significantly correlated to these designations. Such findings underscore the utility of considering specific psychopathic personality traits, such as callousness and nonplanfulness, when assessing the interplay of psychopathy and instrumentality/reactivity in child molestation.

The lack of significant differences between intrafamilial and extrafamilial offenders in PPI total scores further highlights the value of examining specific psychopathic personality traits between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters. Findings of elevated scores on the *Coldheartedness* and *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscales in intrafamilial child molesters indicate that the construct of psychopathy should not be treated as a single construct. Instead, examinations of psychopathy in intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters should continue to examine the specific psychopathic personality traits that differentiate these two groups of sexual offenders. Finally, the inability, in this sample, of the PPI total scores to discriminate between individuals who committed *purely instrumental* vs. *some reactive* crimes or between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molestations also suggests that specific traits of psychopathy should be considered in investigations of psychopathy and child molestation.

Conclusions and Future Directions

This investigation assessed levels of PPI-defined psychopathy as well as instrumentality and reactivity of index sexual offenses in a group of child molesters in a state correctional institution, and explored the presence of specific psychopathic personality traits within child molesters. Results confirmed that the majority of the sexual offenses were instrumental in nature, indicating that most child molesters in this sample were goal-oriented in committing their offenses, namely to obtain sexual gratification. These findings seem intuitively congruent with the notion that the central defining characteristic of child molesters is the presence of deviant sexual preferences in children.

Elevated scores on the *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscale in child molesters with *purely instrumental* offenses suggest that a component of sexual offender treatment should

focus on helping child molesters identify, predict, and accept the presence of significant consequences to their choices to molest their victims. Increased training with this focus may help offenders make more planned and safe choices to refrain from molesting potential victims. On the other hand, elevated scores on the *Stress Immunity* subscale in child molesters with *some reactive* crimes imply the presence of some emotion regulation skills which may facilitate certain child molesters' training in cognitive restructuring skills, to help them identify alternative and healthy means of obtaining sexual gratification than molesting a child.

Some of the most informative findings of this investigation were those which addressed differences between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters. Findings that intrafamilial molesters scored higher than extrafamilial molesters on the *Coldheartedness* and *Carefree Nonplanfulness* subscales provided differentiation between these two groups of child molesters. In other words, considering the debatable state of research findings on significant differences between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters in relation to deviant sexual preferences (e.g. Barsetti et al., 1998), the presence of distinct differences in certain psychopathic traits between these two groups of child molesters further inform assessment and treatment of child molesters. Elevated scores on these two subscales in intrafamilial child molesters suggest that treatment should continue to focus on training child molesters to recognize and accept the consequences of their actions, but more interestingly consider the presence of one of the core components of psychopathy (callousness, remorselessness), and also one of the most difficult to treat.

Given the exploratory nature of this investigation, future studies could continue to assess the relationship between psychopathy, as assessed by the PPI and/or the PCL-R, as

well as instrumentality and reactivity of index sexual offenses, as assessed by the Woodworth et al. (2002) protocol. Future investigations could explore the prevalence of instrumentality vs. reactivity in sexual offenses against children in a larger sample of participants to further delineate the components of goal-directedness or spontaneity in the committing of child molestation. Consequently, results of future investigations may also provide more information on the validity, reliability and therapeutic implications on instrumentality vs. reactivity designations. Finally, future research should also include control participants when assessing psychopathy, to determine significant differences between child molesters and a control sample on various components of psychopathy.

Furthermore, future research should also consider the differentiation of instrumentality and reactivity in adult rapes, especially when considering conclusions of previous investigators (e.g. Porter et al. 2000; 2003) that rapists commit their sexual offenses as part of a larger pattern of antisocial behaviors. Research into the relationship between psychopathy, instrumentality and reactivity within that group of sexual offenders may yield clearer results, namely because rapists are not as likely to possess deviant sexual preferences, and, therefore, may have committed their rapes not only as a means of achieving sexual gratification.

Limitations

One of the central methodological limitations of this investigation involved difficulties in designating the instrumentality or reactivity of child molesters' offenses. Many of the child molesters had several counts of molestation for their index offenses rendering it difficult to determine the true instrumentality or reactivity of a sexual offense. For instance, having several counts of raping a child in a molester's record may indicate that the first count may involve some degree of spontaneity or reactivity, but that continued molestation of the victim

involves an instrumental drive for sexual gratification. Consequently, future studies should consider designating more definitive criteria for determining the effects of having several counts of a sexual offense, and even committing child molestation for several years, on the designation of instrumentality vs. reactivity.

Another methodological limitation to investigating the relationship between instrumentality/reactivity and psychopathy in an incarcerated sample of child molesters involves the generalizability of the findings. The majority of child molesters in this investigation were individuals involved in the institutional sex offenders treatment program. Consequently, this sample may not have included an adequate cross section of incarcerated child molesters. Furthermore, a small proportion (roughly 3%) of child molesters are actually incarcerated in state correctional institutions (Flora, 2001), with most cases of child molestation not being reported, much less prosecuted in court proceedings.

Future investigations into the psychopathic traits in child molesters as well as the complex motives and precipitating factors of child molestation should try to obtain wider samples of offenders from county jails, state correctional institutions, as well as from community sex offender treatment facilities. A more comprehensive sampling of child molesters, and subsequently more generalizable results about personality traits, motivating and precipitating factors to child molestation will greatly inform assessment and treatment of child molesters, thereby making strides in curbing the devastating effects of sexual offenses against children.

References

Arnett, P.A. (1997). Autonomic responsivity in psychopaths: A critical review and theoretical proposal. *Clinical Psychology Review, 17* (8), 903-936.

Arnett, P. A., Smith, S. S., & Newman, J. P. (1997). Approach and Avoidance motivation in psychopathic criminal offenders during passive avoidance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 1413-1428.

Barsetti, I., Earls, C. M., Lalumiere, M. L., & Belanger, N. (1998). The differentiation of intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13*(2), 275-286.

Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Hicks, B. M., Blonigen, D. M., & Krueger, R. F. (2003). Factor structure of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory: Validity and implications for clinical assessment. *Psychological Assessment, 15*(3), 340-350.

Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishments: The BAS/BIS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 319-333.

Chaplin, T. C., Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (1995). Salient victim suffering and the sexual responses of child molesters. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63*, 249-255.

Cleckley, H. (1988). *The mask of sanity* (5th ed.). St. Louis: Mosby.

Connolly, M. (2004). Developmental trajectories and sexual offending: An analysis of the Pathways Model. *Qualitative Social Work, 3*, 39-59.

- Cornell, D., Warren, J., Hawk, G., Safford, E., Oram, G., & Pine, D. (1996). Psychopathy in instrumental and reactive violent offenders. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*, 783-790.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive: Studies in evaluative dependence*. New York: Wiley.
- Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., & Watkins, M. N. (2001). Further validation of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory among offenders: Personality and behavioral correlates. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 15*, 403-415.
- Fischer, D. G., & McDonald, W. L. (1998). Characteristics of intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abuse. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 22*, 915-929.
- Flora, R. (2001). *How to work with sex offenders: A handbook for criminal justice, human service, and mental health professionals*. New York: Haworth.
- Forth, A. E., Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1990). Assessment of psychopathy in male young offenders. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 2*, 342-344.
- Frenzel, R. R., & Lang, R. A. (1989). Identifying sexual preferences in intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abusers. *Annals of Sex Research, 2*, 255-275.
- Gee, D. G., Devilly, G. J., & Ward, T. (2004). The content of sexual fantasies for sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 16*, 315-331.
- Graham, J. R. (2000). *MMPI-2: Assessing personality and psychopathology (3rd Ed.)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hanson, R. K. (2003). Empathy deficits of sexual offenders: A conceptual model. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 9*, 13-23.

Hanson, R. K., and Bussiere, M. T. (1998). Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66* (2), 348-362.

Hanson, R. K., Gizzarelli, R., & Scott, H. (1994). The attitudes of incest offenders: Sexual entitlement and acceptance of sex with children. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 21*, 187-202.

Hare, R. D. (1985). Comparison of procedures for the assessment of psychopathy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53*, 7-16.

Hare, R. D. (1991). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Hare, R. D. (1993). *Without conscience: The disturbing world of the psychopaths among us*. New York: Guilford.

Hare, R. D. (1996). Psychopathy: A clinical construct whose time has come. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 23* (1), 25-54.

Hare, R. D. (1998). Psychopathy and its nature: Implications for the mental health and criminal justice systems. In T. Millon, E. Simonsen, M. Birkert-Smith, & R. D. Davis (Eds.). *Psychopathy: Antisocial criminal and violent behavior* (pp.188-212). New York: NY: Guilford Press.

Hare, R. D., Harpur, T. J., Hakstian, A. R., Forth, A. E., Hart, S. D., and Newman, J. P. (1990). The Revised Psychopathy Checklist: Reliability and factor structure. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 2*(3), 338-341.

Hare, R. D., & McPherson, L. (1984). Violent and aggressive behavior in criminal psychopaths. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 7*, 35-50.

Harpur, T. J., Hakstian, A. R., & Hare, R. D. (1988). Factor structure of the Psychopathy Checklist. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*, 741-747.

Harpur, T. J., Hare, R. D., and Hakstian, A. R. (1989). Two-factor conceptualization of Psychopathy: Construct validity and assessment implications. *Psychological Assessment, 1* (1), 6-17.

Harris, G. T., & Rice, M. E. (1996). The science of phallometric testing of male sexual interest. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 5*, 156-160.

Harris, G. T., Rice, M. R., & Cormier, C. A. (1991). Psychopathy and violent recidivism. *Law and Human Behavior, 15*, 625-637.

Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., Quinsey, V. L., & Chaplin, T. C. (1996). Viewing time as a measure of sexual interest among child molesters and normal heterosexual men. *Behavior Research and Therapy, 34*, 389-394.

Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1989). Discriminant validity of the Psychopathy Checklist in a forensic psychiatric population. *Psychological Assessment, 1*, 211-218.

Hart, S. D., & Hare, R. D. (1997). Psychopathy: Assessment and association with criminal conduct. In D. M. Stoff, J. Brieling, & J. Maser (Eds.). *Handbook of antisocial behavior* (pp. 22-35). New York: Wiley.

Hart, S., Hare, R. D., & Forth, A. E. (1994). Psychopathy as a risk marker for violence: Development and validation of a screening version of the Revised Psychopathy checklist. In J. Monahan & H. J. Steadman (Eds.), *Violence and mental disorder: Developments in risk assessment* (pp. 81-98). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hart, S., Kropp, P., & Hare, R. (1988). Performance of male psychopaths following conditional release from prison. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*, 227-232.

Hemphill, J. F., Hare, R. D., & Wong, S. (1998). Psychopathy and recidivism: A review. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 3*, 139-170.

Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 25*, 517-572.

Knight, R. A., & Prentky, R. A. (1990). Classifying sexual offenders: The development and corroboration of taxonomic models. In W.L. Marshall & H. E. Barbaree (Eds.), *Handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender* (pp.23-52). New York: Plenum Press.

Kosson, D. S., Smith, S. S., & Newman, J. P. (1990). Evaluating the construct validity of psychopathy on black and white male inmates: Three preliminary studies. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 99*, 250-259.

LaFond, J. Q., & Winick, B. J. (1998). Sex offenders and the law. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law, 4*, 3-24.

Lilienfeld, S. O., & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality traits in noncriminal populations. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 66*(3). 488-524.

Looman, J. (1995). Sexual fantasies of child molesters. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 37*, 321-332.

Marshall, W.L. Fernandez, Y. M., Lightbody, S., & O'Sullivan, C. (1994). The assessment of person-specific empathy deficits in child molesters. Unpublished manuscript.

Marshall, W. L., Jones, R., Hudson, S. M., & McDonald, E. (1993). Generalized empathy in child molesters. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 2*, 61-69.

Marshall, W. L., Hudson, S. M., Jones, R., & Fernandez, Y. M. (1995). Empathy in sexual offenders. *Clinical Psychology Review, 15*, 99-113.

Marshall, W. L., & Maric, A. (1996). Cognitive and emotional components of generalized empathy deficits in child molesters. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 5*, 101-110.

Morey, L. C. (1991). *The Personality Assessment Inventory: Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Muschang, V., Rouleau, J. L., Barsetti, I., & Lavalley, K. (2004). Resemblances between intrafamilial and extrafamilial child molesters. *Review of Psychology of Quebec, 25(3)*, 259-274.

Porter, S., Fairweather, D., Drugge, J., Herve, H., Birt, A., & Boer, D. (2000). Profiles of psychopathy in incarcerated sex offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 27*, 216-233.

Porter, S., Birt, A. R., & Boer, D. P. (2001). Investigation of the criminal and conditional release profiles of Canadian federal offenders as a function of psychopathy and age. *Law and Human Behavior, 25*, 647-661.

Porter, S., Campbell, M. A., Woodworth, M., & Birt, A. R. (2003). A new psychological conceptualization of the sexual psychopath. *Advances in Psychology Research, 7*, 21-36.

Poythress, N. G., Edens, J. F., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (1998). Criterion-related validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory in a prison sample. *Psychological Assessment, 10(4)*, 426-430.

Prentky, R. A., & Knight, R. A. (1991). Identifying critical dimensions for discriminating among rapists. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*, 643-661.

Pratt, J. (1998). The rise and fall of homophobia and sexual psychopath legislation in postwar society. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 4, 25-49.

Quinsey, V. L. (1986). Men who have sex with children. In D. N. Weisstub (Ed.), *Law and mental health: International perspectives* (Vol. 2, pp. 140-172). New York: Pergamon.

Quinsey, V. L., & Lalumiere, M. L. (1996). *Assessment of sexual offenders against children. The APSAC study guides 1*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Quinsey, V. L., Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (1995). Actuarial prediction of sexual recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10, 85-105

Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (2002). Men who molest their sexually immature daughters: Is a special explanation required? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 111, 329-339.

Rice, M. E., Quinsey, V. L., and Harris, G. T. (1991). Sexual recidivism among child molesters released from a maximum security psychiatric institution. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59 (3), 381-386.

Sandoval, A. M. R., Hancock, D. L., Poythress, N., Edens, J. F., & Lilienfeld, S. (2000). Construct validity of the Psychopathic Personality Inventory in a correctional sample. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 74, 262-281.

Serin, R. C. (1991). Psychopathy and violence in criminals. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 6, 423-431.

Serin, R. C., Malcolm, P. B., Khanna, A., & Barbaree, H. E. (1994). Psychopathy and deviant sexual arousal in incarcerated sexual offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 9, 3-11.

Smallbone, S. W., & Milne, L. (2000). Associations between trait anger and aggression used in the commission of sexual offenses. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 44, 606-617

Smith, A. D. (2000). Motivation and psychosis in schizophrenic men who sexually assault women. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 11, 62-73.

Seto, M. C., & Barbaree, H. E. (1997). Sexual aggression as antisocial behavior: A developmental model. In M. Stoff, & J. D. Maser (Eds.). *Handbook of antisocial behavior* (pp. 524-533).

Stermac, L. E., & Segal, Z. V. (1989). Adult sexual contact with children: An examination of cognitive factors. *Behavior Therapy*, 30, 573-584.

Studer, L. H., Aylwin, A. S., Clelland, S. R., Reddon, J. R., & Frenzel, R. R. (2002). Primary erotic preference in a group of child molesters. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 25, 173-180.

Tellegen, A. (1982). *Brief manual for the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript: University of Minnesota.

Van Ness, S. R. (1984). Rape as instrumental violence: A study of youth offenders. . *Gender issues, sex offenses, and criminal justice* (161-170). The Haworth Press.

Ward, T. (2000). Sexual offenders' cognitive distortions as implicit theories. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 5, 491-507.

Ward, T., & Keenan, T. (1999). Child molesters' implicit theories. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14, 821-838.

Ward, T., & Siegert, R. (2002). Toward a comprehensive theory of child sexual abuse: A theory knitting perspective. *Psychology, Crime, and Law*, 8, 319-351

Webster, S. D., & Beech, A. R. (2000). The nature of sexual offenders' affective empathy: A grounded theory analysis. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, *12*, 249-261.

Webster, S. D., & Marshall, W. L. (2004). Generating data with sexual offenders using qualitative material: A paradigm to complement not compete with quantitative methodology. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, *10*, 117-122.

Weiss, J., & Schell, R. (1991). Estimating WAIS-R IQ from the Shipley Institute of Living Scale: A replication. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *47*, 558-562.

Welsh, G. S. (1956). Factor dimensions A and R. In G. S. Welsh & W. G. Dahlstrom (Eds.). *Basic Readings on the MMPI in Psychology and Medicine*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wong, S. (1988). Is Hare's Psychopathy Checklist reliable without the interview? *Psychological Reports*, *62*, 931-934.

Woodworth, M., & Porter, S. (2002). In cold blood: Characteristics of criminal homicides as a function of psychopathy. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *111*, 436-445.

Zachary, R. (1986). *Shipley Institute of Living Scale: Revised Manual*. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

Table 1

Demographic and Descriptive Data for Participants

Variable	Participants (<i>n</i> = 54)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	%
Age at testing	40.48	11.52		
Age at index offense	31.94	9.32		
WAIS-R IQ estimate	92.72	16.10		
Age of victims	11.37	3.04		
Ethnicity				
African American			7	13
Caucasian			44	81
Hispanic			3	6

Table 2

Frequency Data for Victims' Gender, Number of Index Offense Victims, and Total Number of Sexual Offenses

	Frequency	Percentage
Variable and number		
Victim gender		
Male	13	24
Female	36	67
Both	5	9
Number of index offense victims		
1	40	74.1
2	7	13.0
3	3	5.6
4	2	3.7
5	1	1.9
9	1	1.9
Total number of sexual offenses		
1	19	35.2
2	15	27.8
3	13	24.1
4	2	3.7
5	3	5.6

Table 2 (cont.'d)

Frequency Data for Victims' Gender, Number of Index Offense Victims, and Total Number of Sexual Offenses

	Frequency	Percentage
<u>Variable and number</u>		
Total number of sexual offenses		
10	1	1.9
11	1	1.9

Table 3

Frequency Data for Total Number of Sexual Offense Victims and Total Number of Nonsexual Offenses

	Frequency	Percentage
<u>Variable and number</u>		
Total number of sexual offense victims		
1	37	68.5
2	8	14.8
3	4	7.4
4	2	3.7
5	1	1.9
9	2	3.7
Total number of nonsexual offenses		
0	21	38.9
1	9	16.7
2	1	1.9
3	15	27.8
4	2	3.7
5	4	7.4
7	1	1.9
8	1	1.9

Table 4

Descriptive Data for PPI Total and Subscale Scores

Variable	Participants (n = 54)		Normative Sample (n = 46)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
PPI total score	448.72**	43.84	362.67**	37.70
Machiavellian Egocentricity	84.46**	15.01	68.46**	12.55
Social Potency	66.69	10.97	63.24	12.23
Fearlessness	50.39	11.10	47.83	10.01
Coldheartedness	60.74**	9.68	39.80**	7.12
Impulsive Nonconformity	48.80**	8.35	36.50**	9.15
Blame Externalization	43.52**	11.09	33.43**	6.04
Carefree Nonplanfulness	57.30**	9.74	34.83**	6.57
Stress Immunity	28.80	6.30	31.87	6.18
Deviant Responding	35.50	3.74		
Unlikely Virtues	39.46	6.03		
VRIN	-1.04	7.50		

** $p < .01$

Table 5

Distribution Data for Instrumentality and Reactivity Ratings

	Frequency	Percentage
Type of sex offense		
Instrumental	44	81.5
Instrumental/reactive	5	9.3
Reactive/instrumental	5	9.3

Table 6

Demographic and Descriptive Data for Purely Instrumental vs. Some Reactive Offenders

Variable	Purely Instrumental (<i>n</i> = 44)		Some Reactive (<i>n</i> = 10)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age at testing	40.75	12.46	39.30	6.11
Age at index offense	32.27	9.80	30.50	7.08
WAIS-R IQ estimate	93.82	16.01	87.90	16.39
Age of victims	11.48	2.90	10.90	3.73
Years since index offense	8.25	6.39	8.60	5.76
Total number of sexual offenses	2.73*	2.05	1.20*	0.42
Total number of nonsexual offenses	1.75	2.10	2.20	1.48

* $p < .05$.

Table 7

Descriptive Data for PPI Total and Subscale Scores in Offenders with Purely Instrumental and Some Reactive crimes

Variable	Purely Instrumental (<i>n</i> = 44)		Some Reactive (<i>n</i> = 10)		Eta _p ²
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
PPI total score	453.64	45.90	427.10	24.85	0.06
Machiavellian Egocentricity	86.25	15.19	76.60	11.96	0.06
Social Potency	66.36	11.05	68.10	11.04	0.00
Fearlessness	50.93	11.12	48.00	11.25	0.01
Coldheartedness	61.14	9.55	59.00	10.58	0.01
Impulsive Nonconformity	49.64	8.73	45.10	5.32	0.05
Blame Externalization	44.14	11.50	40.80	9.11	0.01
Carefree Nonplanfulness	59.14**	8.50	49.20**	11.14	0.16
Stress Immunity	27.84*	6.17	32.80*	5.35	0.10
Deviant Responding	36.09*	3.26	32.90*	4.75	0.11
Unlikely Virtues	39.61	6.12	38.80	5.87	0.00
VRIN	-0.80	7.03	-2.10	9.65	0.01

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

Table 8

Demographic and Descriptive Data for Intrafamilial vs. Extrafamilial Offenders

Variable	Intrafamilial (<i>n</i> = 24)		Extrafamilial (<i>n</i> = 30)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age at testing	43.92	9.31	37.73	12.50
Age at index offense	33.38	9.75	30.80	8.96
WAIS-R IQ estimate	88.33	17.33	96.23	14.36
Age of victims	10.50	3.12	12.07	2.83
Years since index offense	10.46*	5.91	6.60*	6.01

**p* < .05.

Table 9

Descriptive Data for PPI Total and Subscale Scores in Intrafamilial vs. Extrafamilial Offenders

Variable	Intrafamilial (<i>n</i> = 24)		Extrafamilial (<i>n</i> = 30)		Eta _p ²
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
PPI total score	451.33	44.88	446.63	43.65	0.00
Machiavellian Egocentricity	83.04	14.39	85.60	15.67	0.01
Social Potency	66.25	11.40	67.03	10.79	0.00
Fearlessness	49.63	12.60	51.00	9.92	0.00
Coldheartedness	64.63**	8.26	57.63**	9.73	0.13
Impulsive Nonconformity	48.00	9.38	49.43	7.54	0.01
Blame Externalization	41.04	12.93	45.50	9.12	0.04
Carefree Nonplanfulness	61.25**	7.88	54.13**	10.04	0.13
Stress Immunity	29.50	6.74	28.17	5.95	0.01
Deviant Responding	35.58	3.62	35.43	3.89	0.00
Unlikely Virtues	38.42	6.22	40.30	5.84	0.03
VRIN	-2.38	7.10	0.03	7.75	0.03

** $p < .01$.

Table 10

Correlations between WAIS-R IQ Estimate, Age at Testing, Total Number of Sexual Offenses, Total Number of Nonsexual Offenses, Number of Victims in Index Offense, Ages Of Victims, and PPI Total and Subscale Scores

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	(n = 54)										
1. WAIS-R estimate	--	.03	.09	-.30*	.14	.06	-.04	-.20	-.02	.19	-.13
2. Age at testing		--	.13	-.20	.15	-.14	.43**	.25	.16	.40**	.31*
3. Total sexual offenses			--	-.02	.60**	.05	.21	.15	.22	.10	.08
4. Total nonsexual offenses				--	-.18	.18	-.10	.10	-.10	-.11	-.17
5. Number of index victims					--	.05	.07	.05	-.06	.16	.04
6. Ages of victims						--	.04	.19	-.10	-.04	-.31*
7. PPI total scores							--	.80**	.48**	.71**	.43*
8. Machiavellian Egocentricity								--	.17	.45**	.17
9. Social Potency									--	.28*	.28*
10. Fearlessness										--	-.04
11. Coldheartedness											--

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table 11

Correlations between WAIS-R IQ Estimate, Age at Testing, Total Number of Sexual Offenses, Total Number of Nonsexual Offenses, Number of Victims in Index Offense, Ages Of Victims, and PPI Total and Subscale Scores (cont.'d)

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	<i>(n = 54)</i>										
1. WAIS-R estimate	--	.03	.09	-.30*	.14	.06	-.04	-.14	.25	-.06	-.05
2. Age at testing		--	.13	-.20	.15	-.14	.43**	.19	-.03	.41**	.05
3. Total sexual offenses			--	-.02	.60**	.05	.21	.12	-.11	.21	.12
4. Total nonsexual offenses				--	-.18	.18	-.10	-.04	-.05	-.00	-.15
5. Number of index victims					--	.05	.07	-.02	.03	.05	.02
6. Ages of victims						--	.04	.06	.41**	.04	-.33*
7. PPI total scores							--	.77**	.29*	.52**	-.08
8. Impulsive Nonconformity								--	.45**	.30*	-.28*
9. Blame Externalization									--	.06	-.62**
10. Carefree Nonplanfulness										--	-.29*
11. Stress Immunity											--

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table 12

Correlations between PPI Total and Subscale Scores with Intrafamilial vs. Extrafamilial Offense Designations and Purely Instrumental vs. Some Reactive Offenses

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
	(n = 54)										
1. PPI Total	--	.80**	.48**	.71**	.34*	.77**	.29*	.52**	-.08	.24	-.05
2. Machiavellian Egocentricity		--	.17	.45*	.17	.65**	.29*	.42**	-.36**	.25	.09
3. Social Potency			--	.28*	.28*	.18	-.23	-.03	.43	-.06	.04
4. Fearlessness				--	-.04	.61**	.26	.11	.02	.10	.06
5. Coldheartedness					--	-.09	-.45**	.45**	.31*	.09	-.36**
6. Impulsive Nonconformity						--	.45**	.30	-.28*	.21	.08
7. Blame Externalization							--	.06	-.62**	.12	.20
8. Carefree Nonplanfulness								--	-.29*	.40**	-.37**
9. Stress Immunity									--	-.31*	-.11
10. Purely instrumental vs. some reactive										--	.05
11. Victim relation											--

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

16. I would not mind wearing my hair in a "mohawk."
A **B** **C** **D**
17. I occasionally forget my name.
A **B** **C** **D**
18. I rarely find myself being the center of attention in social situations.
A **B** **C** **D**
19. It might be fun to belong to a group of "bikers" (motorcyclists) who travel around the country and raise some hell.
A **B** **C** **D**
20. I tell many "white lies."
A **B** **C** **D**
21. I often hold on to old objects or letters just for their sentimental value.
A **B** **C** **D**
22. I am a good conversationalist.
A **B** **C** **D**
23. A lot of people in my life have tried to stab me in the back.
A **B** **C** **D**
24. I am so moved by certain experiences (e.g., watching a beautiful sunset, listening to a favorite piece of music) that I feel emotions that are beyond words.
A **B** **C** **D**
25. I often find myself resenting people who give me orders.
A **B** **C** **D**
26. I would find a job of movie stunt person exciting.
A **B** **C** **D**
27. I have always been extremely courageous in facing difficult situations.
A **B** **C** **D**
28. I hate having to tell people bad news.
A **B** **C** **D**
29. I think that it should be against the law to seriously injure another person intentionally.
A **B** **C** **D**
30. I would be more successful in life had I not received so many bad breaks.
A **B** **C** **D**
31. It bothers me (or it would bother me) quite a bit to speak in front of a large group of strangers.
A **B** **C** **D**
32. When I am faced with a decision involving moral matters, I often ask myself, "Am I doing the right thing?"
A **B** **C** **D**
33. From time to time, I really "blow up" at other people.
A **B** **C** **D**

82. I've been the victim of a lot of bad luck in my life.
A B C D
83. I have at times eaten too much.
A B C D
84. I sometimes question authority figures "just for the hell of it."
A B C D
85. When my life becomes boring, I like to take some chances to make things interesting.
A B C D
86. I tend to be "thin-skinned" and overly sensitive to criticism.
A B C D
87. I've quickly learned from my major mistakes in life.
A B C D
88. When someone is hurt by something I say or do, I usually consider that to be their problem.
A B C D
89. I like to dress differently from other people.
A B C D
90. If I really wanted to, I could convince most people of just about anything.
A B C D
91. I get restless and dissatisfied if my life becomes too routine.
A B C D
92. I generally feel that life has treated me fairly.
A B C D
93. Ending a friendship is (or would be) very painful for me.
A B C D
94. When I am under stress, I often see large, red, rectangular shapes moving in front of my eyes.
A B C D
95. I often do favors for people even when I know that I will probably never see them again.
A B C D
96. I have sometimes "stood up" a date or a friend because something that sounded like more fun came up.
A B C D
97. I haven't thought much about what I want to do with my life.
A B C D

114. I'm hardly ever the "life of the party."
A **B** **C** **D**
115. I have occasionally felt discouraged about something.
A **B** **C** **D**
116. I agree with the motto, "If you are bored with life, risk it."
A **B** **C** **D**
117. I am a squeamish person.
A **B** **C** **D**
118. I enjoy (or I would enjoy) participating in sports involving a lot of physical contact (e.g., football, wrestling).
A **B** **C** **D**
119. I do not enjoy loud, wild parties and get-togethers.
A **B** **C** **D**
120. I often push myself to my limits in my work.
A **B** **C** **D**
121. I am easily "rattled" at critical moments.
A **B** **C** **D**
122. In school or at work, I sometimes try to "stretch" the rules a little bit just to see how much I can get away with.
A **B** **C** **D**
123. On occasion, I've had to restrain myself from punching someone.
A **B** **C** **D**
124. I wouldn't mind belonging to a group of people who "drift" from city to city, with no permanent home.
A **B** **C** **D**
125. I have at times been angry with someone.
A **B** **C** **D**
126. If I were growing up during the 1960's, I probably would have been a "hippie."
A **B** **C** **D**
127. When a friend says hello to me, I generally either wave or say something back.
A **B** **C** **D**
128. While watching a sporting event on TV, I sometimes wince when I see an athlete get badly injured.
A **B** **C** **D**

145. Sometimes, I'm a bit lazy.
A **B** **C** **D**
146. I sometimes like to "thumb by nose" at established traditions.
A **B** **C** **D**
147. During the day, I generally see the world in color rather than in black-and-white.
A **B** **C** **D**
148. When I am doing something important (e.g., taking a test, doing my taxes), I usually check it over at least once or twice to make sure it is correct.
A **B** **C** **D**
149. When I'm among a group of people, I rarely end up being the leader.
A **B** **C** **D**
150. To be perfectly honest, I usually try not to help people unless I think there's some way that they can help me later.
A **B** **C** **D**
151. Many people probably think of my political belief as "radical."
A **B** **C** **D**
152. I sometimes lie just to see if I can get someone to believe.
A **B** **C** **D**
153. I have to admit that I'm a bit of a materialist.
A **B** **C** **D**
154. I think that it might almost be exciting to be a passenger on a plane that appeared certain to crash, yet somehow managed to land safely.
A **B** **C** **D**
155. In social situations, I sometimes act the same way everyone else does because I don't want to appear too different.
A **B** **C** **D**
156. Never in my whole life have I taken advantage of anyone.
A **B** **C** **D**
157. I can hold up my end of a conversation even if the topic is something I know almost nothing about.
A **B** **C** **D**
158. I often tell people only the part of the truth they want to hear.
A **B** **C** **D**

Appendix B

INSTRUMENTAL-REACTIVE CODING SCHEME

1. Offender's identification (CODE) number: (CODE)**2. Date of birth: (DOB)**

YEAR/MONTH/DAY

3. Age (calculation based on offender's age as of April 2006): (Age)**4. Marital status: (Marital)**

~this includes any marriages (including common-law) in the offender's lifetime.

1 = Never married

2 = Married once

3 = Married more than once

4 = Currently divorced or separated: married once

5 = Currently divorced or separated: married more than once

5. Legal Description of the Sexual Offenses: (legal)

--Get these descriptions from the prison files

1 = Involuntary Deviate Sexual Intercourse

2 = Indecent assault

3 = Incest

4 = Rape

5 = Statutory Sexual Assault

6 = Sexual Assault

7 = Aggravated Indecent Assault

8 = Corruption of Minors

9 = Sexual Abuse of Children

10 = Kidnapping

11 = Sexual Exploitation of Children

6. How many years ago was sexual offense (based on days since violent offense): (tim_off)**7. Age when committed sexual offense: (Age_vio)**

8. Total number of sexual offenses committed by the offender: (tot_vio)

~an indication of the total number of sexual offenses the offender has committed. Include the current sexual offense. Include all convictions BUT NOT charges.

9. Total number of non-sexual offenses committed by the offender (tot_non)

~an indication of the total number of non-sexual offenses the offender has committed. Include all convictions BUT NOT charges.

***10.* Approximate time of day of index offense: (approx_t)**

- 1 = Morning (5:00 AM-11:59 AM)
- 2 = Afternoon (12 PM - 4:59 PM)
- 3 = Evening (5 PM - 10:59 PM)
- 4 = Late Evening (11 PM - 4:59 AM)

11. Approximate time of day of previous sexual offenses

- 1 = Morning (5:00 AM-11:59 AM)
- 2 = Afternoon (12 PM - 4:59 PM)
- 3 = Evening (5 PM - 10:59 PM)
- 4 = Late Evening (11 PM - 4:59 AM)

***12* Duration of index sexual offense (the actual event, not planning etc.) (dura)**

- 1 = Less than half an hour
- 2 = half and hour to 2 hours
- 3 = 2 hours to 5 hours
- 4 = More than 5 hours

Inmate input→

13. Duration of past sexual offenses (not planning)

- 1 = Less than half an hour
- 2 = half and hour to 2 hours
- 3 = 2 hours to 5 hours
- 4 = More than 5 hours

Inmate input→***14.* Number of victims for index sexual offense: (nu_c_vic)**

~The number of victims from the offender's current sexual offense conviction (either deceased in the case of a homicide, or listed as a victim in the official description).

15. Total number of victims: (tot_vic)

~The total number of victims from all of the offenders' sexual offense convictions.

***16.* Number of individuals involved in the index sexual offense: (ind_vio)**

- 1 = Just the offender being coded
- 2 = The offender and one other individual
- 3 = The offender and two other individuals
- 4 = The offender and three or more individuals
- #5 = Can't Recall

17. Number of individuals involved in all previous sexual offenses

- 1 = Just the offender being coded
- 2 = The offender and one other individual
- 3 = The offender and two other individuals
- 4 = The offender and three or more individuals
- #5 = Can't Recall

***18.* Offender's "role" in the sexual offense: (role_vio)**

~this variable investigates the "role" of the offender who was convicted of criminal violent offenses

- 1 = Offender was primarily responsible for the criminal violent offense (e.g. offender was alone, offender assaulted the victim while a second individual waited in a car outside).
- 2 = Offender committed the violent offenses with one or more other individuals who also had a substantial "role" in the crime (e.g. the offender and one other individual both severely beat a victim).
- 3 = Offender had a minor "role" in the criminal violent offenses (e.g. the offender "kept

watch” outside while his companion attacked/murdered the victim inside their apartment).
 4 = Completely unclear what role the offender had in the violent offense.

#5 - offender can't recall/refuses to say

Inmate input→

***19.* Type of sexual offense: (sex_type)**

- 1 = Instrumental sexual offense
- 2 = Instrumental/reactive sexual offense
- 3 = Reactive/instrumental sexual offense
- 4 = Reactive sexual offense
- 5 = Unable to determine

a) You would code a 5 when,

- 1.** There is a lack of information due to **a:** missing or too little information or **b:** coder is unclear as to what actually happened, how it happened, or why it happened (e.g. an offender's girlfriend is found dead, and he is charged with a violent offense, HOWEVER he does not admit to the crime, there are no details regarding how the incident occurred and there is no indication of planning or motivation)
- 2.** Coder is completely unclear about what the possible motive or rationale for the sexual offense may be. (e.g. the violent offenses does not appear to have been provoked **or** planned). In most cases, this second possibility will be in homicide or violent offenses that have been committed against women or strangers for no apparent or obvious reason.

b) For the purposes of coding an offense **that has a sexual component:** the instrumental/reactive continuum described in 19 below should be considered when determining if the offense should be labeled as instrumental, reactive, or a combination of the two. **Sexual violence will not automatically be assumed to be one type of violence or the other.**

Please refer to the descriptions below for further information on 19 (1 through 4).

19 (4). Reactive sexual offense:

- ~Primary motive appears to be anger or displaying aggression
- ~Evidence of provocation, without a "cooling off" period between the time of the provocation and the time of the sexual offense.

~Sexual offense crime scene appears careless and spontaneous.

~Sexual offense is in response to some type of dispute or interpersonal conflict, without a "cooling off" period between the time of the dispute or interpersonal conflict and the time the sexual offense was committed. If there was a "cooling off" period, the files may indicate that the interpersonal conflict or dispute actually led to an instrumental sexual offense which was committed for reasons of revenge or retribution, rather than being a reaction to the immediate dispute.

~Sexual offense appears to be spontaneous or unplanned consequence of another **encounter** (violence was not initially used to force or manipulate the victim into sexual acts)

*Please Note: Holmes & Holmes (1998) have described the "cooling off" period as a "singleness of time." Another perhaps more appropriate way to conceive of this is as a "singleness of incident." This is meant to imply that there is no discernable gap between the incident in question and the violent offenses.

Ex 1. The offender and victim engage in an argument at a drinking establishment and within the course of the night the victim is brutally assaulted by the offender = No cooling off period.

Ex 2 . The offender and victim engage in an argument at a drinking establishment and two days later the offender brutally assaults the victim at their place of employment. = cooling off period.

Inmate input→

19 (3). Reactive/Instrumental:

~When there is clear evidence of both reactive and instrumental behavior regarding the sexual offense, yet the primary cause could be attributed to Reactive violence.

E.g.. person reacted to a conflict or provocation by sexually assaulting the victim(s), but continued to offend in process of achieving more goals (sex, drugs, money)

Inmate input→

19 (2). Instrumental/Reactive:

~When there is clear evidence of both instrumental and reactive behavior regarding the sexual offense, yet the primary cause could be attributed to Instrumental violence

E.G. initial motivations were to get sexual gratification or other goals from victim(s), but became agitated/distressed at various points and continued to offend impulsively or reactively

Inmate input→

19. (1) Instrumental sexual offense:

~Evidence of planning

~Evidence of some type of goal. This could include reasons such as: sexual offense that was committed for

A. Revenge or retribution for past events (such as stealing from the offender)

B. Monetary gain

C. Drugs or alcohol

E. A female (two individuals competing over the same woman)

F. To escape custody/remain at large

G. Sexual Motivation (e.g., a sexual assault that is planned out)

~Violent offenses committed for a clearly identifiable purpose other than “hot-blooded” spontaneous anger, frustration, or provocation.

~ No immediate emotional/situational provocation, committed sexual offense(s) for sexual gratification or other instrumental goal, intentional and motivated by clear external goals (e.g. sex, drugs, money)

Inmate input→

***20.* Specific Type of Violence: (vio_spef)**

List the primary reason that the sexual offenses occurred.

- 1 = Monetary gain
- 2 = Drugs or alcohol (includes prescription drugs).
- 3 = Revenge/retribution for past events (**if based on female relationship issues/problems code # 4**)
- 4 = A female (a fight over an affair or jealousy, or upset about ending of relationship).
- 5 = To obtain nonconsensual sex, Intentionally victimize a female/male, or male/female children
- 6 = Completely spontaneous sexual assault (**the offender may or may not have been provoked**)
- 7 = Unplanned result of another planned event (e.g., robbery)
- 8 = Completely unclear what the motivation was/offender refuses to say
- 9 = Other

** put reason why for number 9 (it will be entered into SPSS)

Inmate input→

***21.* General type of violence: (vio_gen)**

‘Secondary violence’ reflects offenses that are committed for a reason that was not primarily intended to inflict harm upon a victim (e.g., to obtain money). ‘Primary violence’ reflects offenses where the violence was committed primarily for the reason of causing pain or discomfort to the victim.

- 1 = Secondary violence
- 2 = Primary violence
- 3 = Unclear which would be more appropriate

Inmate input→

***22.* Gender of sexual offense victim/s: (gender)**

~the gender of the victim (s) for the offender's index sexual offense conviction.

- 1 = Male
- 2 = Female
- 3 = Male and Female

***23.* Relationship of victim to offender: (relate)**

~the predominant relationship between the offender and his index victim.

- 1 = Male Stranger
- 2 = Female Stranger
- 3 = Involved in a common-law/marriage relationship/serious girlfriend (or has recently split-up from one of the aforementioned)
- 4 = Family member (e.g. immediate family, son, daughter, stepson/daughter, cousins)
- 5 = Friend (or family friend; or family friend's child)
- 6 = Co-worker/business partner/casual acquaintance
- # 7 = Can't recall/refuses to say

24. Specific age of the index offense victim: (age_spc)***25.* General age of the index offense victim: (age_gen)**

- 1 = Child (0-12)
- 2 = Teen-ager (13-19)
- 3 = Adult (20-64)
- 4 = Senior (65 and over)
- #5 = Can't recall/isn't sure/won't say

***26.* Relationship of other victims to offender: (relate2)**

~the predominant relationship between the offender and a second victim, if there was more than one victim from the current violent offenses (see **variable 23** for coding details).

27. Specific age of other victims: (age_spc2)

***28.* General age of other victims: (age_gen2)**

~see **variable 25** for coding details.

***If there are more than two victims -pick the two victims that appear to have been the primary/most effected victims.**

***29.* Type of weapon: (weap_ryp)**

~categories for coding the type of weapon used to commit the sexual offense;

1 = Gun

2 = Knife

3 = Bare hands (hitting, kicking, biting, scratching, throwing, pushing)

4 = An object used for the purpose of bludgeoning , stabbing, strangling or restraining (except for a knife), that has/could be conceived of as a weapon. ex. Club, axe, sword.

5 = An object used for the purpose of bludgeoning, stabbing, strangling, or restraining the victim that has not traditionally been thought of as a weapon. ex. Broken glass, rock, piece of wood, eating utensil.

6 = Combination of Gun and/or Knife and/or bare hands and/or any type of object

7 = No weapon (tampered with the car brakes etc.)

#8 = Can't recall/refuses to say

Inmate input→

***30.* How the weapon was obtained to commit current sexual offense: (weap_how)**

~the method by which the offender obtained the weapon that was used during the violent offenses.

- 1 = Weapon of opportunity (what was immediately available at crime scene)
- 2 = Weapon of choice (chosen beforehand to help achieve a goal)
- 3 = No Weapon (includes using only hands **or** items that would fall under 7 from variable 34)
- 4 = Unclear if 1. or 2. would be more appropriate .

Inmate input→

***31.* Drugs: (drugs)**

- 0 = No drug involvement
- 1 = At the time of the offense, offender was under the influence of ‘minor’ drugs such as marijuana, hashish, or prescription drugs such as Tylenol 3’s.
- 2 = At the time of the offense, offender was under the influence of ‘major drugs’ such as mushrooms, LSD, cocaine, heroin or prescription drugs such as Demerol or morphine.
- 3 = both minor and major drugs
- 4 = Drugs were determined to have played a role in the sexual offense, even though the offender was not intoxicated during the commission of the offense
- #5 = offender can't recall/refuses to say

*An example of (4) would be an offender who was on a cocaine ‘binge’ for a number of days and had become quite delusional and neurotic. Even if he was NOT under the influence of cocaine at the time he committed the violent offenses, the circumstances may still reveal that the drug was a major contributing factor towards the violent offenses. Another example would be if the offender was attempting to get drugs when the violent offense was committed .

Inmate input→

***32.* Alcohol: (alcohol)**

- 0 = No alcohol
- 1 = At the time of the offense, offender was under the influence of a small amount of alcohol at the time of the offense (1-2 beers or 1-2 hard alcoholic drinks or 1-2 glasses of wine).
- 2 = At the time of the offense, offender was under the influence of a moderate amount of alcohol (3-6 beers or 3-4 hard alcoholic drinks or 3-5 glasses of wine).

3 = At the time of the offense, offender was under the influence of an extreme amount of alcohol (over 6 beers and/or 5-6 hard alcoholic drinks and/or more than 5 glasses of wine). A 3 would also be appropriate in cases where prior to the offense the offenders was reported to have been “binge” drinking or “drinking for the entire day and/or night.”

4 = Alcohol was determined to have played a role in the violent offenses, even though the offender was not intoxicated during the commission of the offense.

5 = Offender was under the influence of an undetermined amount of alcohol at the time of the offense.

#6 = Offender can't recall/refuses to say

Inmate input→

***33.* Drugs and alcohol: (dru_alc)**

0 = neither one applies

1 = only variable 36 applies (drugs)

2 = only variable 37 applies (alcohol)

3 = both variables apply (offender was under the influence of both drugs and alcohol)

#4 = Unclear based on offender's self-report

Inmate input→

34. Total number of sexual offenses committed by the offender: (tot_sex)

Curriculum Vitae

Aref Jabbour, Ph.D.

EDUCATION

Ph.D.: Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University, August 2007

M.S.: Psychology, The Pennsylvania State University, May 2002

B.A., Cum Laude: Psychology, Northwestern University, June 2000

HONORS AND AWARDS

Phi Beta Kappa

Honors Program in Psychology, Northwestern University, 1999-2000

Dean's List, Northwestern University, 1997-2000

INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS AND LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE

Sexual Offenders Treatment Program, Psychologist and Program Coordinator, State Correctional Institution at Rockview, October 2006-present

Mental Health Coordinator, Psychological Services Specialist, State Correctional Institution at Rockview, July 2005-October 2006

Sex Offender Process Group Facilitator, The Psychological Clinic at Penn State, October 2003-September 2005

Graduate Student Peer Supervisor, The Psychological Clinic at Penn State, May 2004-July 2004

Part-Time Clinic Assistant, The Psychological Clinic at Penn State, July 2003-July 2004.

Part-Time psychology intern, State Correctional Institution at Rockview, July 2003- April 2004.

Full-Time Clinic Assistant, The Psychological Clinic at Penn State, July 2002-July 2003.

Part-Time Clinic Assistant, The Psychological Clinic at Penn State, July 2001-July 2002.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

Erian-Ghebrial, M., **Jabbour, A.**, & Arnett, P. A. (2003). The Role of Dysfunctional Family Context Variables and Decreased Emotional Responsivity in the Development of Factors of Psychopathy. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, Boston, MA.

Jabbour, A & Arnett, P. A. (2001, October). Why Aren't Psychopathic Individuals Low-Anxious. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Research in Psychopathology, Madison, WI