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Major contributors in the field of child sexual abuse have agreed that sex offenders who sexually abuse children are not primarily motivated by sexual desire and have proposed that the simultaneous satisfaction of a number of psychological needs is the prominent motivation of sex offenders of children. Few attempts have been made to empirically validate the clinical and theoretical impressions regarding the psychological needs of this group using psychological measures designed to assess needs or motives.

The purpose of this study was to investigate to what extent the assumptions about the psychological needs of sex offenders of children would be supported when these needs were measured by a standardized objective psychological instrument that was based on a theory of psychological needs. The psychological instrument used was the Personality Research Form E (PRF-E) (Jackson, 1984), based on Murray's theory of manifest needs.

The sample consisted of 50 men, between the ages of 18 and 72, who were accused of child sexual abuse and who were evaluated as outpatients by psychologists with expertise in sex offender assessment. To be included in the sample, they had to be at least 4
years older than their victims and not been through a lengthy adjudication process. The offender group's PRF-E results were compared to those of the randomly selected PRF-E adult male normative group. Subgroups of the offender sample were also compared based on offense variables.

The sex offenders of children group's mean scores were significantly higher on the Abasement and Succorance scales and significantly lower on the Aggression, Autonomy, Dominance, Exhibition, Play, and Sentience scales when compared to the adult male normative group by t-test analysis. Chi-square revealed a significant difference on the Nurturance scale; the observed values were not normally distributed on this scale. Significance was determined at the .05 level.

The results of this study indicate that some of the psychological needs attributed to sex offenders of children as a group are supported by their measurement on the PRF-E, and that sex offenders of children as a group differ in need state patterns from a randomly selected group. Individual offender profiles varied from the mean score profile of the offender group.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

As early as 1857, the French expert on legal medicine, Ambroise Tardieu, began publishing his findings on the physical and sexual abuses to which children were being subjected (Masson, 1984). This led to an interest in and proliferation of study and reporting of cases of child sexual abuse in France. Masson (1984) believed that Freud's exposure to this body of literature, while he was studying with Charcot in Paris, provided the background that led to Freud's sensitive understanding of his female patients as they told of their childhood sexual traumas. S. Freud (1896/1962) saw the childhood sexual experiences as so profoundly affecting the lives of his patients that in his "Aetiology of Hysteria", he wrote, "I therefore put forward the thesis that at the bottom of every case of hysteria there are one or more occurrences of premature sexual experiences, occurrences which belong to the earliest years of childhood" (p. 203). Masson (1984) stated that this theory, which became known as the seduction theory, purported that these very real sexual experiences had a "damaging and lasting effect on the later lives of the children who suffered them" (p. 3). Masson also reported that the theoretical importance of such early sexual
traumas was greatly diminished when Freud partially recanted his seduction theory by stating, among other things, that it was not very probable that such widespread perversions against children could exist. When S. Freud (1924/1952) proposed the concept of the "phantasy of seduction", including it as one of the primal fantasies, he stated that the reality of childhood seduction was "not as often real as it seemed from the first results of analysis" (p. 379). Freud's colleagues and followers so readily accepted the fantasy of seduction concept that the emphasis shifted away from the real childhood sexual traumas. Peters (1976) made the accusation that this shift in emphasis was so readily accepted to relieve the anxiety of Freud's fellow clinicians created by the thought of looking at the power structure as capable of committing such aberrant acts against children. Additionally, he stated that psychoanalysis has "oversubscribed to the theory of childhood fantasy and overlooked incidents of actual sexual victimization of childhood" (p. 401). If this theoretical shift changed the emphasis from viewing children as victims of sexual crimes to viewing children primarily as creators of their own imaged traumas, then there was no need to examine what factors contributed to an adult's sexual abuse of a child.

Prevalence of the Problem

There is now an increasing body of information about the reality of the widespread problem of the sexual abuse of children.
A. Freud (1981) stated:

Far from existing only as a phantasy, incest is thus also a fact . . . . Where the chances of harming a child's normal developmental growth are concerned, it ranks higher than abandonment, neglect, physical maltreatment or any other form of abuse. It would be a fatal mistake to underrate either the importance or the frequency of its actual occurrence. (p. 34)

There have been numerous attempts to estimate the incidents and prevalence of this problem which by its very nature is hidden and secretive. Russell (1984) conducted the only random nonclinical study on the prevalence of child sexual abuse among females in the United States and found 38% of the 930 women surveyed reported being sexually abused before the age 18. When the definition was extended to include encounters with exhibitionists and inappropriate propositions for sexual activity, the rate rose to 54%. Only 5% of these cases had ever come to the attention of the authorities. Wyatt (1985) studied a sample of 124 Black women and 124 White women and found 62% of her sample had at least one unwanted sexual experience as a child. Mayer (1985) reported on Martin's research findings that indicate 32-46% of all children are sexually assaulted by age 18. Other studies (Finkelhor, 1979; Gagnon, 1965; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953) found the prevalence estimates to range from 11% to 40%. These estimates are likely to be low when it is considered how many victims never disclose their secret, how many have repressed it, and how many are prone to dissociation. It has been pointed out by Finkelhor and Hotaling (1984), however, that based on the 1979 census data of 60 million children currently under
the age of 18 in the United States, if 10% of all girls and 2% of all boys were destined to be sexually abused, it would lead to approximately 210,000 new cases per year. Sarafino (1979) estimated the number of incidents to exceed 336,000 per year by extrapolating from reported cases in four regions of the United States.

It is conservatively estimated that there are 4 million sex offenders who abuse children in the United States today (Geiser, 1979; Groth & Bairnbaum, 1978) and that these offenders are responsible for the sexual abuse of one child every 2 minutes (O'Brien, 1986). The number of victims per offender is at times staggering. In a study by Abel, Becker, Murphy, and Flanagan (1981), where a federal Certificate of Confidentiality was secured, 232 molesters had attempted 55,250 molestations (mean 238.2), completed 38,727 (mean 166.9), and involved 17,585 victims (mean 75.8) under the age of 14. Additionally, sex offenders of children were found to be responsible for 10 times the number of victims as rapists of adults. Freeman-Longo and Wall (1986) studied 53 offenders who had committed an estimated 25,757 sexual crimes. Abel, Rouleau, and Cunningham-Rathner (1986) stated that pedophilia and incest are among the most serious sex crimes in the United States because of the high frequency; that by the time the average pedophile reaches adulthood, 25 molestations will have been attempted by that person. The average number of victims per offender has been described as ranging from 50 (Mayer, 1985) to 62.4 (Abel et al., 1981). O'Brien (1986) found 70 victims per offender.
not to be unusual. She also pointed out the problem of the multiplier effect whereby each victim in turn victimizes more children. In recent research (Finkelhor, 1986; Groth, 1985; Mayer, 1985), one of the most consistent findings is that an unusually high number of sex offenders against children were themselves objects of sexual abuse.

Previous Attempts to Describe and Differentiate Offenders of Children

Sex offenders of children have been described and classified according to personality variables (Anderson, Kunce, & Rich, 1979; Justice & Justice, 1979; Rist, 1979), psychosocial variables (Groth, 1978; Knopp, 1984; Summit & Kryso, 1978; Weinberg, 1955), offense variables (Finkelhor, 1986; Groth & Bairnbaum, 1978; Russell, 1984), and psychosexual variables (Ellis & Brancale, 1956; Gebhard, Gagnon, Pomeroy, & Christenson, 1965; Groth, 1978). Attempts to differentiate sex offenders of children from the rest of the population based on demographic, educational, or social class variables have not proven fruitful (Finkelhor, 1984; Russell, 1984; Wyatt, 1985). Knopp (1984) stated that they appear to be a heterogeneous group that do not differ in most respects from the population as a whole. They do differ, however, in that they seek sexual gratification and relief from the stresses with which they cannot cope by the sexual victimization of children.

Although there is an abundance of research that dispels the
theory that all sex offenders are pathological (Finkelhor, 1979; Gebhard et al., 1965), many child abuse theorists continue to focus on the personality structure of the offender when examining factors that contribute to the sexual abuse of children. If psychopathology is not always the determining factor for sexually abusive behavior, then other factors should be examined; and instruments that are designed to assess variables that are not directly related to psychopathology utilized if more insight into the dynamics of the abusers is to be achieved.

**The Role of Psychological Needs**

Most major child abuse theorists (Finkelhor, 1986; Groth, 1978; Russell, 1984; Sgroi, 1982) agree that child sexual abuse is not primarily motivated by sexual desire. Sgroi (1982) described it as a "sexual behavior in the service of nonsexual needs" (p. 1). Groth (1978) believed that sexually abusive behavior fit the criteria of a symptom formation in that it serves to partially gratify a need, defend against anxiety, and express unresolved conflict. He added that it may serve a number of needs simultaneously and is thought to become compulsive as the offenders become dependent on this sexual activity to meet their emotional needs. The nature of these emotional needs is primarily extrapolated from behavioral observations, theoretical propositions, and clinical inferences regarding personality structure. Some of the psychological needs commonly referred to in the literature include dominance,
aggression, dependency, impulsivity, adequacy, affiliation, and self-protection. Groth (1978) and Karpman (1954) have described sex offenders of children as concerned only with their own needs and feelings, insensitive to the needs and feelings of others, fearful of adult relationships, unable to delay gratification or tolerate frustration, and deficient in insight and understanding of their own behavior. Groth stated that the psychology of pedophilia remains largely an enigma, because very little research is available that relates statistical findings to theoretical propositions.

Statement of the Problem

There have been very few attempts to validate empirically the clinical and theoretical impressions regarding the psychological needs of sex offenders of children using psychological measures designed to assess needs or motivational variables. The only studies that aimed at assessing the psychological needs of sex offenders of children (Fisher, 1969; Fisher & Howell, 1970) by an objective standardized psychological instrument, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), used samples from a receiving center of the California Department of Corrections. These prisoners had been rejected by the sex offender treatment program as having a poor prognosis for treatment and rehabilitation; therefore, they may not be a representative sample of sex offenders who abuse children. Meanwhile, these assumptions about the psychological needs operating in the etiology of child sexual abuse appear to be accepted as
factual, with treatment and disposition of cases often based upon them.

The question remains as to whether the assumptions regarding the psychological needs of sex offenders who sexually abuse children can be supported by measurement of such needs on an objective standardized psychological instrument based on a theory of psychological need.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate to what extent the assumptions of various practitioners about the psychological needs of sex offenders who sexually abuse children are supported when these needs are measured by an objective standardized psychological instrument that is based on a theory of psychological need.

Significance of the Study

Finkelhor (1984) stated, "We can't recognize the social and psychological significance of adults relating sexually to children unless we understand the broad emotional and developmental meaning such behavior has for its perpetrators" (p. 29). This study was conducted in an attempt to add to the knowledge base of what emotional meaning sexually abusive behavior has for sex offenders of children and to shed some light on the psychological make-up of these individuals. It also stands to support the current theoretical assumptions about sex offenders of children or to challenge those in
this field of endeavor to place less emphasis on psychological needs and to look to other factors for explanation of this behavior.

Knopp (1984) pointed out that two of the critical factors involved in the treatment of sex offenders are competent evaluation and treatment aimed at the needs of the offender. Sgroi (1982) added that it is important to help them meet these needs in a more adaptive fashion. If the needs evaluation instrument used in this study demonstrates particular relevance to the assessment of sex offenders, it may be a useful tool by which a portion of the treatment could be directed and which could be used to objectively measure offender progress in treatment.

Meiselman (1978) stressed the importance of identifying standardized tests and the reporting of standardized test results for the purpose of future research. She stated:

While all the better known standardized tests contribute some additional knowledge beyond that gained by interview alone, the increased reporting of objective test results would be especially desirable, because these results are less likely to be affected by the subjective biases of the researcher and because of the interesting possibility that results obtained from different samples by different researchers could be combined, which is especially intriguing in a field of research where small samples are almost the rule. (p. 44)

The results of this study could be used as the base for future research into a particular relevant area of offender personality, psychological needs, that has thus far been relatively neglected in research using psychometric measures.

Should certain patterns emerge, future research matching
particular treatments to particular patterns could be beneficial in increasing the potential for successful treatment of sex offenders. Additionally, it may be worthwhile in future research to see if particular histories are related to particular patterns to provide clues to the prevention of this problem.

Groth (1978) stated, "If we are to help the victims, we must understand the offenders, for the etiology of a victim's trauma lies in the offender's pathology" (p. 24). Although this study was not aimed at pathology, the above statement might also read that the etiology of a victim’s trauma lies in the offender's motives and needs. The healing of many victims includes an answer to their question of why someone did this to them. If the results of this work provide any information that helps a victim understand that their victimization was a product of the dynamics of the offenders, and not related to the victim's worth, this study would be significant and worth doing.

Limitations of the Study

The etiology of the sexual abuse of children is a multifaceted problem, and the focus of this study was upon only one facet of the problem. The psychological needs assessed were limited to those represented by the needs evaluation instrument selected for this study. It is possible that there are other needs, other motivating factors, that are untapped by the test but are important precipitating variables in child sexual abuse. It is also possible
that the items used to sample each need state represented on the
instrument may not tap those aspects of the needs most salient to
offenders' dynamics.

Since the needs evaluation instrument is dependent on
offenders' self-reports, it is also subject to the denial,
distortion, and dissociation so commonly associated with the self-
reports of sex offenders (Burgess, Groth, Holmstrom, & Sgroi, 1978;
quoted Finkelhor as saying:

The study of child molesters is not an easy task. Such
individuals do not make enthusiastic or cooperative
subjects and the matters of most interest to the
researcher are often the exact ones the subjects are least
interested in divulging. (p. 146)

Because the sample was made up of offenders who have come to
the attention of the authorities, the results may represent the
characteristics of offenders who get caught but may not be
representative of offenders who do not get caught. Cook and Howells
(1981) believed that reported incidents are usually more serious and
damaging than those not reported. It is possible, however, that
some of the most serious and most damaging are not reported due to
the extreme fear and disturbance of the victim. Because an
outpatient group was used as the sample, some of the more serious
offenders who would be sent directly to closed forensic centers to
be evaluated were also eliminated.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Cautions Regarding the Relevant Literature and Research

The sexual abuse of children is a social and psychological problem that has come out of the closet in quantitative strides. The study, assessment, and treatment of individuals who engage children in the sexual gratification of their needs is a relatively new and evolving specialization. Although there is unanimous agreement among the leaders in this field (Finkelhor, 1984; Groth, 1985; Knopp, 1984; Mayer, 1985; Russell, 1984; Salter, 1988) that specialization is essential for therapists involved in the evaluation and treatment of such cases, Sgroi (1982) extended a word of caution.

Beware of "experts bearing expertise". The field is too new and the body of accumulated knowledge and skills too small and inadequately tested for anyone to claim that he or she has the answers. We are many years away from evolving an intervention methodology that has stood the test of time. . . . At best, the expert can convey his or her current perspective on the state of the art. . . . It is then up to the listener to decide if the information and advice are credible and to what extent they can be applied. (pp. 5-6)

Lanyon (1986) reported that the literature on sexual deviations is derived from descriptive studies, experimental laboratory studies, or treatment studies. Small groups are more common than not and dramatic results are sometimes claimed based on very small
sample sizes. For example, Kirkland and Bauer's (1982) highly publicized study that found 90% of incest offenders to have serious psychopathology was a Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) study with only 10 subjects. These studies that do have larger samples are generally drawn from prison populations and security hospitals. Gebhard et al. (1965) believed this causes socioeconomic bias, because offenders are more likely to be sentenced to jail if they have a lower socioeconomic level. Others (Cook & Howells, 1981; Finkelhor, 1986) raised the concern that these jail and hospital samples may not be representative of the population, and the use of such groups makes it difficult to discriminate if the characteristics identified are related to the cause of their sexually abusive behavior or the results of prolonged contact with the criminal justice or mental health systems. Mohr, Turner, and Jerry (1964) believed that previous samples may also have been biased because subjects were often only referred for psychological evaluation if they were manifesting obvious mental or emotional problems. Finkelhor et al. (1983) stated that research on these subjects occurs after the fact, increasing the chances that the responses may be distorted; may reflect the state of having been caught; and may involve high levels of denial, repression, and dissociation.

Three studies using the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) (Fisher, 1969; Fisher & Howell, 1970; Fisher & Rivlin, 1972) are the only psychometric studies to examine the psychological needs
of sex offenders using an instrument based on a theory of psychological needs. The most common psychometric studies infer psychological needs from MMPI results. However, Hall, Maiuro, Vitaliano, and Proctor (1986) found that when making statements about sex offenders as a group, the MMPI is of very limited utility. Even though the 48 profile was significantly elevated on the mean profile, it only appeared on about 7% of the individual profiles. The MMPI is frequently used as the cornerstone in evaluations of dangerousness; but when Quinsey, Arnold, and Pruessse (1980) attempted to discriminate between offender types by comparing types of offenders, ranging from murderers to nonviolent property offenders, including a group of child sexual abusers, the MMPI did not differentiate violent from nonviolent offenders. Still another study (Erickson, Luxemberg, Walbek, & Seely, 1987), using a sample of 403 sex offenders, could find no support for any MMPI profile being considered typical for any sex offender group. They believed that the only reasonable use of the MMPI with sex offenders is to evaluate individuals and to look at individual progress over time.

Abel et al. (1986) expressed caution regarding the interpretation of results from what is considered the most effective measure of determining sexual interests, the penile plethysmograph. This instrument measures a man's degree of sexual arousal to various stimuli by means of a transducer placed around the penis. Hall, Proctor, and Nelson (1988), who were able to use multivariate statistical analysis due to their sample being significantly larger
than previous studies, found that 80% of the subjects were able to voluntarily and completely inhibit their sexual arousal. Abel et al. (1986) reported that subjects were also able to "fake" arousal and that nonoffending controls showed some arousal to children as young as age 6. Hall et al. (1986) hypothesized that deviant sexual arousal among sex offenders may reflect general arousability rather than deviant sexual behavior.

Mohr et al. (1964) reported that when research involves the use of tests, sex offenders are suspicious of unfamiliar test materials; and when only one test is presented to offender subjects, they are prone to try to "psych out" the test.

A precise understanding of the sexual abuse literature is at times hampered by the fact that the literature contains considerable variability in the descriptions of what constitutes the sexual abuse of a child and in the definitive terms used to describe a person who perpetrates such an act.

Sex Offenses Against Children

The extent of physical contact in sex offenses against children ranges from only visual contact, as in exhibitionism, to the other extreme of lust murder (Groth & Burgess, 1977). Finkelhor (1986) reported that many studies include only those sexual acts with a child that involve actual physical contact, while other studies include exhibitionism, child pornography, and procurement of children for the sexual misuse of others. Karpman (1954) described
a sexual offense as a sexual behavior that offends the particular society in which an offender lives. This was expanded by Gebhard et al. (1965) to include the act being for the immediate sexual gratification of the offender and legally punishable. D. A. Mrazek and Mrazek (1981) built further on that definition to emphasize that the adult's sexual gratification is achieved without consideration of the child's psychosocial or sexual development. Breer (1987) highlighted the misuse of power and control of the child when he described a sexual offense as the "use of greater age, force, prestige, intelligence or other source of power to coerce another person into a sexual act to which they might otherwise not consent" (p. 5). Others (Hobson, Boland, & Jamieson, 1985; Kempe & Kempe, 1984) would take exception with Breer's implication of consent where children are concerned and would define child sexual abuse as the involvement of dependent, developmentally immature children and adolescents in sexual activities in which they are unable, either legally or realistically, to give informed consent because of their lack of true appreciation for the significance or consequence of the act.

The reported frequency of different types of sexual offenses varies across studies and by definition. Russell (1984) redefines sexual intercourse to include oral, anal, or vaginal penetration. Groth (1979), using penetration as the discriminator between offenses, reported 39% of his sample to engage in foreplay with no penetration, 31% to engage in some type of penetration, and 19% to
be involved in both types of abuse. In Peters's (1976) study, forcible rape comprises 37% of the offenses, fondling and caressing 30%, penile-vaginal contact without penetration 20%, oral sex 7%, and anal penetration 12%. A study of a clinical population (Kendall-Tackett & Simon, 1987) at a child sexual abuse treatment program divides the types of incidents as follows: fondling from the waist up 64%, fondling from the waist down 92%, penile-vaginal intercourse 44%, oral sex 48%, and anal intercourse 9%. They speculate that their rates for more serious types of sexual offenses may be higher than other studies due to the nature of their sample, who, seeking treatment for this experience, may be more likely to divulge sensitive information.

Sex Offenders of Children

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-Revised (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 1987) describes the essential feature of all paraphilias as being a deviation in that to which an individual is sexually attracted. Pedophilia is one subgroup of the paraphilias in which the inappropriate object by which an individual seeks sexual gratification is a child. Literature in the field, however, uses that same term to designate both a fixed characterological trait and a state which may be determined by a number of factors. The definition of pedophilia was even changed between the 1980 and 1987 publications of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM III and DSM III-R).
The DSM III (APA, 1980) requires the critical feature of a diagnosis of pedophilia to be the act or fantasy of engaging in sexual activity with children as the "repeatedly preferred or exclusive method of achieving sexual excitement" (p. 271). This is still the definition that is used heavily in the literature and comes to mind in many of the individuals in the field of child sexual abuse when they hear the word "pedophile". In the DSM III-R (APA, 1987), however, the critical features are changed to be stated as the recurrent, intense, sexual urges, and sexually arousing fantasies of at least 6 months duration, involving sexual activity with a prepubescent child that has either been acted upon or is causing distress. It also includes both those that are sexually attracted only to children, exclusive type, and those that are sometimes attracted to adults, nonexclusive type. Salter (1988) pointed out that although the clinical literature also frequently distinguishes between two types of offenders, the research literature is equivocal on the differences and indicates that the patterns of deviancy are similar for both types. In a study of offenders who denied primary sexual attraction to children (Abel et al., 1986), 62.2% of them changed their reports and confirmed their paraphilic sexual interests when confronted with their physiological responses on the penile transducer.

Because pedophile is used to both refer to those with a primary sexual orientation toward children and to all individuals who engage in sexual activity with children, and because there is currently
such disparity in the field regarding making that distinction, other descriptive terms have been sought. Even though "child molester" is frequently used to identify this population in the literature, Langevin, Handy, Russon, and Day (1985) believed the term child molester was too pejorative for scientific investigation. They also stated that those engaged in sexual acts with minors are such a heterogeneous group that offenders, or offenses, against children or minors are preferred descriptive terms. Groth (1978) provided one of the most complete definitions of a sex offender when he stated:

A sexual offender against young people (commonly referred to as a child molester) is a significantly older individual whose conscious sexual desires and responses are directed, either partially or exclusively, toward prepubetal children (pedophile) and/or pubescent children (hebephile) to whom he or she may be directly related (incest) or not. (p. 3)

Christie (cited in Langevin, 1985) described the childhood histories of sex offenders of children as including over 50% of them being raised by mothers alone or someone other than their birth parents, 50% being children of alcoholics, 31% being the victims of violent beatings, and 15% being subjected to excessively punitive discipline. Langevin, Handy, Russon, and Day (1985) did not find aggression to be a primary factor on the Clark Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire but did find the mothers of offenders to have been more strict and less affectionate than those of controls. Father identification was marginally weaker among the offenders. In Herman's (1981) sample, 32% of the offenders were the oldest or only
child. Groth (1978) estimated that as many as 80% of sex offenders of children were themselves victims of sexual abuse as a child.

Approximately 90% of reported cases of child sexual abuse involve a male offender (Finkelhor & Hotaling, 1984), and approximately 50% of the offenders are married at the time of the offense (Groth, 1979; Mohr et al., 1964). Research (Baxter, 1986; Groth, 1979; Kendall-Tackett & Simon, 1987; Peters, 1976) indicates that 71-99% of sex offenders of children know their victims. Groth (1979) found offenders to be fairly specific regarding the preferred age of their victims; 14% preferring victims age 5 or less, 46% preferring victims 6-11, 33% preferring victims 12-15, and only 7% offending across age groups.

Offense Characteristics

Groth and Burgess (1977) believed that discernible subclasses of offenders can be identified if the nature and quality of the offenses are examined, as well as, the motivation underlying them. Some of the variables that have been suggested for examination by other researchers (Cook & Howells, 1981; Finkelhor, 1984; Salter, 1988) include whether the offense is incestuous or nonincestuous, whether the offense involves the use of force, whether the victims are male or female, whether sex offenses are part of a criminal pattern, how much responsibility the offender assumes for the offense, and if the offender is chemically dependent.
Incestuous and Nonincestuous Offenses

There is a tendency to consider incestuous and nonincestuous offenders as very different, usually with the assumption that these categories are mutually exclusive. Often, incestuous offenders are automatically considered situational offenders; and the thought of treating them as pedophiles with a sexual orientation toward children is rarely considered (Russell, 1988; Salter, 1988). Incest is commonly viewed as the expression of intrafamilial conflicts (Cavallin, 1966; Kroth, 1979) and the dynamics between the offender and various family members are examined from a systems approach for an understanding of the etiology of sexual abuse within the family (L. M. Anderson & Shafer, 1979; Baxter, 1986; Giaretto, 1982). Quinsey (1977) found recidivism rates for heterosexual incest offenders to be consistently lower than those for heterosexual pedophiles and hypothesized both the basis for the behavior and treatment for each to be different; incest offenders to focus on intrafamily dynamics and heterosexual pedophiles to focus on attraction to young girls. This was supported by the fact that Goldman and Wheeler (1986) reported that incestuous fathers most often engage in incest in their mid 30s, an age where marital problems often emerge.

Reports on the research of the Sexual Behavior Clinic at the New York Psychiatric Institute conducted under a federal Certificate of Confidentiality with 232 sex offenders of children contradict
these previous assumptions and approaches (Abel et al., 1981; Abel et al., 1986; Becker & Coleman, 1988). Becker and Coleman (1988) reported that 59% of the incest offenders experienced the onset of their deviant arousal during adolescence, long before the family dysfunction. With absolute confidentiality assured, 44% of incest offenders admitted to having sexually abused unrelated female children; 11% admitted to having sexually abused unrelated male children; 18% reported raping adult women; 18% acknowledged exhibitionism, and 21% described involvement in other paraphilias. When psychophysiologic measures were taken of penile responses to various stimuli, incest offenders became aroused to scenes of children who were strangers and showed minimal arousal to sex with adult females. When an index was obtained from comparisons between arousal to children and arousal to adults, the heterosexual incest offenders had higher indices than the heterosexual pedophiles, suggesting that a classification system that relied on recorded sexual arousal patterns would redefine heterosexual incest cases as heterosexual pedophiles. Their treatment would then also have to be directed toward their sexual orientation toward female children (Abel et al., 1986). This finding conflicts with an earlier study (Quinsey, Chaplin, & Corrigan, 1979) that found incestuous offenders to have more appropriate sexual age preference than nonincestuous offenders; however, that study compared only 9 incest offenders to 7 nonincest offenders.

Groth (1978) believed that the attraction to a child in incest
appears to have dynamically the same determinants underlying any pedophilia with the added factor being a means to act out anger against the wife. Panton's (1979) MMPI study of incestuous and nonincestuous offenders generally supports this position in that both groups obtained similar profiles (4 prime, 237 prominent, and low 9) with one exception. The incest offenders had a much higher 0, social introversion, score. Both groups appeared self-alienated, insecure, rigid, inhibited, nonaggressive, anxious, inadequate, and fearful of heterosexual relationships. Another MMPI study (Erickson et al., 1987) identified the 43 profile as most common (12.9%) for biological incestuous fathers and 47 as most common (11.1%) for stepfathers. Nonincestuous offenders were more likely to have 42 or 48 profiles; however, the difference between intra and extrafamilial offenders was not statistically significant. Also, 20% of all profiles in this study were within normal limits even though the subjects were all convicted felons.

Differences were noted between incestuous and nonincestuous offenders in a study (Langevin, Handy, Russon, and Day, 1985) utilizing the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF). Incestuous offenders were reported to be less intelligent, assertive, and imaginative than pedophiles who were more calculating, shrewd, self-sufficient, and less group dependent. The incestuous offenders in this study were a highly diverse group and reflected the heterogeneity seen within the sex offender population.
Same Sex and Opposite Sex Victim Offenses

It has been thought that the majority of preferred victims are female; however, an Oakland County, California, study (cited in Groth, 1979) indicates there may be cause to question this and consider the possibility that boys are less likely to report and offenders less likely to admit abusing boys. Prior to the study, 74% of reported cases were female, 17% were male, and 9% were without information regarding the sex of the victim. After a training program where teachers and counselors acted as contact people, 51% of reported cases were female, 46% male, and 3% without adequate information. Mayer (1985) reported that most intrafamilial victims are female and extrafamilial victims are male.

The research literature commonly refers to offenders who sexually abuse children of the same sex as homosexual offenders and those who victimize opposite sex victims as heterosexual offenders. Groth (1979) found 51% of his sample to molest female victims only, 28% to molest male victims only, and 21% to molest both. Forty-nine percent sexually responded exclusively to children and not to age mates of either sex; therefore, orientation in this group was strictly pedophilic and homosexuality not an issue. Of the remaining 51%, considered regressed offenders, 83% were strictly heterosexual and 17% were bisexual, indicating no real overlap between homosexual orientation and child sexual abuse. Goldman and Wheeler (1986) reported that most homosexual pedophiles have
heterosexual orientation even though they sexually abuse males.

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) was used to compare the psychological needs of those who molest same sex victims and those who molest opposite sex victims (Fisher, 1969; Fisher & Howell, 1970). When the two groups were combined and compared to general offender males, they were higher on intraception and abasement and lower on autonomy and aggression. When those with opposite sex victims alone were compared to adult males, they were higher on deference, intraception, abasement, and endurance and lower on autonomy, change, and aggression. Those with same sex victims, when compared with adult males, were higher on intraception, abasement, nurturance, and heterosexuality and lower on achievement, order, autonomy, and aggression. When the groups were compared to each other, the same sex victim group was higher on heterosexuality and lower on order and nurturance.

The results of a study by Mohr et al. (1964) indicate that offenders of same sex victims are more likely to have molested strangers and less likely to have a close relationship with their victims. Their victims tend to be older, 14-15, when compared to the preferred age for opposite sex offenders, which is 8-10. Those who molest victims of the same sex are described as more narcissistic and more psychosexually immature (Mathis, 1972; Sgroi, 1982). Male object pedophiles are much more resistant to talking about sex (Goldstein, Kant, & Hartman, 1973) and much less likely to have been drinking at the time of the offense (Cook & Howells, 1981). They
are known to have had more sexual contact with children than those with opposite sex victims (Nedoma, Millan, & Pondelickova; 1971), which may be attributed to the fact that 75% of homosexual pedophiles develop their deviant arousal by age 19 compared to 45% of heterosexual pedophiles (Abel et al., 1986). Abel et al. (1986) believed that when paraphilic offenders develop their arousal at an early age and continue throughout their lives, there is a 70-fold increase in the number of crimes committed. Same sex offenders have higher recidivism rates (Mohr et al., 1964) and are more likely to have previous convictions for nonsexual and sexual offenses (Cook & Howells, 1981).

The Role of Aggression

It is suggested by some researchers (Gebhard et al., 1965; Mohr et al., 1964) that overall aggressive behavior is rare in pedophilic offenses. Groth (1979) and Lanyon (1986) reported the lowest incidents of physical force or threat of harm; Groth finding 12% of offenders using threats of harm, 5% weapons, 11% minimal force, 4% excessive force; and Lanyon finding that cases involving violence constitute about 10-15% of child sexual abuse cases. Langevin, Handy, Russon, and Day (1985), however, stated that violence has been underestimated in pedophilic acts. deYoung (1982) reported threats and force used in 33% of her sample, and Peters (1976) reported threats of bodily harm in 31% of cases and forcible rape in 37% of cases. Finkelhor (1979) identified 55% in his study as
having involved force or threats of force, and DeFrancis (cited in Finkelhor, 1979) and Bagley (cited in Salter, 1988) both found 60% of such cases in their studies. Abel et al. (1981) reported a study in which 59% of cases involved physical force and 58% involved excessive physical force. They also reported that victims sustain notable injury by child offenders in 42% of cases compared to 39% of rapists' victims. Abel et al. (1981, 1986) purported that the association of aggression and hostility cannot be discounted in child sexual abuse cases when the overlap between child sexual abusers and rapists is examined. Of their sample of rapists, 50.6% also report sexually abusing children; and 18% of incestuous offenders admit to forcible rape. By using psychophysiologic measures, they also found that heterosexual pedophiles, like rapists, were highly aroused by descriptions of physical assaults of victims.

The point has been made by Gebhard et al. (1965) that any time a child and adult relate, there is always an element of duress in the background; the disparity in strength and social status is an ever present factor. Ward (1985) quoted Griffin as defining child sexual abuse as an act of aggression where the victim is denied self-determination and placed in a state of complete helplessness which always carries with it the threat of death, because the complete taking over takes away the victim's process of being in the world.

Groth (1978) stated that it is important to make a distinction
in the role aggression plays as a motivational factor. Groth and Burgess (1977) recommended examining the method by which the offense was committed to determine which of the following strategies is operative; dominance by authority as a way to insure sexual activity over time, intimidation and exploitation as a way to establish control, or aggression through sadism as a way to execute revenge.

Groth and Burgess (1977) distinguished sex pressure offenses, in which there is a lack of physical force or threat of harm, from sex force offenses, in which the threat of harm or use of physical force is present. In a sex pressure offense, the offender uses enticement, persuasion, cajolament, or entrapment to overcome the child's resistance, manipulating the child to feel indebted to oblige. The offender will usually not pursue if the child resists. Aggression is inhibited in this type of offender; and at some level, they feel involved with and care about the child with whom they feel safe and comfortable. They are likely to describe their victims in positive terms such as loving, open, and affectionate. Groth and Burgess believe the major components of motivation are dependency and affiliation based on projective identification.

Sex force offenses are divided into exploitive assaults and sadistic assaults. In the exploitive assault, the child's helplessness, fear of adults, and naivete' are exploited by the use of threats, restraint, intimidation, or physical strength to overcome the victim's resistance and accomplish the sexual act. This offender will not retreat if the victim resists and has no interest...
in a relationship with the child. The child is seen solely as an object for sexual relief, and the offender feels entitled to use or abuse the child for sexual purposes. Victims are described by these offenders as weak or helpless, and the offenders feel stronger and more in charge with the child. The operative need in this type of assault is the need for power.

In a sadistic assault, the aggression and force are eroticized. Physical and psychological abuse are necessary for sexual excitement and gratification. It is the offenders' intention to hurt, degrade, and destroy their victims, who become the symbol of everything the offenders hate about themselves. The children, thereby, become the objects of punishment and targets for the offenders' rage and cruelty. The assaults are premeditated, often involve a weapon, and use an amount of force that always exceeds that necessary to overcome the child's resistance. Groth (1978) stated that in this type of assault "sexuality becomes an expression of domination and anger" (p. 15). He added that it is fortunate that the sadistic offender is thought to constitute a very small percentage of sex offenders.

Armentrout and Hauer (1978), using the MMPI, compared rapists of adults, rapists of children, and nonrapist sex offenders. The mean profile for each group produced a 48 profile, with the nonrapist offender group having the lowest 8. All were viewed as impulsive, self-centered, hostile, irritable, avoiding close emotional involvement, and having poor social intelligence. Panton
(1979), in his MMPI study of adult rapists, child rapists, and nonviolent child molesters, also found a 48 profile for the rapist groups, with 9 and 6 prominent. There was no difference between rapists of adults and children. The nonviolent molesters had a prime 4 with prominent 237 profiles. The molester group also had a significantly higher L than both rapist groups; it exceeded 70T. This high L calls into question the validity of the molester profile results. An item analysis of Scale 4 showed that the rapists endorsed items related to authority conflicts and social alienation, and the molesters endorsed items related to self-alienation and family discord in the formative years. The only study to examine the psychological needs of rapists (Fisher & Rivlin, 1972), using the EPPS, compared rapists to a general adult male group and a general non-sex-offender prison group. The rapists were higher than both groups on abasement and endurance and lower than both groups on aggression and autonomy. Fisher and Rivlin believed this indicates that the prime motivational need in using force is not aggression but that rape is an expression of hostility by a male who feels weak, inadequate, and dependent. The two EPPS studies conducted on heterosexual and homosexual pedophiles (Fisher, 1969; Fisher & Howell, 1970) also found both groups to be lower on aggression when compared to a control group of nonoffending adult males.

Criminality

It has been observed that sex offenders rarely get involved in
antisocial behavior outside the sexual sphere; however, sexual aggression may be just one sphere of an antisocial approach to life (Abel et al., 1986). Patch, Seymour, Halleck, and Ehrmann (1962) reported 40% of their sample had previous correctional experience, and P. B. Mrazek (1981) believed that sex offenders of children often commit other sexual or violent acts. Langevin, Handy, Russon, and Day (1985) found that 22% of heterosexual offenders have previous criminal charges related to violence compared to 8% for homosexual offenders and none for bisexual offenders. In this study, 72% of heterosexual pedophiles, 54% of homosexual pedophiles, and 57% of bisexual pedophiles have some type of previous conviction. Toobert, Bartelme, and Jones (1959) reported, of 120 incarcerated pedophiles, 64% were recidivists and 34% committed nonsex offenses. Christie et al. (cited in Langevin, 1985) reported 51% of pedophiles have previous convictions for sex offenses and 74% have previous convictions for nonsex offenses. Due to the fact that the samples are made up of incarcerated or identified pedophiles, and because it is known from victim studies that the vast majority of child sexual abuse is never reported, it is unclear to what extent criminality is involved in the total population of pedophiles.

Alcohol and Drug Dependency

The extent to which alcohol and drug dependency is an important variable in the sexual abuse of children is another area where the
picture is not clear. Groth (1979) reported that 30% of his sample are alcohol dependent, which is similar to Herman's (1981) finding that one third of incest victims describe their fathers as problem drinkers. Groth went on to point out, however, that he found no drug use among his offenders and that 66% did not use any type of intoxicants. Alcohol and drugs were insignificant factors in the Langevin, Handy, Russon, and Day (1985) study, where 60-70% of the pedophiles had never tried drugs. Several studies (Howells, 1981; Peters, 1976; Rada, Laws, & Kellner, 1976) reported that in about 50% of sexual offenses against children, the offender was drinking at the time of the offense. Christie et al. (cited in Langevin, 1985) supported this in their finding of 53% of pedophiles being noticeably intoxicated at the time of the offense, 23% drinking before the offense, and 9% using drugs. Additionally, they identified 65% of the pedophilic prison sample as problem drinkers or alcoholic. Mayer (1985) reported that 75% of incest offenders are alcoholic or chemically dependent; however, Justice and Justice (1979) found alcoholic fathers only 10-15% of the time. Crewdson (1988) pointed out that chemical dependency is used as part of the disavowal syndrome in which the offender disowns responsibility for the sexual abuse of a child. Finkelhor (1979) supported that position by stating that alcohol is more a way the behavior is excused rather than the cause of it. Herman (1981) stated that often the substance abuse is part of the premeditation of the act; that upon careful questioning, offenders often admit they drink to
gather the courage to make their approach. Abel et al. (1986) found that 30% of their sample of child sexual abusers indicated that drinking alcohol increased their attraction to children and 45% of rapists reported that alcohol increased their desire to rape. They concluded that alcohol seems to be a particularly dangerous drug for paraphiliacs to use.

Responsibility or Denial

Patch et al. (1962) stated that one of the most striking features of sex offenders of children is that they continually deny responsibility for their behavior. Salter (1988) stressed that even when an offender admits to sexual involvement with the victim, one cannot assume that because the offender "has 'no reason' to lie and admitted parts of the victim's story that his version of the events is correct" (p. 97). Paraphilic behaviors are supported by cognitive distortions and rationalizations which reduce the individual's anxiety, guilt, or depression, both in frequency and intensity, thereby reinforcing and increasing the deviant behavior (Abel et al., 1986; Mayer, 1983).

Mayer (1983) and Salter (1988) discussed several components of denial that may operate to prevent offenders from accepting full responsibility for the sexual abuse of a child. Denial of the acts themselves may take the form of an emphatic denial, or the offenders may equivocate over such details as where they were at the time of the offenses or if they are the kind of people to commit such acts.
If offenders are to genuinely internalize responsibility for the offenses, it is important to admit how much fantasy and planning, including the grooming and manipulating of the child, actually preceded the offense. Many offenders use minimalization and rationalization in efforts to deny the seriousness of their behavior, which protects them from guilt. Salter believed that as long as the negative affect about the event consists primarily of shame, without an appreciation for how damaging sexual abuse can be to a child, there is high risk for reoffense. Even when participation in sexual involvement with the child is acknowledged, many offenders deny responsibility by putting the blame elsewhere: on alcohol, a seductive child, a rejecting wife. Denial of the difficulty in changing abusive patterns is one of the reasons that even though offenders readily enter treatment, they do not persevere through the lengthy treatment process unless there is an external motivator, such as the courts. Acceptance of the difficulty in changing abusive patterns includes acceptance of control of this behavior as being a life long process over which one must remain diligent.

Sexual Abuse of Children as an Addictive Behavior

There does appear to be considerable agreement in the field of child sexual abuse that sex offenders of children are addicted to that behavior (Groth, 1978; Knopp, 1984; Salter, 1988). Pithers, Kashima, Cumming, and Beal (1988) pointed out that the commonalities
of addictive and compulsive behaviors purported by Miller clearly apply to sex offenders of children. These include the immediate acquisition of short-term satisfaction at the expense of delayed negative consequences, high personal and social costs, absence of a treatment with superior effectiveness, lack of a single empirically validated etiology, and difficulty inherent in transferring the initial behavior changes that occur during treatment into enduring changes after termination. Pithers et al. also pointed out that sex offenders can be their own worst enemies in setting up circumstances to relapse and are always at risk for reoffending if they fail to cope adaptively; therefore, relapse prevention is viewed as an integral part of the treatment of these individuals. Salter (1988) reported that few therapists with experience working with sex offenders regard them as "curable", and Groth (1979) is emphatic in his statement that child sexual abuse offenders do not spontaneously abandon their sexual involvement with children.

Contributing Factors to the Sexual Abuse of Children

Groth and Burgess (1977) classified child sexual abuse as a sexual deviation in that it is nonconsensual and in that sexuality is not at the roots of this behavior. Groth (1979) attributes such factors as affiliation needs, power and control issues, hostile and aggressive impulses, and distorted expressions of identification as the main predisposing conditions. The strong erotic characteristic
of this behavior cannot be dismissed, however, when experimental data (Abel et al., 1981; Atwood & Howell, 1971; Quinsey, Steinman, Bergensen, & Holmes, 1975) show that child sexual abusers, including incest offenders, show an unusually high degree of sexual arousal to children when compared to nonoffending controls. Nonoffending controls have been shown to react erotically to children as young as age 6 but to not act out in the community (Langevin, Becker, Ben-Aron, Purins, & Hook, 1985). Finkelhor (1986) stated that research has shown that no single factor can begin to explain why adults are capable of being sexually aroused by a child, why they direct that impulse to a child, and why no social or psychological inhibitions intervene to prevent them from acting on those impulses.

**Finkelhor’s Four Factor Model**

Finkelhor (1986) has drawn from a variety of theoretical, clinical, and experimental sources to develop a comprehensive framework within which the etiology of the sexual abuse of children can be examined and understood. This four-factor model is divided into concepts of sexual arousal, blockage, disinhibition, and emotional congruence.

**Sexual Arousal**

It appears clear from research with physiological measures (Abel et al., 1986; Atwood & Howell, 1971; Quinsey et al., 1975) that the sex offenders of children are significantly more sexually
aroused by immature stimuli. Finkelhor (1986) believed that one group of hypotheses about sexual abuse basically explains how a person comes to find children sexually arousing. The contribution that hormonal abnormalities plays has been studied, but the findings have been inconsistent. Berlin and Coyle (1981) found elevated testosterone levels; however, Rada et al. (1976) did not.

The most prevailing theory of what leads to sexual attraction to children is that early childhood sexual experiences condition one to find children arousing. Russell (1984) believed it is very unlikely that normal childhood sexual exploration could be a factor here, except possibly if this were the only satisfying experience in an otherwise very troubled, traumatic childhood. Childhood sexual victimization is much more likely to be related to sexual orientation toward children (Finkelhor, 1984; Groth, 1978). Cook and Howells (1981) emphasized the important role operant conditioning and observational learning can have in developing this orientation. If the child was aroused during the sexual experience with an adult, this could reinforce cross generational sexual contact. Observing the arousal and orgasm of the offender can leave a powerful impression on a child and teach a child through modeling that this is an arousing activity. McQuire (cited in Cook & Howells, 1981) described how learning through the process of fantasizing either through memory of the actual abuse or some distortion of the memory and combining that with masturbation occurs. The fantasy becomes increasingly arousing through the
masturbatory experiences, and the orientation toward child-adult sex reinforced. Another possibility of which very little is written relates to the developmentally inappropriate sexual experiences that children share with other children for the purposes of child pornography and voyeurs. The stimulation received during these experiences could be sufficiently reinforcing to influence one's sexual arousal patterns.

Attributional errors in which the offender mislabels affectionate or parental feelings as sexual can lead to sexual arousal toward children (Howells, 1981). Hobson et al. (1985) referred to this as the misidentification and mismanagement of emotions. Russell (1984) related this to the male sex-role orientation where distinguishing between sexual and nonsexual forms of affection is uncommon. She pointed out that men are generally more easily aroused by sexual fantasies and activities with little connection to the context in which they occur. The socialization of men to be attracted to weaker, younger, and smaller partners makes childlike characteristics attractive.

Langevin, Hecker, Ben-Aron, Purins, and Hook (1985) stated that stimulus and response generalization in pedophiles may fail to distinguish between the physical features of children and adults in their erotic arousal.

Meiselman (1978) referred to a "hypersexual" group of offenders who appear to be easily sexually aroused by a wide variety of stimuli, including children. This group fits Freud's description of
polymorphous perversity (cited in Gebhard et al., 1965). Summit and Kryso (1978) saw a group classified as perverse incest in which the offenders showed no specificity or limit to their sexual needs and often engaged in flamboyant, ritualistic, or multiple partner sex. The psychopathic group seen by Weinberg (1955) was described as desiring and pursuing anyone; whose daughters became victims out of mere accessibility not out of relationship needs. Ellis and Brancale (1956), however, found that the majority of offenders are sexually inhibited but may appear hypersexual, because their compulsive behavior is out of control.

Blockage

Finkelhor (1986) stated that blockage occurs when an offender is blocked in some way from meeting sexual and emotional needs in an adult heterosexual relationship. Psychoanalytic theory provides the developmental blockages that relate to unresolved Oedipal conflicts and castration anxieties. Cavallin (1966), in his work with incestuous fathers, described incest as an expression of hostility toward the mother that fuses with primitive genital impulses and is discharged toward the daughter, who symbolically becomes the mother. Gillespie (cited in Cook & Howells, 1981) emphasized that sexual deviations, including pedophilia, serve the defensive function of providing avoidance of Oedipal conflicts and castration anxieties. The misogynistic incest offender, whose fear and hatred of women predominates, is said to have been affected by these unresolved
conflicts (Summit & Kryso, 1978).

The offender's inadequate social skills sometimes cause children to be the targets of sexual interest merely because they are more obtainable. Finkelhor (1986) pointed out that poor social skills influence sexual choice differently here than in the emotional congruence theory in that there is no compelling meaning to the attraction, only convenience. Abel et al. (1986) found 40.8% of the child offenders they studied to have poor social skills. When Langevin, Hecker, Ben-Aron, Purins, and Hook (1985) measured pedophiles on the Assertion Inventory and Rathner's Assertiveness Schedule, no significant difference was discovered between pedophiles and control groups. They suggested that the pedophile may be more accurately described as introverted and that relative lack of social skills may result from disinterest rather than failed attempts to relate in a sexually mature way.

Rorschach studies (Mohr et al., 1964; Peters, 1976) indicate offenders may be anxious, hostile, fearful of others, dependent, socially withdrawn, and insensitive to the needs of others. Studies using the MMPI (Armentrout & Hauer, 1978; F panton, 1978, 1979; Toobert et al., 1958) indicate poor social intelligence, hostility, fear of emotional involvement, anxiety, inadequacy, insecurity in association with others and expectations of rejection and failure in adult heterosexual relationships. Using the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, Wilson and Cox (1983) found offenders to have poor social skills, lack confidence, and to be shy, depressed, and
humorless. Overholser and Beck's (1986) research identifies molesters as unassertive, socially inept, and overly sensitive about their performance with women. Fisher and Howell (1970), utilizing the EPFS, additionally find offenders to be sexually and emotionally inadequate in relating to adult females. Patch and Crowden (cited in Cook & Howells, 1981) stated that pedophiles are less capable than normals of establishing satisfying relationships with mature people of the opposite sex. Peters (1976) also described offenders as feeling unable to compete with other men in attracting adult women because of their intense feelings of inferiority. Gebhard et al. (1965) classified this group as socio-sexually underdeveloped and characterized them as not having had heterosexual experiences normal for their age. Sexual deprivation is always a variable in this type of offender's choice of a child as a sexual partner.

Several researchers (Cavallin, 1966; Meiselman, 1978; Overholser & Beck, 1986; Toobert et al., 1959; Weiner, 1962), utilizing a variety of psychometric measures and procedures, identified sexual offenders of children as being extremely concerned about the appraisal of others, suspicious, and possessing paranoid thinking patterns. This type of thought process serves to further alienate one from others and makes the establishment of relationships difficult.

Russell (1984) proposed that repressive sexual norms can contribute to an adult choosing a child as a sexual partner. Goldstein (cited in Finkelhor, 1986) found pedophiles to be least
permissive in their attitudes about premarital and extramarital intercourse. These moralistic restrictions on their behavior combined with a paternalistic view of children being possessions may contribute to some offenders turning to children for sexual gratification.

When adult marital and romantic relationships are disruptive or disturbed, a block to sexual gratification with an adult may be created. A prevalent theory of the etiology of incest is that incest is a symptom and product of family dysfunction (Groth 1978; Herman, 1981; Mayer, 1983; Meiselman, 1978; Walters, 1975). Mayer (1983) described these families as often multiproblem families with few abilities necessary to reconcile their difficulties. Langevin, Handy, Russon, and Day (1985), however, found only homosexual pedophiles had less frequency of sexual outlet with adult females; therefore, some doubt is cast as to how prevalent a factor this is.

**Disinhibition**

Disinhibition is the factor in Finkelhor's (1986) model of the etiology of the sexual abuse of children that accounts for the fact that social or psychological inhibitions are not in effect to prevent someone from acting on their sexual attraction toward children. Poor impulse control and the inability to delay gratification are frequently attributed to be major disinhibiting factors (Gebhard et al., 1965; Summit & Kryso, 1978). Finkelhor (1986), however, agreed these are characteristic of a small group of
offenders but not of most. In a study using the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (BIS) and the Self-Report Test of Impulse Control (Overholser & Beck, 1986), child molesters did not differ from the four control groups on impulsivity. These were self-report instruments and may have been influenced by the denial and distortion of the offenders. Pithers et al. (1988) also reported that their research dispels the prominent role of impulsiveness. Over 50% of the offenders they studied appeared overcontrolled before they committed their offenses.

Senility and retardation have historically been associated with child molesters; however, Finkelhor (1986) reported that there is little research to support this. Weinberg (1955) and Kubo (cited in Meiselman, 1978) found incestuous fathers with subnormal intelligence; however, more studies (Cavallin, 1966; Lukianowicz, 1972; Weiner, 1962) have found incestuous fathers to have average to above average intelligence. Gebhard et al. (1965) stated that when a retarded individual does molest a child, it is usually out of unthinking simple opportunism and the lack of appreciation of or understanding of social rules. They additionally pointed out that on the rare occasions that senility plays a role in child sexual abuse, deprivation is a dominant motivation and impotence a complicating factor. These assaults are most likely to primarily involve fondling. Hecker and Ben-Aron (1985) did not find elderly sex offenders to suffer from organic brain syndrome to any greater degree than their nonoffending peers.
Many studies associate alcohol with the sexual abuse of children (Gebhard et al., 1965; Meiselman, 1979; Peters, 1976; Rada et al., 1976). Russell (1984) believed that alcohol deadens the moral constraints and weakens inhibitions against preexisting tendencies when it does play a role in child sexual abuse.

There are always stories of subcultures within our country, particularly in Appalachia, where the sexual abuse of children is not only tolerated but a subcultural norm. This has been termed the rustic environment group (Summit & Kryso, 1978). Thus far, there are no research studies to support this (Finkelhor, 1986).

Another common assumption is that familial crowding or sleeping together lowers one's inhibitions to incest. Weinberg (1955) and Finkelhor (1979) could find no support for this assumption in their research.

Psychopathology is often attributed as the cause of someone's sexual abuse of a child. Some offenders do show symptoms after exposure or while incarcerated (Cavallin, 1966; Weinberg, 1955); however, research indicates that the number of mentally ill offenders is actually very low, with estimates ranging from 5% to 10% (Abel et al., 1986; Finkelhor, 1979; Gebhard et al., 1965; Summit & Kryso, 1978).

Failure of the incest avoidance mechanism to prohibit sexual abuse within the family is much more likely to occur when parents and children are not biologically related. Finkelhor (1979) found the rate of father-daughter incest to be 5 times higher when a
stepfather is involved than any other group in his survey. In Russell's study (1984), 1 out of every 6 girls with stepfathers were molested, compared to 1 out of 43 girls with biological fathers being molested. Additionally, 47% of stepfathers were engaged in the very serious forms of abuse as compared to 26% of the biological fathers. Parker and Parker (1986) believed that it is possible that the lack of opportunity for bonding is a variable here, because fathers who are heavily involved in the early care and socialization of their daughters are thought to be less at risk for intrafamilial sexual abuse. It is also possible that pedophiles marry into families with children to have easier access to children.

The presence of confusion between adult and child roles within the family increases the risk of incest (Summit & Kryso, 1978). Herman (1981) believed that when daughters are encouraged to take on the "little mother" role, they are at risk for taking on the other roles of the wife. The endogamous incest offender described by Summit and Kryso (1978) is one that operates on a distortion of family roles and relationships. Finkelhor (1979) referred to this role confusion as sociopathy.

Patriarchal norms and a sense of entitlement exist when a father believes he has absolute authority to do whatever he pleases to his children (Russell, 1984). Armstrong (1978) stated that "an incestuous father must have a sense of paternalistic prerogative to even begin to rationalize what he is doing. He must have the perception of his children as possessions or objects" (pp. 234-235).
Russell (1984) believed the disparity of power between adults and children, and even between men and women, may serve to reinforce a man's belief in those rights. These fathers fit the category of imperious incest offenders (Summit & Kryso, 1978) who are known to set themselves up as rulers over their households. Often their typical mode of behavior within the family is to inspire fear and obedience. Herman (1981) found one of the most distinguishing characteristics of these fathers was the domination of their families by force; 50% of the victims said their fathers were habitually violent. Ward (1985) added that the passive-dependent father is as dominant as the tyrant type; one rules with passivity, the other with aggression.

When families are socially isolated and insulated from the scrutiny of public view, some of the external influence over their behavior is diminished (Finkelhor, 1979). Incestuous families are frequently isolated from others by the offenders due to their social alienation, fears of interpersonal relationships, and efforts to keep the family secrets. Russell (1984) pointed out that the lack of external observation and influence leads to greater enmeshment within the family and less fear of discovery. Weinberg (1955) used the term endogamous to describe the offenders who exclude the outside world and turn inward to their family. These are often affection seeking fathers who rule their households and appear to the outside world as dedicated family men. Rist (1979) described these offenders as introjective personalities who are socially
isolated and highly dependent on their families for satisfaction of their emotional needs and for their relationships.

The psychopathic personality has no regard for societal control, is concerned only with one's own needs and feelings, is insensitive to the needs and feelings of others, and has no conscience or guilt (Groth, 1978; Rist, 1979; Weinberg, 1955). Without conscience or concern for others, there are no internal constraints to prevent these offenders from acting on their impulses toward a child, except for fear of what could happen if caught. Gebhard et al. (1964) referred to this group as amoral delinquents and stated that deprivation is not an issue in their offenses, which are described as being purely amoral opportunism.

The theory that situational stresses with which one cannot cope lowers one's ability to not act on deviant impulses is a predominantly accepted factor (Groth, 1978). This type of offender is referred to as a situational offender (Gebhard et al., 1965; Howells, 1981) or regressed offender (Groth, 1978). Groth (1978) stated that this person originally preferred an adult sexual partner; however, when this relationship became conflictual in some important respect or the offender too stressed to cope with the demands of the adult relationship, the child became substituted for the adult as the focus of the offender's sexual interests and desires. This type of offender has strong feelings of inadequacy, low self-esteem, and impaired sexual identity. Salter (1988) stated that many of these offenders cannot solve nonsexual problems or
experience certain feelings without escaping into sex offending. They suspend their usual values in an "impulsive and desperate act that is symptomatic of a failure to cope adaptively with life stresses" (Groth, 1978, p. 9). Groth also reported that the stresses often lead to a state of depression, during which time they do not care about what they are doing, or states of partial dissociation, during which times they do not think about what they are doing. They may be distressed by their behavior, but their controls are too weak to control it.

Emotional Congruence

The emotional congruence theory proposed by Finkelhor (1986) holds that the offender's emotional needs and characteristics of the child fit in such a way that the child takes on some emotionally compelling meaning to the offender. The arrested psychosocial development of some offenders makes children attractive, because they relate on the same immature level as the child. Krafft-Ebing (1886/1968) dealt with the topic of pedophiles under the heading of "arrest of mental development" (p. 384). Peters (1976), in a study of offenders using a variety of psychometric measures (Rorschach, Bender Gestalt, Cattell Personality Inventory, and Cornell Medical Index), found pedophiles to be immature with strong dependency needs and strong feelings of phallic inadequacy. Ellis and Brancale (1956) described many of the offenders they studied as developmentally immature and reported:
An unusually large number of offenders have little ability to face squarely the problems of modern living, to form even reasonably warm attachments to individuals other than their parents, to accept the frustrations of life with a moderate degree of calm or tolerance, to live up to their own capacities, or to check their impulses of the moment. (p. 59)

These offenders have been found to spend most of their time with children (Mohr et al., 1964; Sgroi, 1982). This is the group referred to as pedophiles by many in their classification systems (Gebhard et al., 1965; Meiselman, 1978; Summit & Kryso, 1978; Weinberg, 1955). Howells (1981) referred to them as preference offenders, and Rist (1979) used the term psychosexually immature. Groth (1978) defined these offenders as fixated offenders, where the fact that the offenders have been primarily or exclusively attracted to children who are significantly younger since adolescence, regardless of their sexual experiences, is the distinguishing feature. These offenders are comfortable with this preference and experience no guilt, shame, or remorse. The attraction becomes a compulsion, and they are preoccupied with sexual thoughts and fantasies of children. They are likely to sexually abuse any children with whom they have access—their own, as well as, others. Groth supported Ellis and Brancale (1956) in his description of these offenders as often being marginal individuals who are somewhat overwhelmed by the ordinary demands of life.

Finkelhor (1986) identified a similar group of offenders who are emotionally drawn to children because of the offenders' low self-esteem and poor social skills. With children, they can feel in
control, powerful, and looked up to. Rosen (1979) stressed that deviant sexual behavior serves as a regulator of self-esteem and is brought about by traumatic stressful life events leading to feelings of humiliation and lowered self-esteem. The deviant sexual fantasy is then a response to the lowered self-esteem and leads to overt deviant sexual behavior. Several studies (Fisher, 1969; Fisher & Howell, 1970; Hobson et al., 1985) support that offenders have low self-esteem and poor social skills (Overholser & Beck, 1986; Panton, 1978; Wilson & Cox, 1983). Peters (1976), however, found that on a self-rating scale of self-esteem, offenders rated themselves above average. He attributed these results to being an example of how denial works to defend against their inner conflicts and not as a reflection of their feelings of self-worth. Justice and Justice’s (1979) introverted offender is one subtype of this group, who, no matter how successful on the outside, is low in self-esteem, lonely, and depressed within.

There is some evidence to indicate that children are attractive because of their lack of dominance. Using the Kelly Repertory Grid, Howells (1981) discovered that issues of dominance and hierarchy were much more important to the offender group than to the control group. The offenders viewed adults as overbearing and dominant and children as nonthreatening and easy to relate to because of their submissive status. Thus, some offenders may be attracted to a child’s lack of dominance due to their own sense of vulnerability and inferiority. The child rapists identified by Summit & Kryso
(1978) are attracted to a child's lack of dominance; however, because in their confusion of masculinity and power, they only feel sexually adequate by frightening and overpowering their victims. Langevin, Hecker, Ben-Aron, Purins, and Hook (1985) found that stimuli related to domination of a fearful child was most arousing to offenders of children.

Some feminist authors (Bass & Thornton, 1983; Butler, 1978) have stated that the fact that men are socialized to be dominant, given permission to be the aggressor, and influenced to see those smaller and weaker as attractive makes children a natural choice for them to select to meet their needs. This hypothesis remains untested.

Finkelhor (1986) reported that the process of identification through narcissism is thought to be another way in which children take on a compelling meaning to sex offenders. Due to emotional deprivation or overprotection, the offenders remain involved with themselves as children or likenesses of said children. They try to give the love they missed to the child victims, the symbols of themselves. Fraser (cited in Cook & Howells, 1981) referred to this as narcissistic inversion. Crewdson (1988) also associated narcissism with frustrated dependency needs which leave the offenders feeling insecure, powerless, and unworthy. The feelings are then compensated for by seeking the admiration and recognition of others. Children are sought out to provide that recognition, because they do not threaten the adult's security. Kraemer (1976)
saw this narcissistic identification as arising from the narcissistic relationship between the mother and child. The mother narcissistically loves herself, sees her child as an extension of herself, gives her child excessive "love", and the child develops a narcissistic attitude that is then projected onto children with whom the offender identifies. These are theoretical propositions that find some support in clinical case studies but not from the research literature.

Recent research (Finkelhor, 1979; Groth, 1985) consistently finds that an unusually large number of sex offenders of children were sexually abused as children, leaving them feeling helpless in an overpowering world. The offenders attempt to overcome these traumatic feelings of helplessness through identification with the powerful aggressor and the sexual abuse of children in a powerless position. Hobson et al. (1985) found a sense of vulnerability and helplessness characteristic of the offenders in their study. Stoller (1975) elaborated on this by stating that sexually abusive behavior serves both ego defensive and hostility expressive functions that acquires its power of gratification through its ability to serve as a symbolic scene of mastery over childhood induced psychological trauma. This part of the emotional congruence theory is based on work with sex offenders who were themselves victims. Not all victims become offenders, and there is not a clear picture of what causes some victims to become offenders and others to resolve their trauma in other ways. It is clear that victims
need to be given ways to master their trauma before this process appears to be their only solution.

The emotional congruence theory is the factor most associated with the psychological needs of the sex offender who sexually abuses children; however, no one aspect of the four factor model is sufficient to explain why someone sexually abuses children. Various aspects may combine in a variety of ways to account for the heterogeneity observed among offenders.

The Role of Psychological Needs in the Assessment and Treatment of Sex Offenders of Children

Nowhere is there more reference to the psychological needs of sex offenders of children than in the literature concerned with their assessment and treatment. Knopp (1984) stated that treatment of sex offenders can only be successful if a thorough, competent evaluation is conducted to determine the particular needs and dynamics of the individual offender. Groth (1979) advised that the evaluation must take into account the characterological traits of the offender, the emotional and psychological needs lived out or expressed in the offense, and the situational conditions that activated or supported such acts, as well as, the degree to which these factors continue to operate both within the offender and the environment. Sgroi (1982) recommended that the evaluation should assess one’s general level of personality functioning, overall ability to think rationally, act purposefully, communicate effec-
tively, respond appropriately, and deal effectively with the environment. Of particular importance is the relationship of the nature and intensity of the offender's sexual and aggressive drives and the sexualization of their nonsexual needs. Groth (1979), Knopp (1984), and Sgroi (1982) additionally suggested that the evaluation should include assessment of the offender's attitudes, values, needs, reality contact, perception and judgment, predominant mood states, stress and frustration tolerance, impulse control, insight and understanding, empathic ability, self-image and self-regard, emotional expressiveness, sense of humor, and ability to manage one's own life. Abel et al. (1981) believed that a psychophysiologic measure of the offender's sexual arousal to various stimuli is an essential component in assessment.

Mayer (1985) stressed that the whole family needs to be evaluated and treated, and the dysfunctional family dynamics addressed in incest cases. She stated that some of the issues that need assessment and reconciliation include the marital relationship, family roles, parenting skills, problem resolution, knowledge of child development, privacy, children's rights, communication skills, community involvement, and desexualizing the parent-child relationship.

Both individual and family treatment are based on the results of the evaluation, and all deficient areas addressed. Either type of treatment is a lengthy process; measured in years, not months.

Sgroi (1982) stated that because the sexually abusive behavior
is compulsive, patterned, and ritualized, it will remain in the behavioral repertoire; and the goal of treatment is the relative mastery of a serious behavioral problem, an addiction, not a cure. Knopp (1984) agreed that offenders always remain vulnerable to reoffense and will reoffend if they discontinue managing their lives in ways necessary to prevent reoffense. Sgroi (1982) and Salter (1988) reported that for successful treatment, the offender must accept full responsibility for the offense, must get in touch with unmet needs and find more appropriate ways of meeting them, must identify life demands with which they do not successfully cope, and find ways of avoiding stress related to those demands. Pithers et al. (1988) stressed that sex offenders must identify situations and behavior patterns that are antecedents to sexual abuse and learn ways of responding to those warning signals that will interrupt the offense behavior. The sexual arousal pattern to children must be altered and arousal to appropriate stimuli facilitated (Abel et al., 1984). Groth (1985) added that the offenders must understand their own motives and dynamics and have an appreciation for the damage their offending behavior does to their victims; and for those offenders who were themselves sexually abused as children, treatment for their victimization is essential.

Psychological Needs and the Sexual Abuse of Children

The recurrent theme of psychological needs as an integral
component in the etiology of the sexual abuse of children and as a significant issue to be addressed in the assessment and treatment of sex offenders of children cannot be missed. At issue is the propensity of offenders to convert these nonsexual needs into inappropriate sexual behavior and the extent to which these needs correlate with the act of engaging in and sustaining that behavioral pattern. Knopp (1984) made the point that this behavior satisfies some need or it would be dropped from the repertoire. Karpman (1954) stated that it is the satisfaction of one's emotional needs and freedom from tension and anxiety that makes this behavior reinforcing. Sgroi (1982) added that it also expresses unresolved conflict and that the offender becomes dependent on this sexual activity to meet emotional needs without the demands of an adult relationship.

McGaghy (1967) reported that sex offenders do not necessarily possess values contradictory to conventional society, but that they learn socially available motives that are instrumental in decreasing both external and internal controls. Solomon (1980) stressed that acquired motives, or needs, can be as powerful as innate ones and can become the focus for major behaviors of the organism even at the expense of innate needs. In order to refine and improve methods of prevention, assessment, and treatment of child sexual abuse, Groth (1978) believed that professionals must learn to distinguish types of offenders, their needs, and their motivations. An understanding of the concept of needs as motives and the evolution of the theories
from which that concept has emerged may further enhance that process.

**Contributions to Understanding Psychological Needs**

In the psychological literature, the terms "needs" and "motives" are frequently used interchangeably to refer to the initiators of action. Chambers (1980) stated that the motivation for all actions is the attempt to satisfy needs or combinations of needs, and that both internal and external conditions arouse, evoke, and affect needs. He reported that need systems are considered subsystems of the total personality and are organized with an internal set of checks and balances. Rather than being concerned with a linear causal relationship between isolated needs and behavioral variables, need systems are instead concerned with sets of needs that are interrelated by an organizing principle to form a whole. Chambers (1980) emphasizes that the common function of these systems is to increase satisfaction and avoid dissatisfaction.

The historical antecedents of present motivational concepts are embedded in philosophical and religious issues (Edwards, 1970). The struggle between good and evil was frequently at the core of conflicting motivational needs. This emphasis appears to have shifted with the advent of modern psychological theories.

McDougall (1906) developed his theory or hormic, or purposive, psychology, the study of goal seeking behavior, in which he regarded instinct as the main concept in explaining behavior. He defined
instinct as an inherited or innate psychological disposition which determines how individuals perceive and attend to certain objects, how they experience emotional excitement based on that perception, and how they act, or experience an impulse to act, in response to such feelings and perceptions. Madsen (1973) described McDougall's explanations of instinct as all inclusive and containing both directing cognitive functions and dynamic energizing functions. Chambers (1980) stated that McDougall's emphasis on psychological dispositions and sentiments proved to be transitional concepts between the accepted ideas about instinct and the developing concepts of needs and motives.

Allport (1937), in the development of his theory, declared that traits were not only the chief unit of personality structure but also the major dynamic source of human motivation. He described traits as neuropsychic structures that have the capability of rendering many stimuli functionally equivalent and of initiating and guiding equivalent forms of adaptive and expressive behavior. Madsen (1973) stated that Allport denied the importance of biological needs and drives, as well as, the importance of childhood development; whatever motivated a person to act must have been presently operating. Thetford and Schucman (1975) reported that Allport's concept of functional autonomy stated that motivational systems were not dependent upon or explained by the antecedent conditions from which they arose. All present motives that sought new goals were included. A wide range of motives, including
interests, abilities, intentions, plans, attitudes, and habits, were recognized.

In Lewin's (1935) field theory, the person and the environment are part of regions of the same psychological field. Environment, here, refers to the person's perception of the environment, the psychological environment, rather than the actual physical environment. Through his topological concepts, he tried to clarify the interconnections of the different regions of the field and the nature of the boundaries separating them at a particular moment in time. Lewin (1936) used his dynamic concepts to refer to conditions of change, particularly to needs and forces. Needs are described as the chief motivational constructs. Unsatisfied needs arouse tension, which induces disequilibrium. The person reacts to restore the equilibrium either through realistic or unrealistic means. The tension is then reduced or equalized as the need is met through action or ideation. The actual motive power that drives the person toward tension reduction, or need satisfaction, is the concept of force. The need arises from within the person and the force exists in the environment. Madsen (1973) stated that Lewin's theory is very exact and systematic but criticizes it for having too few operational definitions. He added, however, that Lewin's theory has been an inspiration for much experimental work in psychology and social psychology.

Murray (1938) acknowledged the influence of Lewin (1935), as well as McDougall (1908), in the development of his theory of
psychological need. This theory attempted to integrate learning theory and psychoanalytic theory and arose out of a team effort that represented backgrounds in psychology, medicine, sociology, and anthropology. Murray proposed the term personology for the study of personality that concerns itself with the study of human lives and the forces that influence their course. He insisted that personality could never be separated from its biological roots and stressed the importance of the historical developmental influence on a person's life. The primary concept in Murray's (1938) theory of motivation is the "need", which he defined as: "A need is a construct . . . . a force which organizes perception, apperception, intellection, conation and action in such a way as to transform in a certain direction an existing unsatisfying situation" (p. 123). Thetford and Schucman (1975) reported that in Murray's theory, the need can arise from within the person (proactive needs) or can be induced by the environment (reactive needs). Needs are triggered by "press", which is seen as a force, either real or perceived, in the environment that has the capacity to arouse need-tension in a person. Once the need is aroused, it produces continued activity until it is reduced or satisfied. Schultz (1986) stated that Murray's theory contains approximately 40 needs, divided into viserogenic needs, which are primary needs that arise from internal body processes, and psychogenic needs, which are secondary needs that relate to mental and emotional satisfaction. Madsen (1973) pointed to the wealth of motivational and explanatory variables as
both the strength and weakness of Murray's theory. The strength comes from the possibility of making very differential descriptions of individual personalities, and the weakness lies in the risk of pseudoexplanations appearing when the theory is applied by less critical psychologists than Murray. Schultz (1986) stated that Murray has "provided the most elaborate and carefully determined categorization of needs to be found anywhere in psychology" (p. 173). Chambers (1980) referred to Murray's needs system as "one of the most comprehensive motivation classification systems developed to date" (p. 392), and Madsen (1973) characterized Murray as a driving force in personality theory, where he is perhaps "second only to Freud" (p. 681). Such plaudits are not frequently seen in the literature on needs theories.

Chambers (1980) reported that although Maslow has a shorter and more general list of needs than Murray, he used a strong systems organization, ordering needs hierarchically by the principles of necessity for survival (D needs) and the desire for self-actualization (B needs). Maslow (1970) defined the D needs, or deficiency needs, as those that must be met before any hope of transcending them can occur. The most basic needs are the physiological needs and safety needs. When these are met, behavior is determined by the social needs for affection and approval. Maslow defined the B need, abundancy needs, as growth needs which include the need for knowledge, aesthetic experience, and self-realization. Thetford and Schucman (1975) stated that striving to fulfill the B needs propels
a person toward wholeness, self-fulfillment, and uniqueness. Madsen (1973) recognized that the pyramid model of needs has been very influential in applied psychology. Maslow (1970) rejected both the psychoanalytic and behavior theorists’ hypotheses of motivation as only valid for deficiency motivation and applicable only to animals and neurotic humans and not applicable to normal, healthy adults who have their deficiency needs met and who determine their behavior by striving for positive growth. Madsen (1973) viewed Maslow’s contributions as the most influential force in the humanistic trend in personality theory.

As can be seen from the preceding sample of theories, theories of psychological need vary in their foundation and organization, operational definitions, depth and breadth of focus, and practical utility. One aspect of practical utility in the clinical application of these theories is the ease with which the theoretical propositions can be measured in the individual and in groups.

Assessment of Psychological Needs

Chambers (1980) expressed concerns regarding the clinical assessment of needs and motives. He pointed out that needs and motives are constructs and are identified and measured by inference rather than by direct observation. This raises the question of whether the results of the assessment actually measure the needs in question and to what extent these results are affected by other variables such as response biases. Objective tests were singled
out, because they are based on self-ratings of behavior assumed to express the needs measured and reflect values, attitudes, and beliefs about needs. He concluded that any evaluation instrument must take into account factors that can distort self-report measures such as social desirability, self-awareness, and one's willingness to reveal information. He further recommended the use of a systems perspective that includes the use of measures based upon a theory that utilized a systems approach, such as that of Murray (1938).

The two most widely used standardized objective instruments based on Murray's (1938) needs theory are the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) and the Personality Research Form (PRF).

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) (Edwards, 1957) was primarily designed for counseling and research purposes to provide measures of a number of relatively independent normal personality variables derived from Murray's (1938) list of manifest needs. The EPPS provides measures of 15 personality variables, as well as a measure of test consistency and a measure of profile stability. The 15 scales include Achievement, Deference, Order, Exhibition, Autonomy, Affiliation, Intracception, Change, Endurance, Heterosexuality, Succorance, Dominance, Abasement, Nurturance, and Aggression. Each of the 15 variables was paired twice with each other variable in a forced choice format. High scores on a scale indicate that variable was selected more frequently than those with
low scores.

The forced choice format was selected and items paired by their similarity in desirability level to avoid problems of social desirability bias, which was somewhat effective. Lanyon and Goldstein (1971) explained, however, that this format forces an individual to choose one alternative even though neither may be descriptive of the individual’s behavior, resulting in no information about the absolute strength of one’s preference or the personality characteristic underlying it. The EPPS profile then reflects a rank order of the needs within the individual and not the degree of preference, producing an ipsative measure.

The ipsative format creates some statistical problems. There is a built in negative correlation among the scales and interscale dependencies, making factor analysis inappropriate (Jackson, 1973). Lanyon and Goldstein (1971) pointed out that many statistical operations assume independence of scores; and because the EPPS variables are not statistically independent, studies using the EPPS make the results difficult to interpret. Jackson (1973) further concluded that because the scales must sum to a constant, attempts to compare the score of one subject with another are inappropriate. Additionally, this format heightens the contrast inevitable in items not precisely matching in social desirability. Stollak’s (1965) research indicates that the lack of identical matching is evident in the ability of individuals to alter their profiles in the socially desirable direction when instructed to fake good.
Jackson (1973) stated that there are some advantages to the forced choice format, especially in situations where it is appropriate to make ipsative decisions rather than normative ones, where within subject comparisons are more meaningful than between subject comparisons, such as when counseling an individual regarding career choice. The forced choice format also eliminates other forms of acquiescence, including true responding.

The Personality Research Form

The Personality Research Form (PRF) is constructed based on the application of developments in the areas of personality theory, personality assessment, and test theory in an attempt to evaluate the degree to which a sequential strategy might overcome some of the traditional difficulties encountered in personality scale construction (Jackson, 1967, 1973). Jackson (1970) stressed the importance of psychological theory to the construction of personality inventories and has maintained that Murray’s (1938) theory of personality possesses the advantage “of covering broadly, if not exhaustively, the spectrum of personality needs, states and dispositions, of possessing carefully worked out published definitions and of having a good deal of theoretical and empirical underpinning” (p. 67).

The need scales of the PRF were defined as closely as possible in conformity with Murray’s (1938) definitions; however, some of Murray’s definitions required some modification with respect to their mutual distinctiveness. Earlier forms (A & B) of the PRF
contained 15 scales; however, all three later forms (AA, BB, & E) are made up of 20 personality variable scales and 2 validity scales. The 20 scales include Abasement, Achievement, Affiliation, Aggression, Autonomy, Change, Cognitive Structure, Defendence, Dominance, Endurance, Exhibition, Harmavoidance, Impulsivity, Nurturance, Order, Play, Sentience, Social Recognition, Succorance, and Understanding. The Infrequency validity scale is designed to detect nonpurposive responding and scoring errors, and the Desirability validity scale reflects to what degree the individual tried to present a favorable impression. The items are presented in a true-false format.

The initial item pool from which the final test items were drawn numbered approximately 3,000. Four interrelated principles guided the writing and selection of test items: an explicit, theoretically based definition of a particular trait is necessary before attempts at measurement; the careful empirical selection of items for homogeneity contributes substantially to refined measurement; suppression of response biases such as desirability should be done when selecting items and developing scales; and both convergent and discriminant validity must be considered at every stage of scale development if the final scales are to have these properties (Jackson, 1967).

After the items were written to conform as closely as possible with Murray's (1938) definitions of needs, they were edited, given to college students, and each item was scored on predeveloped keys.
and total scores calculated. All items were then correlated with the total scale scores for each need and with a provisional Desirability scale. Items were retained if they related more highly with their own scales than any others and were within an endorsement range of 5-95%. A Differential Reliability Index (DRI) was computed for each of these items, which represented the reliable portion of the item variance associated with its own content dimension and distinct from a desirability dimension. The items were ranked according to their DRIs to select items with relatively higher levels of content saturation with the desirability variance suppressed. Those with the highest index values were accepted until 40 items for each scale had been chosen. These 40 were divided, pairing items with similar statistical properties, into two parallel forms (Crites, 1969). An important feature of the PRF scale items is that an equal number of items were selected that reflect the positive and negative pole of each trait; therefore, all scores have descriptive meaning (Valentine, 1969). The manual (Jackson, 1984), however, only provides descriptive interpretations for the positive pole of the trait. A corresponding descriptive table for the negative pole of the scale has never been developed by the test author (Jackson, 1988).

Jackson (1973) stated that the major distinguishing characteristic of this modern approach to test construction is the use of a combination of steps in a sequential series. Each of the steps being necessary, but not sufficient, for the construction of
personality measures having properties of construct, and of convergent and discriminant validity. Wiggins (1973) described the PRF as "the only published multitrait personality inventory whose development was guided explicitly by the substantive, structural, and external considerations of the construct viewpoint" and as "unquestionably the best example of a large scale personality inventory under the construct point of view" (p. 409).

Hoffman (1968) examined how well the PRF had succeeded at maximizing valid trait variance and minimizing desirability influences by examining the effects of faking good instructions. He found that instructions to fake in the desirable direction had minimal effect of PRF scores, which differed significantly from Stollak's (1965) findings with the EPPS. Aggression, Autonomy, and Exhibition showed almost no shift in mean scores with fake good instructions on the PRF; although, these scales dropped considerably on Stollak's similar study with the EPPS. Instructions to fake in the undesirable direction, however, showed a remarkable reversal of several of the personality variables on the PRF.

Edwards (1957) proposed that one way to reduce the effects of social desirability on responses to personality scales would be to use items that have Social Desirability Scale Values (SDSV) in the middle to neutral SDSV range. When Abbot (1975) compared the PRF to the Cruse List of Personal Constructs and the Edwards Personality Inventory, the proportion of the PRF items in the neutral SDSV range was much larger than for either of the other instruments. He
reported that this supported previous studies that compared the California Personality Inventory and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory to the PRF on correlations with Social Desirability scales and found the PRF much less confounded with social desirability than the scales of the other inventories. He concluded that Jackson (1970) had succeeded in his attempt to minimize the effect of social desirability in the PRF. Hogan (1978), however, criticized the efforts to control for social desirability, stating that it represents valid rather than error variance. He additionally indicted Jackson, along with "a whole generation of test authors" (p. 643), for his failure to deal with a variety of conceptual and nonpsychometric issues, such as how traits can explain behavior, the stability of traits across situations, and the role of traits in the development of psychological theory.

PRF Relevance to Sex Offenders of Children

The preceding comparison of the PRF and EPPS would indicate that the PRF would be the preferred test in a study in which normative data are to be compared and in which respondents may have a tendency to answer in a socially desirable direction. In sensitive topic areas, such as child sexual abuse, subjects are known to bias their responses in the socially desirable direction (Finkelhor et al., 1983). Certainly sex offenders of children may have a variety of agendas for responding in the socially desirable direction, such as, the desire to present a favorable picture before
the courts, the tendency to minimize the extent of difficulties when entering treatment, or the manifestation of their characteristic cognitive distortions and denial. Several of the PRF need scales describe characteristics frequently discussed in the literature as descriptive of traits of sex offenders of children. There is considerable variability in the amount of pertinent information for each scale; however, there is a foundation upon which predictions can be made regarding the relevance of individual PRF scales to the population of men who sexually abuse children.

Abasement

Abasement relates to the degree to which an individual is self-depreciating, resigned, surrendering, humble, deferential, and willing to accept blame and criticism (Jackson, 1984). Sex offenders of children have frequently been described as feeling inadequate (Finkelhor, 1979; Horowitz, 1985; Panton, 1979; Patch et al., 1962; Toobert et al., 1959) and having low self-esteem (Finkelhor, 1979; Robson et al., 1985; Sgroi, 1982). They have also been noted to feel unworthy and ashamed (Crewdson, 1988), to experience much underlying guilt (Toobert et al., 1959), and to be self-effacing (Salter, 1988). In the three EPPS studies (Fisher, 1969; Fisher & Howell, 1970; Fisher & Rivlin, 1972), homosexual pedophiles, heterosexual pedophiles, and rapists all scored significantly higher on abasement when compared with a control group of nonoffending adult males. All this would indicate that se
offenders of children may score significantly higher on the Abasement scale than a group of nonoffending controls.

In Peters's (1976) study, however, using a self-rating scale of self-esteem, offenders rated themselves above average in self-esteem which was thought to reflect the amount of denial operating in their self-perceptions or self-reports. Others have described sex offenders of children as unable to experience guilt and unwilling to accept blame for their actions (Mayer, 1985; Patch et al., 1962; Salter, 1988). These factors indicate that there may be a group of offenders who score significantly lower on Abasement.

Achievement

Achievement describes the willingness to work hard to accomplish difficult tasks or to attain excellence, a willingness to work toward distant goals, and a maintenance of high standards (Jackson, 1984). Ellis and Brancale (1956) believed that many pedophiles are unable to live up to their own innate capabilities, and Breer (1987) identified an antisocial type of sex offender that is shortsighted and less successful. The inability to delay gratification is also commonly referred to as characteristic of sex offenders of children (Gebhard et al., 1965; Panton, 1979). On the three EPPS studies (Fisher, 1969; Fisher & Howell, 1970; Fisher & Rivlin, 1972), all three groups (homosexual pedophiles, heterosexual pedophiles, and rapists) scored significantly lower than the adult male controls on the Achievement scale. It must be kept in mind,
however, that most of these samples were taken from incarcerated groups who may already reflect a lower socioeconomic level (Gebhard et al., 1965); and even though there is a tendency reflected in the literature for sex offenders of children to score significantly lower on the Achievement scale, it may prove to be more related to other factors such as education of socioeconomic status.

**Affiliation**

Affiliation refers to the need to be with friends and people in general, to accept people readily, and to make and maintain friendships and associations with others (Jackson, 1984). It has been stated that the need for affiliation plays a prominent role in the etiology of child sexual abuse (Groth, 1978, 1979; Sgroi, 1982). The need becomes distorted because the offender is fearful of adults (Finkelhor, 1979; Hobson et al., 1985; Mayer, 1985), feels inadequate in interpersonal relationships (Horowitz, 1985; Toobert et al., 1959), and is socially alienated (Kirkland & Bauer, 1982) and isolated (Armentrout & Hauer, 1978; Hobson et al., 1985; Horowitz, 1985; Sgroi, 1982). Armentrout and Hauer (1978) found all groups of sex offenders studied to avoid close emotional involvement. This would indicate that even though there may be a high need for affiliation, sex offenders of children are likely to score lower than nonoffending groups in terms of their affiliative behaviors with peers. The distribution on this scale could be bipolar if it reflects this difference in need state versus ability to act on that
need.

Aggression

A high score on the Aggression scale describes a person who is threatening, aggressive, easily angered, and willing to hurt someone to get their own way (Jackson, 1984). A rather extensive discussion of the literature regarding sex offenders of children and aggressive needs is presented in the offense characteristic section of this work. Aggression is inhibited in the sex pressure offender but is a motivational element in the sex force offender (Groth, 1979; Groth & Burgess, 1977). The EPPS studies (Fisher, 1969; Fisher & Howell, 1970; Fisher & Rivlin, 1972) found all sex offender groups to score low on the Aggression scale, indicating that the aggressive acts were carried out by men who feel weak and dependent. The literature and research findings would indicate that child sex offenders generally have difficulty with aggression, but the difficulty can lie at either extreme of the continuum. While there may be more who are at the less aggressive end of the continuum, the literature would suggest a group of offenders also being present on the more aggressive end.

Autonomy

A high score on the Autonomy scale describes an individual who is self-reliant, independent, undominated, unattached, and nonconforming (Jackson, 1984). Langevin, Handy, Russon, and Day (1985)
identified pedophiles as being self-sufficient and less group
dependent than controls in a study utilizing the 16PF. Groth
(1978, 1979), however, stated that dependency needs are a major
component of motivation in the sexual abuse of children. Peters
(1976) reported strong dependency needs in sex offenders in his
study using the Bender Gestalt. The EPPS studies (Fisher, 1969;
Fisher & Howell, 1970; Fisher & Rivlin, 1972) identify homosexual
pedophiles, heterosexual pedophiles, and rapists as all scoring
significantly lower than adult controls and general offender
controls on the Autonomy scale. Therefore, even though some
offenders may score in the autonomous direction, the literature
indicates that a much larger proportion of sex offenders of children
would score significantly lower than nonoffending groups on the
Autonomy scale, reflecting the strong dependency needs.

Change

Murray (1938) described change as the tendency to move and
wander, to seek out new experiences, and to adapt to changes in the
environment. Panton (1979) reported on his MMPI study that one
prominent characteristic of the child sexual abusers was rigidity.
Others have used the terms rigid, conservative, fearful, and
dependent to describe these men (Herman, 1981; Justice & Justice,
Rivlin, 1972), both heterosexual pedophiles and rapists scored
significantly lower than both male control and general offender
controls. The social isolation frequently associated with sex offenders of children could relate to a reticence about seeking out new experiences. These facts suggest that sex offenders of children will score significantly lower on the Change scale than nonoffending groups.

**Cognitive Structure**

Cognitive Structure relates to one's need for perfection, exactness, precision, structure, and avoidance of ambiguity. Justice and Justice (1979) described a type of sex offender of children who is perfectionistic, and the rigidity previously mentioned could apply here. The evidence is not strong that this scale has particular relevance to sex offenders of children; however, if it does, it is more likely to be reflected in higher scores.

**Defendence**

High Defendence scores describe someone who is defensive, suspicious, secretive, denying, rationalizing, touchy, and guarded (Jackson, 1984). All those words are found in the sexual abuse literature as descriptive of sex offenders of children. The Cattell Personality Inventory research of Peters (1976) identifies them as suspicious, as does the research of Langevin, Handy, Russon, and Day (1985) and Anderson et al. (1979). Meiselman (1978), Weiner (1962), and Weinberg (1955) all described offenders of children as having
paranoid tendencies. Toobert et al. (1959) reported that the sex offenders of children in their study were highly sensitized to the evaluation of others, and Overholser and Beck (1986) described them as fearful of the negative evaluation of others. The very nature of their sexually abusive behavior requires sex offenders to be secretive and guarded. The characteristic cognitive distortions and denial have already been discussed. The research and clinical literature strongly suggests that the high levels of defency needs in sex offenders of children would be manifested in high scores. It is possible, however, that offenders who do accept responsibility for their behavior and who are not into denial will score in the lower ranges on this scale. Therefore, two groups could emerge in the opposing extreme positions.

**Dominance**

Individuals who score high on the Dominance scale are described as attempting to control their environment and to influence or direct other people. They may seek out the role of the leader. They are assertive, authoritarian, forceful, and supervising. The literature presents a mixed picture with respect to this need and its relationship to men who sexually abuse children. Breer (1987) stated that the key psychodynamic elements in a sex offense are force and control of the victim. This need for dominance has been identified as an important component by others as well (Storr, 1964; Ward, 1985). Groth (1978) stated that child sexual abuse is
the distorted expression of power and control and that in some sex
offenses, sexuality becomes the expression of dominance. Horowitz
(1985) addressed the excessive need to express personal power; and
Langevin, Hecker, Ben-Aron, Purins, and Hook (1985) found that
stimuli with the theme of dominating the fearful child are the most
arousing to pedophiles. Finkelhor (1979) reported that the sexual
abuse of a child leaves the offender feeling powerful and in
control. These offenders are also identified as being very dominant
within their families, often relying on the use of force (Herman,
1981; Weinberg, 1955). Others have viewed these dominant needs as
really being an attempt to compensate for a self-perception of being
powerless, timid, passive, and unassertive (Finkelhor, 1979; Mayer,
1985; Russell, 1984). Sgroi (1982) described them as relating to
life in a submissive way. Peters’s (1976) research with the Cattell
Personality Inventory also identifies offenders as submissive.
Fisher and Howell (1970), based on an EPPS study, described
homosexual pedophiles as passive and weak. Results of a study using
the Kelly Repertory Grid (Howells, 1981) reflect that sex offenders
of children view adults as threatening; therefore, they turn to
children whom they can dominate. Child sexual abusers are not
described as approaching their outside environment in a powerful
manner, nor are the positive leadership aspects of dominance
reflected in the literature as descriptive of this population.
Therefore, even though the clinical literature indicates that there
will be a group of offenders who score significantly higher than
nonoffending controls on the Dominance scale, the research literature indicates it is more likely that a significant number of sex offenders of children would cluster significantly lower on the Dominance scale.

Endurance

Endurance reflects one's persistence, determination, perseverance, stamina, and zealousness. In the Fisher and Rivlin (1972) study with rapists measured on the EPPS, they scored significantly higher than either control group. A multimethod factor analytic study of the Differential Personality Inventory (DPI), PRF, and MMPI found the PRF Endurance scale to be related to the DPI Socially Deviant Attitude scale (Trott & Morf, 1972). They hypothesize that the PRF Endurance scale may reflect persistence in the face of social pressure, and the common underlying dimension may be resistance to social pressure to conform to social norms. Offenders with poor frustration tolerance (Anderson & Shafer, 1979) may not have much endurance. Albeit not a strong case, there is some indication that if this scale is relevant to sex offenders of children, it will be reflected in scores significantly higher than nonoffending groups.

Exhibition

Exhibition measures the degree to which an individual wants to be the center of attention, is conspicuous, immodest, entertaining,
and dramatic. Exhibitionism, as a sex offense, often coexists with pedophilia; and it is suggested that a common etiology may be present (Langevin, Hecker, Ben-Aron, Purins, & Hook, 1985; P. B. Mrazek & Rempe, 1981). This suggests that some sex offenders of children may score high on the Exhibition scale. Panton (1979), however, identified the group of offenders he studied as quite inhibited. The previously cited works that describe sex offenders of children as fearful of peers, socially isolated and alienated, and secretive and suspicious would point to the indication that far more offenders would withdraw from the limelight and fall on the inhibited end of this scale to a significant degree when compared to a nonoffending control group.

**Harmavoidance**

Harmavoidance is indicative of the degree to which an individual does not enjoy exciting activities, and is fearful, apprehensive, timorous, cautious, and self-protective (Jackson, 1984). Ellis and Brancale (1956) described the compulsive nature of the sex offenders' behavior and report that they are literally driven by their terrible underlying anxiety to reckless acts with no regard for safeguarding themselves from the consequences of the act. Gebhard et al. (1965) referred to a group of psychopathic or sociopathic offenders who are reckless with no regard for social controls. These facts indicate that a group of sex offenders of children would cluster in the lower ranges on the Harmavoidance
scale. Sgroi (1982), however, stated that there is a predominant mood state of fearfulness with most sex offenders of children. They are also described as timid (Finkelhor, 1979), fearful of their peers (Finkelhor, 1979; Hobson et al., 1985; Howells, 1979), rigid (Panton, 1979), and conservative (Herman, 1981). This indicates that there may be a large group of offenders who would cluster at the upper end of the Harmavoidance scale; therefore, a bipolar distribution may be observed on this scale.

**Impulsivity**

The Impulsivity scale refers to one's need to act without deliberation, to be uninhibited, impulsive, excitable, hasty, reckless, or spontaneous (Jackson, 1984). Several studies have identified poor impulse control and the inability to delay gratification as prominent characteristics of sex offenders of children (Abel et al., 1986; Armentrout & Hauer, 1978; Gebhard et al., 1965; Panton, 1979; Patch et al., 1962). References to impulse control problems, poor frustration tolerance, and shortsightedness abound in the literature describing this group of offenders (Anderson & Shafer, 1979; Breer, 1987; Cook & Howells, 1981; Ellis & Brancalce, 1956; Groth, 1978; Borowitz, 1985; Summit & Kryso, 1978). Finkelhor (1979) believed that poor impulse control is true for a small group of offenders but not for the majority. Overholser and Beck (1986), using a measure of impulsivity, could not differentiate child molestes and rapists from three control groups. Peters (1976),
using the IES Test and Bender Gestalt, found that pedophiles showed better ego control and less impulsivity than the other groups studied and were better able to comply with demands and restrain impulses without interference of unconscious motives. Pithers et al. (1988) found that over 50% of the offenders were overcontrolled prior to their offenses; and Herman (1981) emphasized that these assaults are planned, not impulsive, acts. There is sufficient evidence to indicate that sex offenders of children could score at either extreme on the Impulsivity scale to reflect either the impulsivity or the overcontrolled features of this group, and a bipolar distribution could be obtained on this scale. The literature does, however, appear to weight more heavily on the extreme of offenders being impulsive and unable to delay gratification.

**Nurturance**

Nurturance reflects the tendency to assist others when possible, to give comfort and support, to care for children and others in need, and to readily perform favors for others (Jackson, 1984). Fisher and Howell (1970), using the EPPS, found homosexual pedophiles to score significantly higher than heterosexual pedophiles on the Nurturance scale. Groth (1977) described sex pressure offenders as genuinely caring about the child at some level. Herman’s (1981) sample of incestuous fathers were for the most part church going individuals who portrayed a caring, supportive role in the community, although their behavior in their families differed.
from that public persona. Crewdson (1988) described a type of child sexual abuser who, in order to compensate for frustrated dependency needs, seeks the recognition of others, which may be accomplished through altruistic tasks. He also pointed out that being involved in groups that teach, support, or care for children gives the offender access to a population of potential victims. Many of the cognitive distortions used by sex offenders of children to rationalize their behavior are related to themes of being loving, affectionate, instructive, or supportive to the child (Conte, 1985). The above indicates that a large number of offenders would endorse items on the PRF that would place their scores in the nurturing direction.

Groth (1979) described sex offenders of children as being insensitive to the needs and feelings of others. Herman (1981) and Salter (1988) emphasized the lack of empathy so characteristic of sex offenders of children. Armstrong (1978) pointed out that if offenders of children really thought or cared about the victim’s needs and the consequences to the victim, they would not be able to engage in the abusive behaviors. The sex force offenders do not care about the needs or consequences to the victims; the sadists, in fact, need to hurt or degrade the victim for sexual gratification to occur (Groth & Burgess, 1977). These offenders and those not in denial would score low on the Nurturance scale.

It is believed that the majority of offenders are sex pressure offenders (Groth, 1979) and that cognitive distortions are more likely to be present than not (Abel et al., 1986; Salter, 1988);
therefore, a greater number of sex offenders of children may score in the nurturing direction on the Nurturance scale. However, a bipolar distribution is likely to occur, especially if the sample includes many offenders who accept full responsibility for their behavior.

Order

The Order scale reflects the degree to which one needs to have one's surroundings neat and organized, dislikes clutter or confusion, and is interested in developing methods for keeping things methodically organized (Jackson, 1984). Fisher and Howell (1970) found homosexual pedophiles to score lower than adult controls on the Order scale on the EPPS. The previous references to offenders being rigid or over-controlled could suggest a positive response in the orderly direction on the PRF. The evidence is, however, not strong that this scale has much relevance to sex offenders of children as a group.

Play

Play refers to such characteristics as doing things "just for fun", spending a good deal of time participating in social activities and other amusements, and maintaining a light-hearted, easy going attitude toward life (Jackson, 1984). Although no studies were identified that related directly to the playfulness of sex offenders of children, there are other factors that are relevant.
to this scale. The previously cited social isolation and alienation would prohibit individuals from participating in social activities. The rigidity, fearfulness, and suspiciousness described earlier are certainly contradictory features to a light-hearted approach to life. Additionally, Wilson and Cox (1983), based on a study using the Eysneck Personality Questionnaire, described sex offenders of children as humorless. These factors point in the direction of scores being significantly lower for sex offenders of children than for nonoffending controls on the Play scale.

**Sentience**

High scores on the Sentience scale describe someone who notices and appreciates smells, sights, sounds, tastes, and how things feel; who believes these experiences are an important part of life; and who is sensitive to many forms of experience (Jackson, 1984). Peters (1976), based on the Rorschach results of sex offenders of children, noted significant repression of sensuous impulses. Langevin, Hecker, Ben-Aron, Purins, and Hook (1985) described the failure of offenders to distinguish the physical features of children and adults as noteworthy. The amount of time these individuals spend ruminating about their deviant sexual compulsions has been emphasized by others (Abel et al., 1986; Pithers et al., 1988; Salter, 1988). This ruminative process could inhibit one's awareness of these other senses. Sex offenders of children may then have a tendency to endorse items that would place their scores in
the lower direction to a significant degree when compared to nonoffenders on the Sentience scale.

**Social Recognition**

An individual who scores high on the Social Recognition scale is one that desires to be held in high esteem by peers, is concerned about reputation, and works for the approval and recognition of others (Jackson, 1984). Crewdson (1988) described a process whereby narcissism results from frustrated dependency needs which leaves offenders feeling insecure, powerless, and ashamed. This leads them to devote themselves to seeking admiration and recognition from others. Sgroi (1982) stated that child sexual abuse has to do with issues of recognition and status, and Finkelhor (1979) reported that the sexual abuse of a child leaves the offender feeling respected. These factors would indicate that many sex offenders have high needs for social recognition and would obtain high scores on this scale. Previously cited works that emphasize that a number of offenders are socially isolated and alienated, fearful of other adults, and secretive and suspicious suggest that a group of offenders may not strive for recognition. Although there are indicators that a significant portion of offenders may score in the upper ranges on the Social Recognition scale, the literature does not provide a clear picture of whether they could be expected to differ to a significant degree from the nonoffending population. Additionally, most of the references to this need are based on clinical observa-
tions with little, or no, research findings to back them up.

**Succorance**

Succorance reflects the degree to which an individual seeks sympathy, protection, love, advice, and support from others. People with high scores on this scale are described as dependent, helpless, craving affection, help-seeking, and defenseless (Jackson, 1984). Patch et al. (1962) stated that the deviant sexual behavior of sex offenders of children is tied to the tremendous need to satisfy passive wishes; to "be fed". They also point out that offenders are continually asking for someone to provide direction for them. Finkelhor (1979) believed sexual abusers of children are trying to get the love they missed and that the sexual abuse allows them to overcome their helplessness. This underlying sense of vulnerability and helplessness is described by others (Hobson et al., 1985; Sgroi, 1982). Justice and Justice (1979) depicted two types of child sexual abusers who are seeking nurturance, succor, love, and comfort rather than being able to give it and who are dependent and looking for someone to take care of them. MMPI studies (Kirkland & Bauer, 1982; Panton, 1979) have identified this group as being insecure, inadequate, and passive-dependent with strong needs for affection and attention. All three EPPS studies (Fisher, 1969; Fisher & Howell, 1970; Fisher & Rivlin, 1972) found significantly elevated scores on the Succorance scale. The evidence clearly indicates that sex offenders of children could be expected to score significantly
higher than a group of nonoffenders on this scale. It is also possible that their scores on the Succorance scale would exceed their scores on Nurturance.

Understanding

Individuals with high scores on the Understanding scale are described as curious, inquiring, reflective, probing, logical, rational, and inquisitive (Jackson, 1984). Sex offenders of children are described by many as having poor judgment, failing to learn from experience, and having little understanding or insight into their own behavior (Anderson & Shafer, 1979; Groth, 1978; Hobson et al., 1985; Borowitz, 1985). Their thinking is governed by denial and cognitive distortions (Abel et al., 1986; Pithers et al., 1988; Salter, 1988). Previously cited works describe their suspiciousness of and withdrawal from the outer world; thus, they are less likely to be curious about it. Indications are that this group could be expected to score significantly lower than a group of nonoffenders on the Understanding scale.

Summary

The research and clinical literature regarding sex offenders who sexually abuse children is replete with references to psychological needs being at the core of a person's propensity to act out sexually with children. There have been numerous efforts to explain the factors that encourage or permit someone to engage in
sexual behavior with children. Finkelhor's (1979) Four Factor Model, which encompasses the issues of how it is that someone can be sexually aroused by children (Sexual Arousal Theory), what happens when a person's usual or preferred outlets are blocked (Blockage Theory), why it is that social or psychological inhibitions do not work to prevent someone from sexually victimizing a child (Disinhibition Theory), and what happens when the child takes on an emotionally compelling meaning for the offender (Emotional Congruence Theory), has been examined in detail. It is this latter concept of emotional congruence that most directly deals with converting psychological needs into sexually abusive behavior.

Differences in the nature and characteristics of the offenses are of interest when examining the correlations between offense variables and predisposing need states. The offense characteristics of particular interest include whether the offense was incestuous or nonincestuous, whether the victims were male or female, whether physical force or the threat of harm was ever used to gain compliance, whether the sex offense was part of a larger criminal pattern, whether the offenders were drug or alcohol dependent, and to what extent the offenders accepted responsibility for their abusive behavior. Clinical and research findings regarding these variables have been reviewed.

Reviewed, also, was the integral part that a thorough assessment of the psychological needs of a sex offender plays in the overall evaluation and treatment of individuals who sexually abuse
children.

It has been made clear that there is very little research designed to measure the need states of sex offenders of children. The importance of testing the clinical propositions regarding the psychological needs of sex offenders with an objective standardized psychological instrument based on a theory of psychological need has been emphasized.

A brief review of theories of psychological needs and motives was presented as background for understanding the concepts of needs as motives and their measurement. The most widely used standardized objective psychological instruments that are based on a theory of psychological need, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) and the Personality Research Form (PRF), were reviewed and compared. The literature indicates that the PRF may be more suited to the comparison of normative data on sex offenders of children. The PRF scales were then individually discussed with regard to what the clinical and research literature has to say about those particular traits within this population. How sex offenders of children can be expected to score on these scales was then specified based on that literature.

These clinical and theoretical postulates require empirical examination to either support or question the role of psychological needs of the offender in the etiology of child sexual abuse and to add to the understanding of the psychological make-up of sex offenders of children.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Population

The population of this study is defined as all adult males who have been accused of sexually abusing a child, and who have been determined to have the history, dynamics, and offense characteristics of men who sexually abuse children. The determination is made by licensed psychologists who have expertise in the field of sex offenders of children. The offender population is made up of men who were at least 18 years of age at the time of the alleged offense and who were at least 4 years older than their victims. Child victims are defined as age 16 or younger. The population includes an outpatient group of offenders who have been accused of sexual abuse but who have not been through a lengthy adjudication process.

Some authors (Butler, 1978; Bass & Thornton, 1984) insist that the problem of child sexual abuse is a gender problem, that only males sexually abuse children. Research (Finkelhor & Hotaling, 1984) indicates that in 80-90% of reported cases, the offender is male. Even though the current prevalent thinking is that cases of female offenders are disproportionately underreported (Groth, 1985), the literature on female offenders is so sparse that there is not yet a basis to assume similarity between male and female offenders.
Additionally, the number of reported female offender cases is so small that it is unlikely that a sufficient number of female offenders could be obtained as subjects for meaningful comparisons. Therefore, this study eliminates female offenders from the population to be studied and focuses on the psychological needs of a population of male sex offenders of children.

Sample

The sample consists of 50 adult males who have been accused of sexually abusing children, ages 16 and younger, and who have not been through a lengthy adjudication process. The victim age to be considered is the earliest age at which the sexual abuse is known to have occurred. The accused offenders were all at least 18 years of age at the time of the offense and at least 4 years older than their victims. The sample was drawn from an outpatient group of accused offenders who were psychologically evaluated and determined to have the history, dynamics, and offense characteristics of sex offenders of children by licensed psychologists who have expertise in the field of sex offenders of children. The referrals for evaluation came from a variety of sources: such as, attorneys, courts, protective services, presentence investigators, mental health professionals, and self-referrals.

The purpose of selecting a sample of offenders who have not been through a lengthy court process was to obtain a better cross
section of offender types; for example, some offenders would never even be prosecuted, some would go to specialized offender treatment or diversion programs, some would get probation, and some would go to prison. Additionally, the selection of this sample was directed at eliminating the effects of prolonged contact with the criminal justice system, as recommended by Finkelhor (1986). Since denial and projection are two of the main ego defenses used by sex offenders, and since most offenders are trying to avoid prison, they need not admit to the offense to be included in the sex offender sample.

The ages of the subjects ranged from 18 to 72; the mean age being 36.6 years. The racial-ethnic composition of the group consisted of 43 (83%) White subjects, 5 (10%) Black subjects, 1 (2%) Asian subject, and 1 (2%) Hispanic subject. Eleven (22%) of the subjects were single, 36 (72%) were married, 1 (2%) was cohabiting, 1 (2%) was widowed, and 1 (2%) divorced. The mean level of education was 12.82 years: 20% of the sample having 8-11 years of education; 40% of the sample being high school graduates; 32% of the sample having 1-4 years of college; and 8% of the sample possessing graduate degrees.

An effort was made to obtain geographic balance by contracting with 34 psychologists from 12 states to provide subjects. This, however, was not successful; and the geographic composition of the sample group consisted of 34 Michigan subjects, 8 Florida subjects,
6 Hawaii subjects, and 2 Minnesota subjects.

Psychological Instrument

Form E of the Personality Research Form (PRF-E) (Jackson, 1967) is a 352-item, true-false format, measure of personality variables, psychological needs, based on the work of Murray (1938) and his colleagues at the Harvard Psychological Clinic. The variables focus on areas of normal functioning and not psychopathology. There are 20 personality variable scales and two validity scales. The personality variable scales are Abasement, Achievement, Affiliation, Aggression, Autonomy, Change, Cognitive Structure, Defendence, Dominance, Endurance, Exhibition, Harmavoidance, Impulsivity, Nurturance, Order, Play, Sentience, Social Recognition, Succorance, and Understanding. The validity scales are Infrequency and Desirability.

Jackson (1974) developed Form E of the PRF to extend the use of the test to a wider array of populations, particularly those with less verbal ability, to utilize advanced technical item-analytic procedures with the best items contained in the longer forms, and to develop a shorter, less time consuming form, shortening the scales from 20 to 16 items. In the PRF-E development, the criterion for item endorsement proportions was more stringent than the earlier forms. In the original forms, the acceptable range was from .95 to .05; in the PRF-E, the acceptable range was .80 to .20. The statistical and editorial procedures used in the development of the
PRF-E were aimed at providing scales with the optimal reliability in relation to their length, minimum mutual redundancy, and being comprised of items combining content saturation, freedom from irrelevant variance, lack of ambiguity, readability, and conciseness (Jackson, 1984).

Jackson (1984) reported the test-retest reliabilities as ranging from .80 to .96 with a median of .90 for Form AA; and for Form BB, the range was .85 to .96 with a median of .93. He also explained that reliability is very much a function of test length, and the reliabilities reported for PRF-E are "a compromise between bandwidth and fidelity" (p. 42), with a range of .50 to .91, reflecting 16 item scales rather than the original 20 or 40 item scales. Jackson (1974) further reported that less than 2% of the items on PRF-E correlated more highly with inappropriate scales than with their own scale, indicating that each scale possesses substantial unique variance.

All the personality variable scales were conceived to be bipolar, both theoretically and in measurement terms, with half of the items for each PRF scale written in terms of one pole of that trait and half in terms of the other pole.

PRF-E raw scores are posted directly to a profile sheet (Appendix A) and the scores converted to standard (T) scores. These profiles were developed by converting every raw score for every scale to cumulative proportions and then to deviates from the normal
curve, so that the resulting profile more accurately reflects a given subject's standing with respect to the normative group.

The Infrequency scale is the validity scale designed to detect nonpurposeful, careless, and random responding and errors in scoring. Profiles with a raw score of 4 or more were excluded from this study, as scores at this level call into question the possibility of errors in responding.

The Desirability scale indicates that the subject has consciously or unconsciously attempted to present the most positive, socially desirable picture of their psychological needs. High scores may indicate distortion, impression management, atypically high self-regard, or a high degree of conventional socialization. Low scores may indicate malingering tendencies or atypically low self-esteem. Raw scores of 16 call into question the usefulness of the response profiles, and this was set as the level at which to exclude a profile from the study group.

Test profiles with 50 or more unanswered questions would not have been included in the study group.

Procedure

Licensed psychologists who routinely psychologically evaluate individuals who sexually abuse children were asked to add the PRF-E to their usual evaluation procedure but not to score the results nor use them as a basis for their evaluation of the offender. The
psychologists were to read the instructions with the subject to insure that the subject understood the directions and could accurately read the material. If it was clear that the subject's reading ability was insufficient to understand the test items, the test was not given and the subject not included in the sample. The psychologists decided where in the order of presentation the PRF-E appeared; however, it was not to be the first instrument presented.

Psychologists used the results of the psychological evaluation procedure and at least one other source of information about the offense (i.e. protective service reports, police reports, victim's statement) other than the offender's self-report to determine if the individual was appropriate to be included in a sample of sex offenders of children. If the psychologist had any significant doubt about the person's involvement in the offense, that person was not included in the sample.

The psychologist also filled out an information form with demographic and offense descriptive information (Appendix B).

The psychologist assigned a number to each subject, based on a range of numbers provided by the researcher, and numbered the test answer sheet and offense information form with corresponding numbers. That number was the only means of identifying the test answer sheet and information forms. The information form and PRF-E answer sheet were sent to the researcher and scored and profiled by two psychologists to prevent clerical errors in scoring.
Since the researcher would never have contact with the subjects and would not know their identity, it was the psychologist's responsibility to inform the subjects that only the PRF-E scores and demographic and offense descriptive information would be used for research purposes, to assure them of absolute confidentiality and anonymity, and to get the appropriate consent forms (Appendix C) signed by the subjects. The consent forms were made part of the psychologist's permanent client file on the subject and not sent to the researcher to protect the identity of the subjects.

Statistical Hypotheses

The original research question was to what extent the assumptions of various practitioners about the psychological needs of sex offenders of children are supported when these needs are measured by a standardized objective psychological instrument that is based on a theory of psychological needs. A review of the related literature led to hypotheses regarding how sex offenders of children may be expected to score on the 20 PRF-E scales. These hypotheses led to the formulation of the following 20 null hypotheses.

1. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Abasement scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Abasement scale score of the normative group.

2. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Achievement scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly
3. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Affiliation scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Affiliation scale score of the normative group.

4. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Aggression scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Aggression scale score of the normative group.

5. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Autonomy scale score of the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Autonomy scale score of the normative group.

6. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Change scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Change scale score of the normative group.

7. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Cognitive Structure scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Cognitive Structure scale score of the normative group.

8. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Dependence scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Dependence scale score of the normative group.

9. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Dominance scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Dominance scale score of the normative group.

10. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Endurance scale score of the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Endurance scale score of the normative group.
scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Endurance scale score of the normative group.

11. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Exhibition scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Exhibition scale score of the normative group.

12. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Harmavoidance scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Harmavoidance scale score of the normative group.

13. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Impulsivity scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Impulsivity scale score of the normative group.

14. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Nurturance scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Nurturance scale score of the normative group.

15. On The Personality Research Form E, the mean Order scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Order scale score of the normative group.

16. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Play scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Play scale score of the normative group.

17. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Sentience scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Sentience scale score of the normative group.

18. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Social
Recognition scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Social Recognition scale score of the normative group.

19. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Succorance scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Succorance scale score of the normative group.

20. On the Personality Research Form E, the mean Understanding scale score for the sex offender group will not differ significantly from the mean Understanding scale score of the normative group.

Statistical Analysis

The sex offender group data were compared to the adult male normative group data presented in Table 10 of the PRF Manual, 3rd Edition (Jackson, 1984). The null hypotheses were tested with t-test analysis. Some of the research hypotheses predicted bipolar distributions in the sex offender group; therefore, the results were additionally tested with chi-square. Goodness-of-fit tests were conducted to determine if the observed values were normally distributed. Significance was determined at the .05 level.

The Sokoda, Cohen, and Beall (1954) test is a test of significance of a series of statistical tests and was used to determine the chance probability of obtaining the number of significant scales observed.
Additional Analyses

Just as sex offenders of children have a number of individual differences in other aspects of personality, it appeared likely that there may be a variety of differences in their need profiles. Whether these differences related to certain offense variables was of interest. Analysis of variance was conducted on the following offense variables; to what extent the offenders accepted responsibility for their sexually abusive behavior; whether the offenders were involved in previous sexual offenses against children, other sexual crimes, or nonsexual criminal offenses; whether the offenses were incestuous or nonincestuous; whether force or the threat of physical harm was ever used (sex pressure vs. sex force); whether the victims were male or female; whether the victims were younger--age 10 or younger, or older--ages 11-16; if the offender was chemically dependent; if there was any known precipitating stress prior to the offense; if the offender was thought to have a primary sexual orientation toward children; if there were multiple victims; and if there was a difference between birth parents and stepparents.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Data were collected on an outpatient group of adult men accused of the sexual abuse of children to determine if the psychological needs of sex offenders of children so commonly referred to in the child sexual abuse literature would be supported by this group's scores on the Personality Research Form E (PRF-E), a standardized objective psychological instrument based on Murray's (1938) need states. A null hypothesis was stated for each of the twenty need state scales and tested by comparing the means of the sex offenders of children group to the PRF adult male normative group's means.

Goodness-of-fit tests were conducted to determine if the observed values of the sex offender groups results were normally distributed. Nineteen of the 20 scale distributions fit the theoretical normal distribution, which indicated that t-test analysis was appropriate.

The t-test analysis (Table 1) indicated significant results on 8 of the 20 scales; 3 significant at the .05 level and 5 significant at the .01 level. The Sakoda, Cohen, and Beall (1954) test was conducted to determine the probability of obtaining such significance in a series of statistical tests. The probability of obtaining 3 tests out of 20 at the .05 level of confidence was
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Table 1
Comparison of Mean Scores of Sex Offenders of Children and Adult Males on the Personality Research Form: $t$-values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRF Scale</th>
<th>Sex Offenders of Children</th>
<th>Adult Male Normative Group</th>
<th>$t$-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abasement</td>
<td>8.02 (3.28)</td>
<td>6.85 (2.95)</td>
<td>1.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>10.78 (3.01)</td>
<td>10.40 (2.66)</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>8.34 (3.83)</td>
<td>9.15 (3.14)</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>6.42 (3.81)</td>
<td>8.99 (2.65)</td>
<td>-4.01***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>5.88 (2.76)</td>
<td>8.10 (2.63)</td>
<td>-4.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>8.32 (2.75)</td>
<td>8.52 (2.46)</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Structure</td>
<td>9.48 (3.07)</td>
<td>9.71 (2.39)</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendence</td>
<td>6.32 (3.27)</td>
<td>6.81 (3.27)</td>
<td>-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>8.46 (3.95)</td>
<td>9.91 (3.73)</td>
<td>-1.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>10.76 (3.22)</td>
<td>11.09 (2.96)</td>
<td>-.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>6.38 (4.05)</td>
<td>8.44 (3.60)</td>
<td>-2.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmavoidance</td>
<td>8.94 (3.91)</td>
<td>8.09 (3.93)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td>5.92 (4.15)</td>
<td>5.25 (3.29)</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td>9.82 (3.42)</td>
<td>8.93 (2.56)</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>9.30 (4.10)</td>
<td>8.94 (4.07)</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>6.80 (2.53)</td>
<td>8.69 (2.84)</td>
<td>-3.66***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentience</td>
<td>7.54 (2.50)</td>
<td>8.50 (3.24)</td>
<td>-1.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Recognition</td>
<td>8.20 (2.90)</td>
<td>7.97 (3.29)</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succorance</td>
<td>7.66 (3.44)</td>
<td>5.97 (2.95)</td>
<td>2.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>7.80 (3.47)</td>
<td>7.66 (3.36)</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Jackson (1984)  Note: df=106  $p<.05$  $p<.01$  $p<.001$
significant at the .05 level. The probability of obtaining 5 tests out of 20 at the .01 level of confidence was significant at the .001 level.

**Null Hypotheses Analyses**

The sex offenders of children group’s mean score was significantly higher at the .05 level than the mean score of the adult male normative group on the Abasement scale. The null hypothesis for the Abasement scale was rejected. This finding is consistent with what was predicted for this scale based on the research and clinical literature. Although it was predicted that the sex offender group mean would be significantly higher than the normative group on the Abasement scale, the literature also indicated that there may be an additional group who, based on denial and cognitive distortion would score low on the Abasement scale. This was somewhat supported by the fact that 14 of the 50 subjects scored at least one standard deviation below the mean when profiled on the PRF profile sheets. This group was not, however, large enough to produce a bipolar distribution.

The null hypothesis was retained for the Achievement scale, because there was no significant difference between the mean score for the sex offenders of children and the adult male normative group. Even though the research literature indicated that sex offenders of children may score low on the Achievement scale, it was thought that those results may be due to sampling bias and that
Achievement scale scores would more likely be related to other variables than to the subjects' sexually abusive behavior.

No significant difference was observed between the mean scores of the adult normative group and the sex offenders of children group on the Affiliation scale; therefore the null hypothesis was retained. This did not support either the high affiliative needs reported to be characteristic of sex offenders of children or their inability to act on those needs with peers.

The difference between the mean scores of the sex offenders of children group and the adult male normative group was significant at the .001 level on the Aggression scale; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The clinical literature and research findings suggested that the largest group of sex offenders of children would score significantly lower on the Aggression scale, which was supported by this finding. It was suggested that there would be a smaller group of offenders, the sex force offenders, who would score high on the Aggression scale. Nine of the 50 subjects' scores exceeded one standard deviation above the mean on the PRF profiles.

The sex offenders of children group's mean score on the Autonomy scale was lower than the adult male normative group's mean score at the .001 level of significance. The null hypothesis was rejected. This supports the prediction, based on the related literature, that sex offenders of children would score significantly lower on the Autonomy scale.
There was no significant difference between the mean scores of the adult male normative group and the group of sex offenders of children on the Change scale; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. This finding is not consistent with the hypothesis that sex offenders of children would score significantly lower on the Change scale.

The null hypothesis was retained for the Cognitive Structure scale, due to the fact that there was no significant difference between the mean scores for the two groups. There had not been a strong indication that this scale would have any relevance to the population of sex offenders of children; but there was some evidence that if it did, they would score higher than the normative group.

The defensive, secretive, and paranoid traits of sex offenders of children so frequently referred to in the child sexual abuse literature were expected to be reflected in a significantly higher mean score for the offender group on the Defendence scale. This was not found, and the null hypothesis was retained.

The research literature was supported by the finding that the sex offender group scored lower than the adult male normative group on the Dominance scale at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis was thereby retained. This supports the speculation by others that the dominant behavior is really a compensation for feeling dependent, helpless, timid, and weak.

There was no significant difference between the means of the sex offenders of children group and the adult male normative group.
on the Endurance scale; therefore the null hypothesis was retained. There was not much evidence that this scale was relevant to the needs of men who sexually abuse children; however, if it was relevant, it was expected that the offender group would score high on the Endurance scale.

The mean score of the sex offenders of children was lower than that of the adult male normative group on the Exhibition scale at the .01 level of significance; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis that sex offenders of children would score in the inhibited direction to a greater degree than the normative group on this scale.

The research and clinical literature indicated that a bipolar distribution could be expected from the sex offenders of children on the Harmavoidance scale. This was not supported by the goodness-of-fit tests nor was a significant difference observed in either direction when the mean scores were compared between the sex offender and adult male groups. The null hypothesis was retained.

Neither the overcontrolled or impulsive characteristics so frequently associated with those who sexually abuse children were reflected in the offender group’s mean score on the Impulsivity scale. There was no significant difference in mean scores between the offender group and adult male normative group; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

The Nurturance scale is the scale in which the observed values were not normally distributed; therefore, the t-test value was not
the appropriate inferential statistic. Chi-square results were significant at the .05 level; however, the meaning of that significance is difficult to interpret; because even though the observed values violated the goodness-of-fit tests, they did not do so in a bimodal pattern. Based on the related literature, it was thought that sex offenders of children would score in the positive direction on the Nurturance scale or that a large group would emerge on the positive pole of the scale with a smaller group on the negative pole of the scale, leaving fewer than expected scores in the midrange.

The null hypothesis was retained for the Order scale, because there was no significant difference between the mean scores for the adult male group and the sex offenders of children group. There was some suggestion that sex offenders may be higher on the Order scale; however, there was little evidence that this scale had much relevance to sex offenders as a group.

The mean score of the sex offenders of children was significantly lower than the mean score of the adult male normative group on the Play scale. The level of significance was .001, and the null hypothesis was rejected. This finding supported the hypothesis that sex offenders would score significantly lower on the Play scale, as the literature suggested.

The lower mean score of the sex offender group on the Sentience scale differed from the adult male normative group mean at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis was rejected, and the
previous research findings that suggested a significantly lower Sentience mean score for sex offenders of children was supported.

The literature did not provide a clear picture of whether sex offenders of children would differ significantly from the normative group on the Social Recognition scale. There was some suggestion that many sex offenders of children sought recognition from others, which may have been reflected in high scores. There was no significant difference between the sex offenders of children group and the adult male normative group on the Social Recognition scale, and the null hypothesis was retained.

The research and clinical literature strongly indicated that sex offenders of children could be expected to score significantly higher than a nonoffending group on the Succorance scale. This was supported by the fact that the sex offenders of children obtained a mean score that was higher at the .01 level of significance than the mean score of the adult male normative group on the Succorance scale. The null hypothesis was rejected.

There was no significant difference in mean scores between the sex offenders of children and the adult male normative group on the Understanding scale; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. This finding did not support the predicted lower mean score for the sex offender group on the Understanding scale.
Discussion of Null Hypotheses Analyses

The t-test analysis found the sex offenders of children to be significantly higher on the Abasement and Succorance scales and significantly lower on the Aggression, Autonomy, Dominance, Exhibition, Play, and Sentience scales when compared to the normative group. Significance was also noted on the Nurturance scale. This indicated that certain characteristics and need states, commonly referred to in the literature concerning sex offenders of children, were supported by measurement of those needs on a psychological instrument based on a theory of psychological needs. Some needs, where the literature presented a mixed picture, were further clarified; for example, high needs for dominance are often clinically observed in the sex offenders of children but not supported by research results. The low PRF Dominance scale mean score supported the conclusions of other researchers (Fisher & Rivlin, 1972; Peters, 1976) that the dominating behavior of many sex offenders of children is really a compensation for feeling dependent, helpless, powerless, timid, and weak. There are other offenders, however, who do appear to have high needs for dominance; 8 of the 50 subjects had scores that exceeded 1 standard deviation above the mean when recorded on the PRF profiles, and 10 of the 50 exceeded 2 standard deviations when profiled. Additonally, the low mean score on the Aggression scale did not preclude there being a subgroup with high Aggression scores.
The Nurturance scale was expected to reflect a group of offenders who scored low on the scale and a larger group who scored high on the scale, with fewer than expected scores in the midrange. The observed values did not fit the theoretical normal distribution but did not violate it in a bimodal pattern; therefore, the significant chi-square results were difficult to interpret. It was further complicated by the fact that 12 cells had expected frequencies less than 5. A larger sample size may produce clearer results. To get a general indication of the meaning of the significant results, the frequencies were divided into three ranges; a midrange based on the normative group's mean, and upper and lower ranges based on one standard deviation from the mean in each direction. In the lower range the expected value was 8.29 and the observed value was 9; therefore, little difference was indicated. In the midrange, the expected value was 35.14 and observed values were 17; and in the upper range, the expected frequencies were 9.84 and the observed values were 22. This supported the prediction that there would be a large group of sex offenders of children who would score high on the Nurturance scale.

Some needs states commonly attributed to sex offenders of children were not supported by their measurement on the PRF. The need for affiliation has been described as playing a prominent role in the etiology of child sexual abuse (Groth, 1978, 1979; Sgroi, 1982); however, offenders were not found to differ significantly from the adult male normative group on the Affiliation scale. The
social withdrawal and inhibitions reflected in their low scores on the Dominance, Exhibition, and Play scales may cause offenders to turn to children to meet their normal affiliation needs. The low Autonomy and high Succorance scale scores indicate; however, that what has been perceived as high affiliation needs may actually be high dependency and succorance needs. Qualitative and characteristic differences exist between dependency, succorance, and affiliation. These differences require different treatment strategies, and it would be a mistake to not clearly distinguish which of these needs states were prominent motivational variables in the individual offender.

Impulsivity is another need state that has been frequently attributed to sex offenders of children, as has the opposing characteristic of overcontrol. The sex offender group mean did not differ significantly from the adult male group mean on the PRF Impulsivity scale. This finding is consistent with Overholser and Beck’s (1986) research that did not distinguish child molesters from 4 control groups on measures of impulsivity. They speculated that the results may have been affected by the cognitive distortions of the offenders, because their instruments were self-report measures. This could apply to the PRF’s self-report nature as well. It appears more likely, however, that the majority of sex offenders of children do not differ from the general population in either the impulsive or overcontrolled aspects of this scale. Their sexually abusive acts usually are preceded by much fantasy and forethought,
require planning, and are followed by strategies to prevent detection. These are not acts characterized by impulsivity. It appears reasonable to consider the possibility that for the majority of offenders, impulsivity may be another rationalization to explain or justify their behavior after the fact rather than a predisposing condition to child sexual abuse. Five of the 50 subjects did obtain Impulsivity scores 2 standard deviations above the mean when recorded on the PRF profile sheets. This supports Finkelhor's position that there is a small group of offenders who are impulsive.

It was predicted that sex offenders of children would score significantly higher on the Defendence scale than the adult male normative group; however, this was not the case. It was also not the case that those who assumed full responsibility for their offenses scored lower on the Defendence scale; in fact, the highest scores on the Defendence scale were obtained by those who accepted full responsibility. The lowest scores on the Defendence scale were obtained by those who denied any involvement in the sexual abuse or accepted only partial responsibility for their behavior. The lowest scores on the Defendence scale also occurred on the profiles with the highest Desirability scale scores. One explanation for the lack of significant differences on the Defendence scale is that the sex offenders of children who are not accepting responsibility for their sexually abusive behavior are also trying to present the most favorable picture of themselves and not endorsing items related to defensiveness and suspiciousness. Those offenders who are accepting
responsibility for their behavior may also be more honest about their feeling states; hence, the higher Defendence scores on their profiles. The fact that the results of psychological evaluations could influence the disposition of their criminal cases may have a bearing on their defensiveness. Being known as a sex offender of children could also contribute to one's concern with how others were viewing them. Another factor to be considered is that the PRF measures normal personality variables. The research studies that identified sex offenders of children as having paranoid tendencies were looking at a pathological process; something which the PRF was not constructed to measure.

Sex offenders of children did not score significantly lower than the adult male normative group on the Understanding scale as expected. This is most readily explained by the fact that the items on the Understanding scale are generally concerned with the outside world; with intellectual, theoretical, or analytical thought about ideas and events outside the individual. The sex offenders of children are thought to have little understanding or insight into their own behavior, and their cognitive distortions are most likely to be related to their own thoughts, behavior, and judgment. Therefore, the Understanding scale does not readily measure the type of deficit in understanding usually associated with sex offenders of children. It is more likely to be related to interests and educational variables.

The findings on the Change scale indicated that sex offenders
of children as a group do not differ significantly from the adult male normative group in their interest in new and different experiences, inconsistency, adaptability, flexibility, or interest in change. This scale may not then have much relevance to sex offenders of children as a group, but may be more useful as a prognostic indicator of an individual's openness to change, particularly at the entry level of treatment.

Harmavoidance was expected to reflect a bipolar distribution of sex offenders; however, the observed values fit a theoretical normal distribution and did not differ significantly from the adult male normative group. Those offenders who were expected to cluster low on the Harmavoidance scale may not have a generally reckless approach to life; but rather a specific lack of concern about the consequences of their sexually abusive behaviors. There was one group that scored high on the Harmavoidance scale; however, the group was not sufficiently large to significantly affect the mean score. Those offenders who had been involved in previous sexual offenses against children tended to score high on the Harmavoidance scale. It is unclear, however, if the Harmavoidance needs were related to predisposing need states or to the consequence of having been caught again for sexually abusing children. For this group, the fearfulness and self-protectiveness could be the result of the fact that most of them did not know what the disposition of their cases would be but could expect to be sent to prison as a repeat offender. For the majority of sex offenders of children, however,
this scale does not appear to have much relevance.

The evidence was not strong that the Achievement, Cognitive Structure, Endurance, Order, and Social Recognition scales had much relevance to sex offenders of children as a group; and no significant findings were observed on these scales. Although these scales were not useful at delineating group differences, these motivational variables may have implications for treatment recommendations.

The scales that did reflect significant differences between sex offenders of children and the adult male normative group produced a profile that describes sex offenders of children as a group as low in self-esteem, dependent, helpless, inhibited, passive, inadequate, nonaggressive, needy, self-centered, socially withdrawn, insensitive, nonperceptive, rigid, conforming, and interested in activities that involve children. These are all descriptive terms that have been frequently attributed to this group based on clinical observations and research findings. It must be kept in mind that these findings reflect group mean scores. The individual profiles were extremely variable, and many individual’s scores differed from the group mean. It would be a misuse of these results to attempt to determine if an individual is or is not a sex offender of children based on PRF scores. An individual with a profile similar to the group mean scores cannot be assumed to be a sex offender, nor can it be assumed that an individual is not an offender based on a profile dissimilar to the mean scores. The most judicious use of individual
PRF score profiles is to assess individual needs or motivational characteristics, to examine if observed behaviors may have other underlying motives, and to measure an individual's progress over time. The significant results obtained with the sex offenders of children as a group indicate that this instrument shows promise for usefulness with individual offenders.

Additional Analysis

Analysis of variance was conducted on several offense variables to determine if need profiles differed according to those variables.

Incestuous and Nonincestuous Offenses

Incestuous offenders made up 64% of the sample and nonincestuous offenders 36%. The 6 subjects who committed both incestuous and nonincestuous offenses were included in the nonincestuous group for purposes of analysis. No significant differences were found to exist between the incestuous and nonincestuous offenders on the PRF. This finding further supports those researchers (Abel et al., 1986; Groth, 1978) who have stated that dynamically there is no difference between these two groups.

The incestuous group was further divided into birthparents and stepparents. Birthparents made up 66% and stepparents made up 34% of the incestuous group. Table 2 shows the comparison between the two parental groups on the offense variables.
Table 2  
Comparison of Birthparents to Stepparents on Offense Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Variable</th>
<th>Birthparent n=22 (66%)</th>
<th>Stepparent n=11 (34%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepted full responsibility</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>6 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial responsibility</td>
<td>6 (27%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit offense/project blame</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny any involvement</td>
<td>9 (41%)</td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offenses with children</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types sex crimes</td>
<td>5 (23%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsexual criminal offenses</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td>1 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple victims</td>
<td>10 (45%)</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger victims</td>
<td>17 (71%)</td>
<td>7 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older victims</td>
<td>7 (29%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known force or threats</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td>4 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penetration involved</td>
<td>13 (62%)</td>
<td>7 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical dependency</td>
<td>7 (32%)</td>
<td>3 (27%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings differed from Russells (1984) report in that there was no significant difference between groups in the percentage who committed acts involving penetration or the percentage who used force or the threat of physical harm to gain compliance. The most extreme differences were noted in the extent to which the two groups accepted responsibility for their behavior; the stepparents were...
more likely to accept full responsibility and the birthparents were more likely to deny any involvement. Stepparents and birthparents were observed to differ significantly on only 2 of the PRF scales; stepparents were higher on the Achievement scale at the .01 level of significance and higher on the Harmavoidance scale at the .05 level of significance. The reason for this is unclear, but further examination of this finding with larger sample sizes may clarify if this is a sampling artifact or if this is a reproducible difference between groups.

**Same Sex or Opposite Sex Victim Offences**

In comparing the sex of the victims, 37 (74%) of the sample were known to sexually abuse females only, and 13 (26%) were known to commit offenses against male victims. The 9 subjects who were known to have sexually abused both males and females were counted as same sex offenders. Table 3 illustrates the comparison of groups on the offense variables that have been associated with same sex and opposite sex offenders.
Table 3
Comparison of Same Sex Offenders and Opposite Sex Offenders on Offense Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense variables</th>
<th>Same sex offenders n = 13</th>
<th>Opposite sex Offenders n = 37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous convictions</td>
<td>7 (46%)</td>
<td>6 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abused strangers</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Victims</td>
<td>5 (33%)</td>
<td>19 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Victims</td>
<td>10 (67%)</td>
<td>19 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemically Dependent</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>13 (35%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results support previous research (Cook & Howells, 1981; Mohr et al., 1964) in that a higher percentage of same sex offenders had previous accusations of sex offenses against children and a higher percentage abused strangers. These results differed from previous research in that same sex offenders were not more likely to abuse older victims, and there was no significant difference regarding chemical dependency. The only significant differences between the same sex and opposite sex offenders on the PRF scales were that same sex offenders scored higher on the Order scale, at the .02 level of significance, and higher on the Succorance scale at the .001 level of significance. The higher Order scale score is consistent with Fisher and Howells’s (1970) finding that homosexual offenders scored higher than heterosexual offenders on the Order scale of the EPPS. The high Succorance scale score supports the positions of Mathis...
(1972) and Sgroi (1982) who described same sex offenders as narcissistic and psychosexually immature.

The Role of Aggression

The number of subjects who were known to have used force or the threat of physical harm to gain compliance was 15, or 30% of the sample. They were more likely to have used force with the younger age groups; the highest frequencies occurring in the 2-4 and 5-7 age ranges. Groth and Burgess (1977) stated that the sex force offenders felt stronger and more in charge with their victims, whom they felt the need to overpower. Using force with such young children would not challenge their success at being able to overpower their victims. Younger children are easier to exploit, and the majority of offenders who use force fit Groth and Burgess' category of exploitive assaulters. Those who were known to use force scored lower on the PRF Affiliation scale at the .02 level of significance, lower on the Change scale at the .001 level of significance, and lower on the Sentience scale at the .04 level of significance. They all appeared less concerned about maintaining positive relationships, less open to new experiences, less adaptable, less interested in changing, and less aware of the sensual aspects of their environment. The low Affiliation scale score further supports Groth and Burgess' assertion that sex force offenders are not likely to be interested in a relationship with their victims. The low Affiliation and Change scale scores could
indicate that this group of offenders would be more resistant to treatment; not as much out of defensiveness, but more out of lack of interest. Due to the fact that the PRF was administered early in the contact with the evaluating psychologists, some offenders who used force may have been missed. The three significant scales on the PRF were not scales that were significant on the EPPS study (Fisher & Rivlin, 1972) of rapists. The EPPS study identified high Abasement and Endurance scores and low Autonomy and Aggression scores for rapists. The sex offenders of children who used force or threats had high Abasement scale scores at the .07 level of significance and low Autonomy scale scores at a .059 level of significance. A larger sample size or having the psychologists make the determination of the use of force later in their contact with the offenders would be strategies worth considering to assess if those scales are relevant to this group of offenders.

Criminality: Prior Offenses

The sex offenders of children were examined to see if different profiles emerged for those who were involved in previous sexual offenses with children, other sex offenses, and nonsexual criminal offenses. Twelve subjects had been involved in previous sexual offenses with children. They were found to score higher on the Harmavoidance scale at the .02 level of significance, higher on the Impulsivity scale at the .03 level of significance, and higher on Succorance at the .001 level of significance. It is difficult to
know if the higher Harmavoidance score is a predisposing condition, perhaps related to fear of confronting adult sexual partners, or the consequence of again facing child sexual abuse charges. The combination of high Succorance and Impulsivity scale scores could reflect this subgroup's lack of sufficient impulse control to restrain them from acting out sexually their dependent needs for succor. It was considered that this may represent scores for a subgroup of offenders with a primary orientation toward children; however, those offenders that the evaluating psychologists determined to have such an orientation did not demonstrate any significant difference on the PRF scales when compared to other offenders. This may again be an artifact of the time in the evaluation at which that determination was made or a reflection of how difficult a determination of primary sexual orientation is with an outpatient group.

The 15 offenders who were involved in other types of sex crimes, in addition to child sexual abuse, scored higher on the Cognitive Structure and Order scales, at the .03 and .005 levels of significance respectively. This group, which could be described as paraphiliac, scored in a manner that indicates they are more perfectionistic, orderly, and rigid than other offenders of children.

No significant differences were observed between the 13 sex offenders of children who also were involved in nonsexual criminal offenses and the remainder of the sample.
Chemical Dependency

The evaluating psychologists diagnosed 17, or 34%, of the sex offenders as chemically dependent. This percentage is close to that reported by Groth (1979) and Herman (1981). These offenders were found to have higher scores on the Aggression and Impulsivity scales, at the .05 and .02 levels of significance respectively, and lower scores on the Dominance and Desirability scales, both at the .02 level of significance. This produces a profile of a subgroup of offenders who are hostile, easily angered, and threatening; who do not have the impulse control to restrain urges to inappropriately act on those aggressive needs; and who are not confident enough to handle their hostility in an assertive manner. They are neither in control of themselves nor their environments; thus, they select weaker, even less dominant, victims. The low Dominance scale score may also relate to Herman's (1981) finding that alcohol is sometimes used by the offender to gather the courage to make the sexual advance. Some offenders may attempt to deaden their hostility with alcohol and instead deaden their constraints against acting on their pedophilic sexual urges. The low Desirability scale indicates they are less likely to present themselves in a favorable light.

Level of Responsibility

The level of responsibility assumed for the offenses was divided into the categories of accepted full responsibility, 19
subjects; accepted partial responsibility, 15 subjects; admitted the offense but blamed someone else, 4 subjects; and denied any involvement, 12 subjects. Those that denied any involvement attempted to present themselves in the most favorable light, as evidenced by their high Desirability scale mean scores, that were significant at the .01 level. This may have caused them to endorse items that caused them to appear less impulsive, at the .04 level of significance; and less defensive, when compared to the group who accepted full responsibility, on the Defendence scale, at the .001 level of significance. It is understandable that those who are admitting their sexually abusive behavior may be more defensive and suspicious coming into a psychological evaluation that may have a bearing on the disposition of their legal case. It is not clear how much generalization can be made from the 4 subjects who admitted the offense but blamed someone else, but the analysis of variance produced a significant pattern for them. They were significantly higher on the Cognitive Structure scale (p<.005) and the Order scale (p<.05) and lower on the Play scale (p<.04). This profile describes a rigid, compulsive, concrete kind of person who likes to put things in order and categories, and who sees things in absolutes. This thinking pattern is the type that would allow someone to separate the categories of their actions from their responsibility.

Victim Age

Analysis of variance was conducted to determine if need
profiles were related to the age range of the victims. The victim age was to be reported at the earliest age the sexual abuse was known to have occurred; however, this was not an accurate measure, because in some cases the duration of the sexual abuse was not clear and the victim age reflected the age at disclosure. Twenty-six subjects sexually abused younger children, ages 10 and younger; and 24 subjects sexually abused older children, ages 11-16. Those who abused older children were higher on the Affiliation scale at the .007 level of significance; therefore, affiliative needs are more a factor for those who sexually abuse older children than for those who sexually abuse younger children. This could be the result of older children being more socially advanced and more capable of fulfilling an adult's social needs, or it could reflect the fact that the relationships had occurred over a sufficient length of time for the adult to view it as a friendship. Older victim offenders were also higher on the Social Recognition scale (p<.03), which supports Sgroi's (1982) position that for some offenders, child sexual abuse may be related to issues of recognition and status and Finkelhor's (1979) observation that some offenders feel respected as a result of the sexual abuse of a child. Those who sexually abused younger children were significantly more inhibited, as reflected in lower Exhibition scale scores (p<.04). They were also significantly lower on the Change scale (p<.04). This social withdrawal, fear of new experiences, and lack of adaptability could account for an offender choosing a young child victim who would not be a
threatening partner.

Summary

Just as there were differences between the sex offenders of children as a group and the normative group, differences existed between subgroups of the sex offender sample based on offense variables. These results are a preliminary examination of the subgroup differences, as the sample sizes of the subgroups are insufficient for conclusive generalizations. Future research is necessary to determine if these results are supported when larger sample sizes are used.
Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate to what extent the assumptions of various practitioners about the psychological needs of sex offenders who sexually abuse children are supported when these needs are measured by a standardized objective psychological instrument based on a theory of psychological needs. This question was the result of the preponderant emphasis in the child sexual abuse literature in the role that the psychological needs of the offender play in the etiology of the sexual victimization of children. The postulate that child sexual abuse is the sexualization of nonsexual needs and that the satisfaction of these nonsexual needs is the primary motivation for this behavior has been derived largely from clinical observations and theoretical propositions. There have been few attempts to empirically validate this premise with psychological instruments that are based on a theory of psychological needs.

The results of psychophysiologic studies (Abel et al., 1981; Abel et al., 1986) of sex offenders of children have called for a reconsideration of the role played by sexual orientation and sexual desire in child sexual abuse. Finkelhor (1986) has stated that no
one explanation of child sexual abuse is sufficient to explain why someone would sexually victimize a child and has developed a comprehensive model that includes the concepts of sexual arousal, disinhibition, blockage of normal sexual outlets, and emotional congruence to begin to explain how several factors can come together to cause this behavior. Testing to determine if the psychological needs, with which sex offenders are thought to maladaptively cope by the sexual abuse of children, are upheld on a measure of psychological need states and are found to differ from a randomly selected group was directed at the evaluation of one aspect of the emotional congruence theory.

The psychological instrument used in this study was Form E of the Personality Research Form (PRF-E) (Jackson, 1984), which is based on Murray’s (1938) theory of manifest needs. It was administered to 50 men who were being psychologically evaluated as outpatients by licensed psychologists following accusations that they were responsible for the sexual abuse of a child, aged 16 or younger. To be included in the sample, the accused offenders had to have been 18 or older at the time of the alleged offense, at least 4 years older than their victims, and not been involved in a lengthy adjudication process. They did not need to admit to the offense to be included as a subject. The psychologists, based on their expertise in the assessment of sex offenders and at least one other source of information, determined if the alleged offender had the history, dynamics, and offense characteristics to be considered
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appropriate for a sample of sex offenders of children. In addition to administering the PRF, the psychologists filled out an information form (Appendix C) that contained demographic and offense descriptive information.

The research and clinical literature provided indications of how the sex offender group could be expected to score on the 20 PRF need scales when compared to a randomly selected sample. Null hypotheses were formed for the 20 PRF need state scales based on those predictions. The sex offender group's mean scale scores were compared to those of the PRF adult male normative group (Table 10, PRF Manual (3rd Ed.) (Jackson, 1984).

Significance was determined at the .05 level. Goodness-of-fit tests determined that 19 of the 20 scales fit a theoretical normal distribution. These scales were evaluated with t-test analysis; and the one scale that violated the goodness-of-fit tests, Nurturance, was analyzed by chi-square. The Sakoda, Cohen, and Beall (1954) test determined that the significance of obtaining the number of observed significant values in a series of statistical tests was .05 for the scales that were significant at the .05 level and .001 for the scales that were significant at the .01 level.

The mean scale scores of the sex offenders of children were found to be significantly higher on the Abasement and Succorance scales and significantly lower on the Aggression, Autonomy, Dominance, Exhibition, Play, and Sentience scales than the mean scale scores of the adult male normative group. Significant
differences were also noted on the Nurturance scale. These results indicate that sex offenders of children as a group are low in self-esteem, dependent, passive, withdrawn, inhibited, serious, nonperceptive, out of touch with sensual experiences, and interested in activities that involve the care of children. It is, therefore, concluded that some of the psychological needs commonly attributed to sex offenders of children are upheld on a measure of psychological needs and are found to differ from those of a randomly selected group. For those need states that were not upheld by their measurement on the PRF, the following possibilities exist. Because need states are inferred from observable behaviors, some behaviors may reflect a compensation for other quite different underlying need states, and other need states may simply be misidentified; for example, the high affiliation needs attributed to sex offenders of children may actually be high dependency and succorance needs. The PRF items used to assess the existence of certain needs may not sample the aspects of those needs that are most relevant to sex offenders of children. Other needs identified with sex offenders of children may result from a pathological process, something that would not be detected on the PRF's measure of a continuum of normal need states. The distortion possible in a self-report measure must also be considered.

It was not the purpose of this study to debate the issues of whether a theory of secondary needs, such as the one measured by the PRF, is philosophically or psychologically correct; but rather, to
determine if the use of such concepts could be determined to be relevant to sex offenders of children. It was also not the purpose of this study to argue the question of whether psychological needs can be measured by standardized objective psychological instruments, but rather, would such an instrument uphold the common assumptions about psychological needs of sex offenders of children when applied to such a sample. The results of this study indicate that, to a considerable degree, the common assumptions about the psychological needs of sex offenders of children are upheld by their measure on the PRF and that the PRF holds promise for relevant use with sex offenders of children.

An additional analysis was conducted to determine if need profiles differed between subgroups of the sex offender sample based on the offense variables described on the information form (Appendix C). Analysis of variance was used to compare the subgroups. No differences were found between incestuous and nonincestuous offenders; and offenders identified as having a primary sexual orientation toward children or those with a known precipitating stress did not differ from the other offenders. Significant differences were noted on at least two scales for each of the other offense variable characteristics. These findings are considered preliminary, because the number of subjects in each subgroup is not sufficient from which to make broad generalizations.
Recommendations

This study was directed toward the support or challenge of clinical observations and theoretical propositions regarding a group of individuals, sex offenders of children. The analysis compared group means and the results reflect how those mean scores compare to the normative group's mean scores. Individual offender profiles demonstrated considerable variability. The group mean results should never be used to determine if a particular individual is or is not a sex offender of children. Obtaining a similar profile to the offender group no more proves that a person is a sex offender than does obtaining a dissimilar profile proves a person is not. This author believes that the all too frequent appearance in psychological reports of statements regarding the capability of an individual to be a sex offender based upon test scores compared to mean score research is incompetent and damaging to the client and the profession.

The fact that the PRF does demonstrate group differences indicates that it does have relevance to this group of individuals; however, the appropriate use of the PRF is to look at the individual's need profile, to determine if the observable behaviors may be compensations for other underlying needs, to use in the development of treatment strategies, and to assess an individual's progress over time. The PRF can be used to plan one specific aspect of a comprehensive treatment plan that must encompass a wide range
of factors in the psychosocial and psychosexual lives of sex offenders of children.

The fact that the group profile described sex offenders of children as passive, dependent, nonaggressive, serious, nonsensual, inhibited, and needy should not be taken to assume that these seemingly harmless characteristics indicate that these individuals are not a threat to children. It is these same characteristics that prevent sex offenders of children from feeling competent and assertive enough to participate in appropriate peer relationships and from developing effective strategies with which to handle their negative emotions and urges. It would be a mistake for parents, mental health workers, criminal justice personnel, and child protective workers to think that someone who has been caught victimizing a child once will not do it again because of their passive, dependent nature and embarrassment at being caught. Quite the opposite is likely to be the case. Until the offenders learn how to meet their needs in appropriate ways, develop assertiveness skills, are able to perceive others accurately, understand the impact of the offending behavior on others, unmask their own denial and cognitive distortions, find pleasure in other aspects of their lives, and have skills to cope with the pressures they feel, they remain at risk for reoffending.

Future research is needed to more fully understand how the psychological needs of sex offenders come together with other factors in the etiology of child sexual abuse. In this study, there
was an attempt to eliminate sample bias by selecting subjects who were beginning their contact with the criminal justice and mental health systems. This controlled out, however, a number of subjects. Since sex offenders of children do not usually readily enter treatment or seek psychological evaluation, it is often far into the adjudication process when such evaluations take place. It would be worthwhile to use the PRF with a larger group of offenders who have already been adjudicated to determine how that group profile compares to these results. Future research with a larger, more diverse sample may alter the results of this study. A better regional distribution would have also improved this study.

Factor analysis and cluster analysis with the PRF results of sex offenders of children are future research endeavors that may further add to the understanding of how different need profiles play a part in the sexual abuse of children. More research is needed conducting analysis of variance on subgroups of sex offenders of children based on offense characteristics with larger samples to test if the results observed in this study between subgroups are supported.

Research should also be directed toward comparing the need profiles of sex offenders of children with other types of groups, such as adult survivors of child sexual abuse who have not been known to sexually abuse children or who do not demonstrate paedophilic arousal patterns, to more clearly define if this group is unique from other related groups.
Understanding the dynamics of sex offenders of children and how they relate to effective treatment is a relatively new and rapidly evolving specialization. What is known is that their treatment needs differ considerably from other populations, and therapists who are going to treat offenders must be knowledgeable of those differences. Therapists must be committed to staying current on the new developments in this field and realize that the decision to treat offenders is a responsibility that goes beyond the individual client.

A discussion of sex offenders of children is not complete without a consideration of their victims. It should not be assumed that because many offenders are passive, inadequate, dependent, and needy that their victims were approached from such a posture. One reason children are selected is that the offenders can dominate them in ways that they would not feel confident enough to approach an adult. For most child victims, it is not going to make a difference whether their abuser was compensating for being inadequate or acting out a dominant need. It is hoped, however, that survivors of child sexual abuse can realize from the group profile of sex offenders of children that they were not victimized because of a flaw in their personal worth; but rather, because of the needs of the offender.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

The Personality Research Form Profile Sheet
Appendix B

Client Information Form
SUBJECT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Estimated Income (in thousands)  Race
0-10  11-20  21-30  31-40  41-50  50+

Single  Married  Cohabitating  Widowed  Divorced

Was the subject ever previously accused of sex offenses with children? Yes  No
Was the subject ever involved in other types of sex crimes? Yes  No
Was the subject ever involved in nonsexual criminal offenses? Yes  No

Did the subject: accept full responsibility for offense  accept partial responsibility for it  admit offense but blame someone else  deny any involvement

Was there more than one victim? Yes  No
Did the subject know the victim(s)? Yes  No

Was the offense incestuous nonincestuous both

If incestuous, was it parental? Yes  No

a. birthparent  b. stepparent

sibling? Yes  No
extended family? Yes  No

Age(s) of known victim(s)
Birth-23mo.  2-4  5-7  8-10  11-13  14-16

Wore the victim(s) Male  Female  Both

Was physical force or the threat of physical harm to the victim or someone close to the victim ever used to gain compliance? Yes  No  Unknown

Did penetration occur? Yes  Vaginal  Anal  Oral  No

Does the offender have a primary sexual orientation towards children that has been in existence since adolescence? Yes  No  Unknown

Was there any identifiable precipitating stress prior to the offense? Yes  No

Is the offender chemically dependent? Yes  No  Unknown

Sources of information from which details of the offense were gained. Offender report  Victim Statement  Official Reports (police, protective services, etc.)
Appendix C

Release/Consent Form
CONSENT/RELEASE FORM

Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
(616) 383-1975

I, ____________________________, give my consent to

I, give my consent to release to Shirley Anne Miller of Western Michigan University my completed answer sheet to the Personality Research Form for the purpose of a research study examining the needs of those who have been accused of sexual misconduct with a child.

To enable the researcher to evaluate if needs vary according to the types of incidents with which one is accused, I also authorize

I further authorize the release of the following information:

- Information on the subject information form checklist, which includes demographic data, such as age, marital status, education level & estimated income, as well as, general offense characteristics. A copy of the checklist will be provided to me if I desire. No other information from my psychological evaluation or background information will be released.

- I understand that at all times my anonymity and confidentiality will be protected and that at no time will my identification be disclosed.

- I understand that by signing this consent I am only agreeing to allow my test scores and checklist information to be used in a research study and that this is in no way related to my statement of my guilt or innocence of the allegations against me.

- I understand that I may have a copy of this consent form if I desire; however, no other copy of this document will be made. This document will remain in my file at __________________ office at all times. The researcher will possess no material upon which my name appears.

Participant's signature ____________________________ Date of birth ____________________________

Witness ____________________________ Date ____________________________
Appendix D

Human Subjects Committee Approval
TO: Shirley Anne Miller  
FROM: Ellen Page-Robin, Chair  
RE: Research Protocol  
DATE: May 13, 1988

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "The psychological needs of sex offenders who victimize children" is now complete and has been signed off by the HSIRB.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 387-2647.
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