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ABSTRACT

In recent years there has been an increase in reported crime in New Zealand, and also an increase in public concern about the levels of crime, particularly violent and sexual crimes. The justice system, while imposing more severe penalties for some crimes, is particularly interested in instituting and expanding rehabilitative and social interventions. In that context, a fuller understanding of the causes of crime, and hence the identification of appropriate strategies to reduce crime and recidivism, is imperative.

The present research investigated the causal attributions offered by male prison inmates for their offending, and also their causal attributions for their sexual arousal and sexual behaviour. In addition, prison inmates' own perceptions of their personal characteristics and life experiences, and how these cognitions contributed to the initiation of their criminal offending was also studied.

Prison inmates who had been convicted of an offence in one of four crime categories were selected from seven prisons in New Zealand. The types of offence studied were child sex offences (children under 16 years), rape (unlawful sexual connection), offences against property, and violent offences against persons. Only offenders' own reasons for their current convictions were assessed, and the focus of this study was the child sex offenders, and their responses were analysed in comparison with those of the three other offender groups.

In semi-structured clinical interviews, specially developed instruments (Offence and Sexual Arousal Questionnaires) were administered. The offenders categorised into attributional dimensions both the causes of their offending behaviour, and the causes of their sexual arousal, and of their sexual behaviour. An Individual Response Inventory which included Social Desirability, Sexual Repression, and Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour scales was administered.
A survey of inmates’ basic sexual knowledge was also carried out by questionnaire. This scale assessed the offender’s knowledge of their own sexuality, and also of female sexuality.

Results presented in this study endorse the importance of individual assessments of offenders in order to identify their causal attributions, and thereby the motivation behind their offending. This study provides support for the view that researchers do not necessarily perceive causes as varying along the same dimensions as the person offering the causes, and this may lead to researchers making misleading interpretations of offenders’ cognitions.

Child sex offenders were differentiated from the other groups by the causes they offered, and the dimensions to which they attributed both their offence behaviour and their sexual arousal. Child sex offenders attributed causes for both their offending and their sexual arousal to internal, stable, and uncontrollable dimensions. Rapists and property offenders attributed their offending behaviour to external, unstable, controllable dimensions, and violent offenders to internal, stable, and uncontrollable dimensions. In contrast to child sex offenders, the other three groups all attributed their sexual arousal and sexual behaviour to external, unstable, and controllable dimensions. Child sex offenders scored lower on the Basic Sexual Knowledge scale, repressed their sexuality more, and reported different sexual fantasies from the other offender groups. Emotional issues featured prominently for all offender groups as causes of their offending. Many offenders in the child sex and violent offender groups viewed these causes as being personal problems, and the offending appeared to be a way of temporarily resolving the problem. In contrast, property offenders and rapists saw their offending as a way of obtaining a pleasurable emotional experience.

Child sex offenders frequently viewed internal urges and forces, or children’s immature bodies, as the causes of their sexual arousal. This contrasted with all other offender groups’ causal attributions.
The findings were discussed in terms of their implications in intervention programmes. The results support a new dimension to psychological intervention with criminal offenders, and demonstrate the importance of assessing and addressing offender's own attributions as part of their rehabilitation programmes.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally the criminal justice system has dealt with criminals by isolating them from society with a period of imprisonment, thereby protecting society, and providing a degree of retribution. The prevailing belief was that the period spent within a penal institution would serve as punishment for the offence, be a deterrent to others, and this in turn would reduce the crime rate. It was also believed that the period spent in prison would somehow rehabilitate the inmates, and that on release they would be responsible members of the community (Prisons in Change, 1988).

Before 1854 serious criminal offenders in New Zealand were transported to Tasmania, Australia. After 1854, when all offenders served their sentences in New Zealand, any attempts to introduce rehabilitative programmes into prisons were viewed unfavourably. This attitude persisted for some time in spite of the efforts of some Justice officials. In 1880 Captain Arthur Hume was appointed Inspector of Prisons for the Colony. He endorsed the use of the birch, and in 1889 in a report to Parliament, he stated that the main object of imprisonment was to punish. On the other hand, during his 28 years in office he did introduce uniformity of treatment, and consistency in rules, regulations, punishments, and privileges. However, his ideas concerning reforms received much opposition, and there was little concern for any individual treatment for prison inmates. In 1909 the Liberal Minister of Justice, Sir James Findlay, proposed a strong rehabilitative emphasis in prison programmes by way of enforced physical and intellectual hard work in an effort to restore self-respect to inmates, but again the changes were not implemented (Prison Review, 1989).
The Criminal Justice Act 1954 introduced a range of sentences to deal with different types of offenders. The espoused philosophy was that by varying the length of sentence according to the crime, it may be possible to deter reoffending. If criminals did reoffend they were to be given long sentences. For example, preventive detention, an indeterminate sentence for repeat sex offenders was introduced. The inefficiency of prison sentences and borstal sentences as a deterrent to further offending was highlighted when it was shown that 70% of inmates released from borstals in 1957 reoffended within 5 years (Prison Review, 1989).

At this time, the belief that imprisonment itself would both rehabilitate and deter continued to be questioned. Partly in recognition of the failure of imprisonment to rehabilitate, in 1955 psychologists, chaplains, and a medical service were introduced into prisons.

In New Zealand during the 1980s, in line with the 1981 Penal Policy Review Committee recommendations, there has been interest in fostering greater community involvement in prison programmes for the reintegration of inmates into society (Department of Justice, 1982). Many of the rehabilitation programmes introduced into prisons have concentrated on attempting to change the behaviour of the inmates, and provide education opportunities, for example attendance at Polytechnic Institutes and Universities.

In spite of the large number and variety of programmes developed, there is no evidence to suggest they have had a significant impact on the reduction of crime or recidivism. Lovell and Norris, (1990) conservatively estimated that one in four of all New Zealand males appear in court for offending, and that they would have a judgement against them at least once before the age of 24 years. Furthermore, the number of prior offences rather than the sentence imposed appeared to have the strongest effect on the likelihood of them reappearing in court. Crime levels continue to rise and the community is either demanding
heavier penalties or more effective rehabilitation (New Zealand Herald, February 6, 1992).

The New Zealand Police statistics for the year ending December 31, 1990 showed that when compared to 1989, investigated murders increased by 9.8%, reported violent crimes by 2.9%, robberies 6.6%, burglaries 10.6%, theft 8.1%, sexual offences 8.2%, and sexual attacks 16.6% (C. Durville, personal communication, May 7, 1991). Since 1990 crime has continued to increase, and the most recent New Zealand Police statistics for the 12 months ending June 30, 1991 show that during that period crimes reported in New Zealand rose 6.2%. The crime rise included an increase in sexual attacks of 20.1%, grievous assaults 25.6%, and robberies 20.9% (C. Durville, personal communication, October 17, 1991). Furthermore, Spier, Southey, and Norris (1991) reported that the number of convictions for sex offences (other than rape) increased by 114% from 1981 to 1990, and there was an overall increase of 95% in the number of convictions for rape.

In the past few years the number of persons in New Zealand prisons has increased from a total of 4720 in 1980, to a total of 6182 in 1990. Furthermore, "the average population in prison establishments in New Zealand in 1990 was 3905, a rise of 9 percent over 1989, continuing the upward trend since 1986" (Department of Justice, 1991a, p. 143).

The Department of Justice Statistics of prison inmates in 1990 (the most recent available), showed that of the 6182 prisoners received under sentence, 204 (3.3%) were found guilty of child sex offences, 191 (3.1%) of sexual violation (adult), 1852 (30.0%) of property offences, 1227 (19.8%) of violent offences against the person, 489 (7.9%) of drug offences, 1127 (18.2%) of traffic offences, 975 (15.8%) for offences against national interest, Justice administration, or good order, and 117 (1.9%) for other "unknown" offences (Department of Justice, 1991a). Clearly, a wide range of crimes continue to be
committed, and the country's prisons contain persons of diverse criminal backgrounds.

In recent years as the number of crimes committed in New Zealand increased, the number of persons receiving prison sentences increased, and this criminal offending has received a greater amount of media attention. Television and newspapers frequently report crime, and attempt to analyse the causes, and consequences of those crimes. In some cities, newspapers (for example, The Tribune, Palmerston North) carry weekly reports of property offences, such as burglaries, pinpointing where in the city each offence occurred. The causes of violent and sexual offending, and methods of reducing crime, have been debated throughout the New Zealand media. Both members of the public, and professionals have offered their views of the causes of offending. These views have ranged from the effects of adverse environmental conditions (for example unemployment), to a loss of Christian values. While some public debate has been aimed at identifying the causes of crime, others have called for increased punishment for offenders. Newspaper polls have shown that a majority of those polled, favoured the return of capital punishment for murder, and more severe penalties for other crimes (New Zealand Herald, February 6, 1992).

There is a growing concern by citizens about the prevalence of criminal acts against the person such as violence and sexual abuse, and also the theft and destruction of property. This is demonstrated by the large number of people contributing to radio talk-back shows, writing to newspapers and marching to Parliament with petitions pertaining to crime. This concern is also held by Department of Justice staff, and is reflected in the Mission Statement of the division of Psychological Services. This statement includes in its objectives the need to promote "order and safety in society", and to reduce "the likelihood of reoffending" (Department of Justice, 1991b, p. 48). Psychologists attempt to address these objectives by providing education, training and advice to relevant groups, by conducting research, and by providing psychological therapy for offenders.
Criminal justice professionals have attempted to identify reasons for different types of offending. Research investigating crime has offered diverse causes, for example, drugs, alcohol, heredity, psychological trauma, poverty, lack of education, biochemical factors, and abnormal cortical activity (Morris & Braukmann, 1987). However, it is likely that offending results from a complex interplay of a diversity of causes. The focus in previous studies was often on individual offender groups, and efforts were made to identify specific characteristics that could lead to appropriate preventative strategies. However, to date there has been little research on the reasons offered by offenders as to why they commit crime.

Research has indicated that a person's attributions, and their cognitions (what they tell themselves), influences how they will act (Weiner, 1986). Practising psychologists recognise the important role cognitions play in behavioural outcome, and address cognitions during therapeutic interventions to change behaviour (Ellis, 1975; Meichenbaum, 1977; Novaco, 1978; McKay & Fanning, 1991). The object of the present study was to identify the reasons for offending, by systematically investigating four different groups of prison inmates, focusing on their cognitions relating to their offending. The four groups comprised, those convicted of child sex offences (children under 16 years), rape (unlawful sexual connection), property offences, and violent offences against the person. Only the offenders' own reasons for their current offending were assessed, and the focus of this study was the child sex offenders. The four offender groups selected for this study were chosen because of their high public profile. Property and violent offences dominate the crime statistics (Department of Justice, 1991a), and the community has expressed particular concern about sexual and violent crimes, both of which are increasing at a high rate (C. Durville, personal communication, October 17, 1991; Spier, Southey & Norris, 1991).

The child sex offenders' responses were analysed in comparison with those of the other three offender groups. The four groups of prison inmates under
investigation in this study were assessed individually, and given the opportunity to discuss their own views and beliefs associated with their criminal activities. Two of the offender groups' crimes involved sexual violation, and to enable comparison across groups all offenders were encouraged to discuss their sexuality and their own perceptions concerning their sexual behaviour.

**Sex Offenders and Recidivism**

While the majority of inmates in prison are not sexual offenders, it has been reported that sexual offenders commit many more sex offences than they are arrested for, and a significant percentage of sexual crimes are not reported (Abel, Becker, Mittelman, Cunningham-Rathner, Rouleau and Murphy, 1987; Groth, Longo & McFadin, 1982). Therefore, the number of men in prison for committing sexual offences is unlikely to be a true representation of the number of men committing sex crimes.

Researchers also report that sexual offenders commit a large number of sexual offences and do not always confine themselves to only one category of sexual offending, or to victims of one sex (Abel, 1988; Marshall & Barbaree, 1988; Marshall, Laws & Barbaree, 1990). In addition, Shapcott (1988) quoted New Zealand surveys showing that only 23% of raped women had reported their attack, and the authorities had only been notified of 13% of incidents of child sexual abuse. This would again indicate that the number of men in prison for sexual offending is likely to be low compared to the number of people who are sexually offended against.

At present there is no clear picture of how many men who have served prison sentences or who have completed treatment programmes reoffend, as there is a lack of research accurately measuring recidivism (Furby, Weinrott & Blackshaw, 1989; Tracy, Donnelly, Morgenbesser & MacDonald, 1983). Thus, while research reports that recidivism is high among sex offenders the number of men who reoffend but are not reported and convicted is unknown. Currently
psychologists in Psychological Services of the Department of Justice in New Zealand are conducting a five year study on the recidivism of all offender groups.

As noted earlier, in recent years there have been trends to develop new strategies to deal with criminal offenders, and alongside the Court’s sentence of imprisonment, Department of Justice psychologists are developing and offering therapy intended to reduce recidivism. This therapy is conducted both individually, and in groups, such as anger management groups (Department of Justice, 1989), and sex offender treatment programmes (Marshall, Johnson, Ward, Jones & Hudson, 1991). Research in the area of criminal offending should contribute to future developments in treatment strategies aimed at reducing offending.

**Attribution Model**

Clinical criminologists such as West (1985) have made it clear that progress in understanding criminal behaviour, and in developing methods for dealing with crime will only occur if inmates undergo individual psychological evaluation. With this emphasis on individual assessment, a personalised strategy to address offending would then be developed. Thus, in the prison environment treatment and rehabilitation programmes based on a sound understanding of offenders’ beliefs, attributions, motivation, and the predisposing factors surrounding their crimes would appear to offer a possible solution to recidivism.

With respect to attributions, it would appear from a number of studies that they are clearly linked to expectancy outcome, affect, and action (Weiner, 1986). Therefore, research addressing offenders’ own attributions relating to the causes of their offences, and the attributions of child sex offenders concerning the cognitions that contribute to their sexual arousal is an area of vital importance when developing treatment programmes. According to attribution theory, causal attributions not only affect whether a person desires something, they also have an impact on the person’s expectations of obtaining the object
or goal. Thus, they largely determine whether a person exhibits the behaviour required to obtain the object or goal. Knowing the linkages between attributions, expectancies, desires, and further attributions will contribute to an insight of those who sexually offend against children, and those who do not.

Because self attributions are linked to emotions and behaviour, it is important to identify offenders' attributions when considering their placement in treatment programmes. This is especially important for child sex offenders as it has been well documented that these inmates tend to deny or minimise their offences, externalise responsibility, and see treatment as unnecessary or not appropriate to their needs (Alford & Kasper, 1987; Hucker, Langevin, Bain, & Handy, 1987; Knopp, 1986; Marshall & Eccles, 1991; Quinsey, 1986; Rogers, 1988; Salter, 1988).

Many treatment methods have been developed to assist child sex offenders in gaining control over their behaviour (Abel, Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, Rouleau, Kaplan & Reich, 1984; Knopp, 1986; Marshall & Barbaree 1988; Quinsey, 1986; Quinsey, Chaplin, Maguire & Upfold, 1987; Salter, 1988). These psychological treatment programmes require active participation on the part of the offender. Viewed from an attributional perspective, it is desirable that only those offenders who view their deviant sexual behaviour as being internally determined, under their control, and unstable join such child sex offender treatment programmes. As a prerequisite to joining these treatment programmes, it will be necessary for some offenders to participate in an attribution retraining programme, in order to modify their beliefs regarding the assignment of causes to attributional dimensions. A cessation in offending requires the offender's continued belief that their behaviour is internally determined, that they can control their behaviour in all situations, and that their new nondeviant sexual behaviour will be stable over time (Laws, 1981; Saylor, 1981; Wolfe, 1981). Thus, while treatment programmes rely on an outcome which results in the offender taking responsibility for their own non deviant sexual behaviour and controlling it in a stable manner over time
(internal/controllable/stable), there have been no definitive studies to show that offenders actually hold these necessary perceptions of their own behaviour. Behaviour changes observed in treatment programmes in prison may be of limited value, if offenders’ attributions are not addressed. It is proposed that only by working with offenders’ attributions for their behaviour, will their changed behaviour generalise to situations outside the prison.

Another practical problem that has been identified is that of client compliance with treatment programmes. Meichenbaum and Turk (1987) noted that people in treatment in North American health centres rarely comply with, adhere to, or otherwise follow the advice they are offered. They quote an average of 40% - 70% of people not adhering to treatment. Similarly in New Zealand, Psychological Services Department of Justice figures for the 1990-1991 year showed a 51% drop out rate of offenders attending psychological interventions in prisons and a 63% drop out rate of offenders attending psychological interventions in the community (McDowall, 1992). A view held by a number of professionals is that nonadherent behaviour results from an 'attitude' problem on the part of the client. It has been shown that attitude and behaviour change is related to an individual’s assessment and attributions concerning whether they attribute change to themselves (internal) or to other influences (external) (Bem, 1967; Brehm, 1966; Kelley, 1967; Weiner, 1986). Internal attributions for change result in greater attitude and behavioural change. Thus, according to Winett (1970), if the development of new attitudes and behaviours is required, then individuals must be encouraged to see that they can make these changes themselves (internal). Foon (1986) noted that attributions contributed to clients’ expectations of the outcome of their therapy, and it was found that clients’ favourable expectations for therapy were increased when the clients’ locus of causality and locus of control matched those of the therapist. West (1980) suggested that more discrimination in identifying the varying treatment needs of offenders was required. He considered that the lack of a combination of sound evaluation and good treatment programmes was an important reason for the apparent failure of penal treatments.
Russell (1982) cautioned against researchers themselves placing respondents’ causes into causal dimensions. He considered that this practice may result in “fundamental attribution researcher error” (p. 1137). Weiner (1986) found that an overriding flaw in a number of empirical research studies has been a failure to conceptualise the situation as perceived by the respondent. Weiner (1986) also considered that a person’s subjective causality of an event was more important in determining subsequent behaviour than actual causality. The attributional dimension framework utilised in the present research allowed the offenders’ subjective perceptions of causality to be classified without the researcher imposing her own a priori attribution scheme. It also enabled the researcher to compare and contrast causes within and across situations and topics.

It is apparent that offenders’ causal attributions may contribute to criminal offending behaviour, and may influence the outcome of offender treatment programmes. To provide evidence for this view, in the present study, child sex offenders, rapists, property offenders, and violent offenders’ attributions with regards to the causes of their offending were investigated. Furthermore, because of the sexual nature of some of the crimes, the offenders’ attributions related to their sexual arousal and sexual behaviour were psychologically assessed, and compared. This information was obtained by way of a semi-structured clinical interview which allowed offenders to offer what they considered to be the causes of both their offending behaviour, and their sexual arousal and sexual behaviour. The format of the interview included structured questionnaires in which the offenders categorised into attributional dimensions both the causes of their offending behaviour, and the causes of their sexual arousal and sexual behaviour. Thus both their individually perceived causes for their behaviour, and the causal dimensions they associated with their behaviour were identified.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

In recent years crime in New Zealand has increased, and the criminal justice system has responded by sentencing more people to imprisonment. This high level of imprisonment has resulted in New Zealand having one of the highest rates of imprisonment in the western world (Norris & MacPherson, 1990). However, it appears that a period of imprisonment has not acted as a deterrent to offending, as is evidenced by the continuing increase in property, sexual, and violent crimes. The introduction of treatment and rehabilitation programmes in New Zealand prisons has given inmates the opportunity to increase their education, to gain skills, and to address their offending. With respect to this study, it is noteworthy that to date there is little evidence that these programmes are reducing recidivism in the area of child sex offending.

In the past, treatment programmes have failed to take into account the causal attributions of criminal offenders. Research from a number of areas has established a link between causal attributions, and behavioural outcome. Similar evidence is lacking in the area of criminal offending. Logically it may be expected that a number of cognitive processes, particularly causal attributions, may be of importance when addressing criminal offending. Consequently, this present study represents an attempt to describe some of the salient cognitive processes, particularly causal attributions for offending, sexual arousal and sexual behaviour, as they relate to child sex offenders, and in comparison with three other categories of criminal offender. Such an analysis should provide a basis for the clinical interventions designed to reduce child sex offending.

In order to clarify some of the issues of the present study, the following account will systematically review recent research related to a number of areas. First, the
attributional model of behaviour will be examined. Secondly each of the four categories of offender groups will be addressed and methods that have been used to assess and identify each group will be examined. Finally, sexual arousal and associated issues will be discussed.

ATTRIBUTIONAL MODEL

Heider (1958) was the first of a number of attribution theorists to formulate and make explicit the rules people use in attempting to infer the causes of behaviour and events. His ideas were the cornerstone for the various causal dimensions elaborated by later theorists. He identified three causal dimensions: locus of causality, stability, and intention. Locus of causality refers to whether a cause is seen as originating from outside the person (external), or within the person (internal). The second dimension stability relates to whether causes vary over time, or whether they are relatively stable. Heider saw the third dimension of intention as a central factor in person causality. Intentional causes were believed to be under the conscious control of the person, whereas unintentional causes were those over which a person had no conscious control.

Following from the work of Heider, Weiner (1972) investigated in the education context ways in which school students differ in their beliefs about the causes of their successes and failures. He initially postulated a two dimensional scheme which classified causal attributions into locus of causality and stability. Rosenbaum (1972), Elig and Frieze (1975), and Frieze (1981) elaborated on Weiner's model by incorporating Heider's dimension of "intention" into a three dimensional model for classifying causal attributions. Weiner (1974, 1976) initially accepted this intentionality dimension, but later (1986) he proposed that intent cannot be considered as a dimension of causality as causes cannot be intentional. Intent describes an action, its anticipated consequences, or the state of a person. Therefore, intent does not appear to be characteristic of a
cause. Weiner (1986) proposed that the intentionality dimension should be more appropriately labelled controllability (controllable-uncontrollable).

In his 1986 book, Weiner proposed the three dimensions of causality namely, locus, stability, and controllability. He contended that these perceived causes not only influence future expectations but they also affect (and it is likely they are affected by) emotional experiences. Expectancies and affect in turn are presumed to guide behaviour. Weiner (1985; 1986) reviewed a large number of studies, examined the sets of dimensions identified by the researchers including intentionality and globality, and stated that "a few basic dimensions underlie the organization of (causal) explanations in all motivational domains" (Weiner, 1986, p. 44). He concluded that the three basic dimensions are locus, stability, and controllability. These three dimensions were used in the present study for analysing offender's attributions.

Weiner (1986) went on to formulate an attribution theory of motivation and emotion which included bidirectional linkages. His theory consists of linkages starting when a person experiences an outcome which they perceive as either positive or negative. Affect, and causal antecedents then contribute to the causal ascriptions which result, and while causal ascriptions may be categorized according to dimensions, affective consequences are also evident. These in turn are related to the behavioural consequences or actions which the person exhibits. Consequently, Weiner (1986) demonstrated that a number of emotional experiences are linked to attributional dimensions. For example, he associated pride and self esteem with the locus of causality, hope and fear with stability, and pity with the controllability dimension. Causes simultaneously ascribed to different dimensions resulted in a variety of emotions such as anger, guilt, and shame. Weiner's model provides a framework for developing an attributional theory of criminal behaviour (Figure 1).

Earlier attribution researchers (Weiner, 1980) focused on the causes of behaviour, and classified these causes into dimensions. More recently, it has
been emphasised that there may be variation across people in the meaning of causal attributions (Krantz & Rude, 1984; Russell, McAuley & Tarico, 1987; Weiner, 1983). For example, child sex offenders may see the cause of their offending as being their sexual interest in the child involved. However, one offender may perceive this cause as being under his control and only temporary, that is controllable/unstable, while another may consider it to be uncontrollable and unvarying over time, that is uncontrollable/stable. Therefore, it is not only important to know the cause of criminal offending as perceived by the offender, but more important is his assignment of dimensional meaning to the causes. An examination of both causes and dimensions (reported by the offender) may provide information about offending attributional processes that would not be obtained from an analysis of the causes alone.

The application of Weiner's 1986 attribution theory to child sex offenders is an area where there is a dearth of information and a recent Dialog search from the Child Abuse and Neglect, and Psycinfo databases (1990,) did not reveal a single study. However evidence from other areas of research shows that self attributed causes of behaviour have an important influence on future behaviour (Antaki & Brewin, 1982; Brewin, 1989; McClelland, Koestner & Weinberger, 1989; Weiner, 1985; 1986). Furthermore, attributions have been shown as spontaneous exploratory activities that take place subsequent to an unexpected event, and not just processes elicited by research procedures (Weiner, 1985).

Prominent in attribution research have been studies which applied attribution theory and an attribution framework to the study of achievement-related activities (Chapman & Lawes, 1984; Chapman & Lawes, 1987; Lawes, 1983). Other attribution research has studied a wide variety of topics relating self-attributions to emotions and behaviour. Topics have included, for example, attempting to give up cigarette smoking (Eiser, 1982; Marlatt, 1985), susceptibility to heart trouble (King, 1983), propensity for regressed child sex molesters to reoffend (McCaffrey, 1987), long term effects of childhood abuse (Gold, 1986), self blaming in rape victims (Janoff & Bulman, 1979), patients with
Figure 1: Attributional theory of motivation and emotion applied to criminal offending
(Adapted from Weiner, p240, 1986)

While there is an absence of published research on causal attributions being important determinants of criminal behaviour, in other fields it is clear that self attributions do have an important influence on future behaviour. A number of the above studies have found that causal attributions are clearly related to behaviour, and others have shown a relationship between attributional style and psychological well being. Guided by these attributional approaches to other behaviours in a diversity of areas, it was considered that there was an important need to conduct attributionally based analyses of the behaviour of criminal offenders.
OFFENDER GROUPS

Past research has attempted to identify characteristics associated with different types of offending. Examples of these studies will be reviewed with particular reference to personality, demographic variables, IQ level, alcohol intake, physiological assessment, and cognitions (statements an individual makes to themselves).

CHILD SEX OFFENDERS

The research literature shows that a number of studies have examined child sex offender’s personality characteristics (Burgess, 1985; Erickson, Luxenberg, Walbek, & Seely, 1987; Groth, 1978; 1983; Hall, 1989b; Hall, Maiuro, Vitaliano & Proctor, 1986; Knopp, 1986; Langevin, 1988; Lanyon, 1986; Loss & Ross, 1982; McCreary, 1975; Quinsey, 1986; Walters, 1987). However, there are no consistent findings, and researchers tend to agree that the heterogeneity of profiles preclude any precise generalizations about the personality characteristics of child sex offenders.

Other researchers have examined demographic characteristics (Abel, Becker, Mittelman, Cunningham-Rathner, Rouleau & Murphy, 1987; Zamble & Porporino, 1988) and their results suggest child sex offenders represent a cross-section of society. Hall (1989b) identified no relationship between sexual offending and the offenders’ IQ levels.

A number of investigators have considered that alcohol played a role in child sex molestation (Araji & Finkelhor, 1985; Knight, Rosenberg & Sneider, 1985; Langevin, Handy, Day & Russon, 1985; Strand, 1986), but other studies have found no evidence of alcohol as a causal variable (Groth, Hobson & Gary, 1982; Lanyon, 1986; Parker & Parker, 1986; Williams & Finkelhor, 1990). Marshall (1989b) commented that while alcohol consumption may contribute to
offending it does not appear to be a major contributing factor to child sex molestation.

In studies with child sex offenders, physiological assessment methods have often been utilised. For example, physiological assessment using a penile plethysmograph to detect deviant sexual arousal has been investigated. The majority of these studies show that child sex offenders react to children with penile tumescence more strongly than men who have not been convicted of sex offences, but their reactions are more variable (Langevin, 1985; Marshall, Barbaree & Butt, 1988; Quinsey, Chaplin & Upfold, 1984; Quinsey, Steinman, Bergersen & Holmes, 1975). In such studies some researchers have, after examination of their data excluded large numbers from their sample of offenders prior to statistical interpretation because they failed to display sufficient arousal (Marshall, Barbaree & Christophe, 1986; Abel, Becker, Murphy & Flanagan, 1981; Avery-Clark & Laws, 1984). It has also been noted that a large number of men who persistently engage in sexual offending do not display deviant arousal during plethysmograph assessments (Marshall & Eccles, 1991).

Freund and Blanchard (1989) found that 25% of their subjects were not diagnosed by a phallometric measure, or alternatively the information had already been obtained verbally. Other researchers (Freund, Watson & Rienzo, 1988) have shown that many subjects can influence the outcome of the phallometric test by fantasising about stimuli and deliberately either increasing or suppressing penile responses.

It has also been noted by some researchers that in a laboratory setting, men not convicted of sex offences react erotically to children as young as 6 years (Freund, McKnight, Langevin & Cibiri, 1972). Similarly, Hall, Proctor and Nelson (1988) reported results from a large sample which showed that the paedophilic arousal of men who had previously sexually offended against adults did not differ from that of men who had previously sexually offended against children.
Paedophiles when compared with non-paedophiles did not show an erotic preference to children (Baxter, Marshall, Barbaree, Davidson & Malcolm, 1984). Results from these studies indicate that penile arousal to immature bodies does not clearly identify men who sexually molest children. Consequently Marshall, Laws and Barbaree (1990) question the value of erectile assessment in the description of sex offenders. Marshall and Barbaree (1988) showed that penile plethysmograph indices of deviant sexual preferences do not predict treatment outcome. Therefore such indices alone should not be used as a guide to inclusion in psychological treatment programmes.

Few studies have explored child sex offenders' cognitions relating to their sexual contact with children. Howells (1981), and Abel, Becker, & Cunningham-Rathner (1984) noted differences between child sex offenders' cognitions concerning children and those of a non sex offender group. Also results from studies by Stermac and Segal (1989), and Segal and Stermac (1990) indicated differences in the cognitions of child sex offenders compared with five other groups, namely, rapists, police officers, lawyers, clinicians, and laypersons. Child sex offenders perceived sexual contact with children as being beneficial to the child, they viewed the child as collaborating with them, and they perceived themselves as being less responsible (than the child) for the sexual acts.

Related to cognitions, researchers have observed that child sex offenders frequently ruminate over deviant sexual fantasies and this can result in compulsive urges which eventually become uncontrollable (Abel, Mittelman & Becker, 1983; Abel, Becker, & Cunningham-Rathner, 1984; Abel & Rouleau, 1990; Quinsey & Earls, 1990). Other research has reported child sex offenders feeling they were compelled by urges, or that they experienced impulsive thoughts and urges to carry out sexually deviant behaviours (Knopp, 1986; Johnston, 1987; Pithers, Kashima, Cumming, & Beal, 1988; Quinsey, 1986). It was noted by Lanyon (1986) that the sex offences were a recurring feature of the offender's life, and that they had a compulsive quality to them, and Salter
(1988), and Pithers (1990) stated that child sex offenders were addicted to their behaviour.

The child sex offender is not readily identified by personality, demographic features, IQ, or alcohol consumption, and while there is some evidence of distinct physiological characteristics, the literature is ambiguous and confusing. Deviant sexual arousal, as measured by a penile plethysmograph, has received considerable attention in recent years, but few investigations addressing offenders' cognitions have been reported. The literature indicates that there are differences between child sex offenders' cognitions, and those of other criminal offenders. Child sex offenders have been shown to ruminate over their deviant sexual fantasies, and to develop uncontrollable urges that are related to these internal ruminations. It has also been found that for them, at least at a cognitive level, it is specifically children who have a role in their sexual interactions.

Weiner's (1986) attribution theory of motivation and emotion proposed a useful model for the links between cognitions and behaviour in a diversity of situations. To date, no studies appear to have applied this model to criminal offending. The use of an attributional framework for the study of criminal offending will identify the causes that offenders view as important to their offending. Importantly, it will also indicate the attributional dimensions (locus, stability, controllability) to which they assign those causes. In particular, the question to be answered was, what is the nature of the child sex offender's attributions in terms of the direction of each dimension - as in internal versus external, stable versus unstable, and controllable versus uncontrollable? Answers to this question should indicate the nature of attribution dimension changes that would be necessary in the rehabilitation of child sex offenders.

The present study sought to identify the differences between child sex offenders' causal attributions, and those of three other offender categories. Child sex offenders have reported uncontrollable urges, their offending behaviours are recurring, and have been described as having an addictive
quality. With this in mind, it was predicted that child sex offenders would report significantly more attributions to internal, stable, and uncontrollable dimensions for their offences, than offenders in the rapist and property offender groups. Thus, it was expected that the dimensions to which child sex offenders attributed the causes of their offending would differ from those of rapists and property offenders, but not from those of violent offenders.

RAPISTS

The examination of personality profiles from Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) assessment have shown no difference between rapists and others (Howells & Wright, 1978). Alder (1984), and Scully and Marolla (1985) did not identify a particular personality profile or consistent pattern of personality type for rapists. Researchers addressing demographic characteristics have shown that offenders vary across demographic variables (Knight, Rosenberg, & Schneider, 1985; Stone, Barrington & Bevan, 1983). In studies investigating the IQ levels of offenders, no differences were found between rapists and non-sex offenders (Burgess, 1985; Howells & Wright, 1978).

Field (1978) found that rapists had more negative evaluations of women, more traditional sex-role perceptions and behaviour, and more pro-rape attitudes than the three other groups studied (police, crisis-counsellors, citizens). However, other researchers have found no difference between rapists, other offenders, and males in the community in their perceptions of women's roles. (Overholser & Beck, 1986; Segal & Marshall, 1985; Segal & Stermac, 1984).

The literature contains numerous references to studies of types of rape behaviour. For example, Groth, Wolbert and Holstrom (1977) analysed the reports of a large groups of rapists. They did not identify one rape incident in which sexual issues were dominant. Rather, they found that power and anger
were the predominant components. Other researchers (Alder, 1984; Brownmiller, 1975; Groth, 1979; Hegeman & Meikle, 1980; Langevin, 1985; Levine & Koenig, 1980; Nadelson, 1977) have described rape as an aggressive, punishing, and dominant act of pseudo-sexual nature, carried out by dangerous individuals, and Burt (1980) hypothesized that sex presented in a brutal manner in movies, television, and magazines encourages and condones rape behaviour and the myths that support it. Groth (1983) observed that some of the rapists studied by him repeatedly rehearsed their offences in fantasy. Groth et al. (1977) identified four types of rapists, two associated with issues related to the need for power (power-assertive and power-reassurance), and two related to anger (anger-retaliation and anger-excitation). Following further research, Groth, Burgess and Holmstrom (1979) added a fifth category, sadistic rape. Mosher and Anderson (1986) hypothesized that men with a macho personality pattern are disposed to acts of sexual aggression to validate their masculinity, and Groth (1983) saw rape as a way of confirming a sense of manliness or masculinity. Segal and Stermac (1990) and Darke (1990) examined the cognitive variables in sexual assault and noted that rapists held negative views of women, and condoned violence against them. The above researchers have suggested that the different types of rape all have the common motivational base - power. Thus, a number of researchers view rape as the use of sexual behaviour to express issues of power and anger.

Other researchers have proposed that sexual as well as aggressive desire contribute to the motivation to rape (Ellis, 1989; Finkelhor, 1984; Palmer, 1988; Rada, 1978; Rapaport & Burkhart, 1984; Thornhill & Thornhill, 1983). In a study carried out by Scully and Marolla (1985) they reported that when rapists talked about their own behaviour they used words such as dominance, power, and anger. Importantly, the rapists viewed their rapes as being in part sexually motivated. Some described rape as the ability to have sex without caring about the woman's response, - that is, sex while avoiding intimacy, was appealing to them.
Felson and Krohn (1990) showed the importance of sexual desirability in rape, stating that the majority of the victims are young and that sexual motivation plays a role in many rapes carried out by young rapists. Palmer (1988) evaluated 12 arguments put forward in previous research papers which had reached the conclusion that rape was not sexually motivated. He cited several examples of a desire for sexual gratification as being a relevant mediator for rapists. He concluded that "at present, the evidence does not justify the denial of sexual motivation on behalf of the rapist" (Palmer, 1988, p. 526).

Scutt (1990) similarly pointed out that analyses that portray rape as an act of power and violence and not sex are erroneous. While it is likely that from the perspective of the victim it is seen as an act of violence, from the point of view of the rapist the behaviour has "something to do with sex" (Scutt, 1990, p. 33).

The belief that alcohol contributes towards rape has been promoted, however, results from studies appear to be equivocal. Some studies show that alcohol does not have a direct causal effect on sexual arousal to recordings of forcible rape and rape behaviour (Barbaree, Marshall, Yates & Lightfoot, 1983; Briddell, Rimm, Caddy, Krawitz, Scholis & Wunderlin, 1978; Ladouceur & Temple, 1985). Other studies (Barbaree, 1990) suggest that alcohol consumption decreases the ability to discriminate between rape and consenting cues in taped descriptions of sexual interactions between male and female adults. The findings from studies investigating alcohol-related expectancies suggest that cognitions rather than the effects of alcohol may have an important effect on sexual arousal (Goldman, Brown & Christiansen, 1986; Hull & Bond, 1986; Massey, 1989; Wilson, 1977). Thus, psychological rather than pharmacological factors appear to play a leading role in sexual behaviour. It follows that to understand more fully offenders' motivations to offend we must explore their beliefs, attributions, and fantasy.

Phallometric assessment of rapists have produced inconsistent results. For example, Baxter, Marshall, Barbaree, Davidson, and Malcolm (1984), and
Murphy, Krisak, Stalgaitis and Anderson (1984) found no significant difference between rapists and non-rapists erectile responses to erotic video material. In a study by Baxter, Barbaree and Marshall (1986) both rapists and non-rapists responded significantly less to rape episodes than non rape sexual episodes. Rapists did not respond more than non-sex offenders to sadistic or masochistic bondage and spanking stories, both where partners consented and where they did not (Quinsey, Chaplin & Upfold, 1984). Men who had offended against adult females exhibited arousal patterns that did not significantly differ from men who had offended against children (Hall, 1989a). In contrast Earls and Proulx (1986) found that rapists responded more than non-rapists to rape episodes, but they did not respond differentially to mutually consenting episodes.

As with child sex offenders the plethysmograph evaluation of rapists must be viewed with caution as it has been shown that subjects who have not been convicted of offences can be stimulated to considerable levels of sexual arousal by depictions of sexually violent acts (Malamuth, Helm, & Feshback, 1980). Malamuth, Check and Briere (1986) concluded that deviant sexual arousal is not by itself a cause of sexual violence, and a critique by Blader and Marshall (1989) concluded that arousal to deviant stimuli is not a necessary functional antecedent to sexual assaults. Thus arousal to depictions of sexually violent acts in the laboratory does not clearly identify sexually assaultive men. Furthermore, it has been shown that subjects are capable of exercising control over sexual responding as measured by a plethysmograph (Barlow, 1977; Hall, Proctor & Nelson, 1988; Henson & Rubin, 1971; Laws & Rubin, 1969; Quinsey & Bergersen, 1976; Wyndra, Marshall, Earls & Barbaree, 1983). In addition, responses can be altered by anxiety, nervousness, anger, discomfort, ageing, drugs or cognitive set (Briddell et al, 1978; Freeman-Longo & Wall, 1986; Yates, Barbaree & Marshall, 1984).

Few studies have investigated the role cognitive factors play in a rape. However, one study by Lipton, McDonel, and McFall (1987) showed that in a simulated date situation, rapists, compared to other offender groups
misconstrued negative cues from women, and interpreted them as positive cues.

On the basis of the studies reviewed above, it is no longer tenable to accept the view that the main causal antecedents for rape are power and anger. Rather, there is convincing evidence that sexual needs or desires may make a major contribution to the motivation for rape.

It would appear that an awareness of the perceptions, attitudes, and attributions of offenders are important in understanding rape. Certainly, examining individual's perceptions and attitudes concerning rape suggested that these rather than the more obvious physical facts surrounding the rape determine people's actions (Gulotta & Neuberger, 1983). This is in line with the views of Heider (1958) and Weiner (1986) who have stated that actions are controlled more by how an event is perceived (subjective causality), than by what actually happens. It was shown in the Lipton, McDonel and McFall (1987) study in a simulated situation, and more importantly, court reports of rape frequently suggest, that the offender viewed the preceding circumstances differently from that of the victim. It would appear cues may be misinterpreted, resulting in attributions which lead to actions with serious consequences. Accordingly, an investigation of the role of attributions in rape would seem well overdue. Such a study should provide a unique analysis of the role of cognitive factors, and in particular of the rapists' causal dimensions for their offending. This information will enhance understanding of the motivating factors for the crime of rape.

This study was to determine the nature of the causal attributions contributing to the commission of rape. In particular, questions concerning the role of internal causes, and the rapists' views of the stability and controllability of such causes were directed at convicted rapists. More specifically, it was predicted that rapists would see the causes of their rape behaviour as internal, variable over time (unstable), and controllable.
PROPERTY OFFENDERS

Palmer and Humphries (1990) state that research has discovered very little with regards to the personality characteristics of property offenders. When demographic characteristics of property offenders have been investigated, it has been shown that they may be members of lower or higher socio-economic classes. Thus social background does not discriminate offenders from non-offenders (Palmer & Humphries, 1990; Zamble & Porporino, 1988). Some researchers (Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985) have claimed that property offenders score in the centre of IQ distributions, but other studies claim that research has not identified any particular patterns of IQ for property offenders (McGurk, Thornton & Williams, 1987).

No clear relationship between property offending and alcohol consumption appears to have been formulated. Pernamen (1982) and Kingshott (1980) argued against alcohol as being a significant causal variable in crime because they considered other factors also impacted on one's propensity to offend. Bennett & Wright's (1984) study of burglars showed that only 10% of their sample reported alcohol consumption as being causally related to their offending, and only 6.7% reported alcohol intoxication as the main reason for offending. Moreover, Cordilia (1985) argued that property offenders avoided heavy drinking because being intoxicated resulted in poorly planned and executed crimes that resulted in little profit.

Research examining property offender's (burglars) own accounts of their offences and the events leading up to them was carried out by Bennett & Wright (1984). Results showed that 46 per cent of the sample reported that the influence of others was important in the decision to offend. The need for money was another reason offered by 46 per cent of the sample. Decisions to commit burglaries were immediately followed by a search for a suitable target and the offence committed immediately according to 45 per cent of the sample. Another large group described planning their offences and there was some time
between the decision to offend and offending. None of these offenders offered alcohol as the main reason for offending nor did they cite events beyond their control.

Most of the offenders did not think that they would get caught, and they stated that they were not worried about being caught and sentenced. Therefore the thought of a prison sentence was not a deterrent to committing burglaries. This finding is supported by Walker, Farrington and Tucker (1981).

To summarise, property offenders actively chose to offend, usually for reasons of monetary gain, or as a consequence of their interaction with others. They usually planned their offences, and the thought of prison sentences did not deter them from offending. It follows that any intervention aimed at decreasing offending must examine offender's beliefs and attributions in an effort to change their decisions to offend.

There is little research investigating the cognitive factors that contribute to property offences. However, it has been indicated that offenders' cognitions may promote offending. This study sought to determine whether, unlike sexual offenders, property offenders attributed the causes of their offending primarily to external factors. It was also designed to ascertain whether they believed the causes varied over time (unstable), and whether they viewed their behaviour as under their control. When property offenders' attributions are understood, treatment programmes can be designed to modify attributions that play a contributory role in offending.

VIOLENT OFFENDERS

Findings from a number of studies quoted in Lang, Holden, Langevin, Pugh and Wu (1987) call into question the usefulness of personality measures in assessing and understanding violent individuals. Megargee (1966) distinguished
between under-controlled and over-controlled aggressors, but his findings have received inconsistent empirical support. Syverson and Romney (1985) report that projective tests such as the Picture Frustration Study, Thematic Apperception Test, Rorschach, Holtzman Inkblot Technique, and the Hands Test do not identify violent offenders with any degree of accuracy. It would appear that the majority of personality tests that have been used in various studies do not differentiate between violent and non-violent prisoners, or between the various groups of violent prisoners.

A number of studies provide evidence suggesting that violent offenders were less intelligent than non-violent offenders (Hays, Solway & Schreiner, 1978; Spellacy, 1977; Syverson & Romney, 1985; Wagner & Klein, 1977; Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985). However, other studies found that level of intelligence did not discriminate between violent and non-violent groups (Hillbrand, Foster & Hirt, 1988; Holland, Beckett & Levi, 1981).

A number of studies are characterized by attempts to identify "childhood markers" that can predict the propensity to engage in violent adult behaviour. For example, Hellman and Blackman (1966) suggested the triad, enuresis, fire-setting and cruelty to animals as childhood markers to a propensity to later violent behaviour. Justice, Justice and Kraft (1974) similarly identified the four early warning signs fighting, temper tantrums, school problems, and inability to get on with others. Goldstein (1974) suggested a childhood of maternal deprivation, poor father identification, nocturnal enuresis, violence towards animals, and brutalisation by one or both parents as antecedents to violent adult behaviour. However, none of these markers has been found to clearly identify individuals prone to violence.

Lang and Sibel (1989) reviewed a number of research papers addressing how alcohol consumption was related to violence and crime. They concluded that in the vast majority of violent crimes alcohol was not a significant contributor.
More recently, Weatherburn (1990) claimed that there was no clear evidence that alcohol increased the likelihood of violent crime.

Support for a cognitive and attributional component in violent behaviour has been offered by a number of researchers (Bandura, 1973; Bandura, 1978; Deffenbacher, Story, Stark, Hogg & Brandon, 1987; Deffenbacher, Story, Brandon, Hogg & Hazaleus, 1988; Hazaleus & Deffenbacher, 1986; Howells, 1987; Howells & Hollin, 1988; Toch 1969; Welsh & Gordon 1991). Batcheler's (1991) reviewed the treatment outcome of programmes aimed at reducing violent behaviour, and he concluded that programmes which targeted the cognitions of participants had a greater effect in reducing violent behaviour than did diverse other programmes. Attributional processes are particularly relevant in determining the affective and behavioural states which follow aversive environmental stimulation (Ferguson & Rule, 1983). The aggressor’s cognitive appraisal of a situation is clearly crucial. Thus, violent behaviour is dependent on cognitive processes and attributions related to a person’s expectations of the outcome of a particular course of action.

The clinical relevance of such attributional processes has been explored by Novaco (1975; 1978) and Grieger and Grieger (1982). Novaco’s analysis of cognitive structuring is based on the premise that aversive events function as provocations because of the way they are construed.

It is clear that people who have exhibited violent behaviour leading to imprisonment are not a homogeneous group in terms of childhood experiences, personality factors, IQ, or alcohol consumption. However, C. McDougall (personal communication, November 6, 1990) found that some individuals have always behaved angrily and violently in conflict situations and they have little knowledge of how else to act. Currently, there is empirical data showing that the cognitive processes of violent people contribute to their violent behaviour. Moreover, there is some evidence that attributional processes underlie and contribute to violent behaviour.
Questions to be addressed by this study, were what role causal attributions play in violent offending, and whether violent offenders’ attributions differed from those of other offender groups. It appears likely that violent offenders may develop a propensity to violent behaviour in response to a complex interplay of cognitive factors, including attributions. Their violent behaviour is the usual way they deal with situations of conflict. The present analysis implied that violent offenders may see themselves as being driven by internal, stable, and uncontrollable factors as they seek to meet their needs.

SEXUAL AROUSAL

The preceding discussion has suggested that there is an emotional sexual component in child sexual offending, and rape, and that men do not engage in these offences solely for the purpose of power. In both these offences there is a physical requirement for overt sexual arousal. An awareness of the factors leading to sexual arousal is part of the key to understanding, explaining, and treating such sexual offences. It follows that the clinical assessment of the four offender groups’ causal attributions related to their sexual arousal and sexual behaviour may lead to an understanding of the cognitive processes associated with sexual arousal, and this may in turn identify an important component in the psychological processes which lead to sexual offending.

The notion that people are driven by undefined forces toward sexual behaviour has not received research support. Rather, sexual arousal is now seen as having a physiological basis, and perceptions, attributions, and learning, determine the choice of a sexual partner or object (Dekker, Everaerd & Verhelst, 1985; Hall, Binik & Tomasso, 1985; Hatch, 1981; Rosen & Beck, 1988; Whalen, 1966).
Erotic imagery or sexual fantasies appear to be a central element in male sexual arousal, and their consideration is important for the understanding of normal and deviant sexual behaviour (Rutter, 1990). Factor analysis of men's reports of their sexual fantasies showed that the most important first factor was highly correlated with the following: being with many women at the same time, group sexual activities, witnessing the sexual performance of other people, being with another partner, and being desired by many women. The authors interpreted this to mean that in these fantasies men are asserting their sexual power either directly or through other people. The second factor consisted mainly of aggressive fantasies, and the third factor was composed of essentially masochistic fantasies (Crepault & Couture, 1980).

Sargeant (1990) noted that body changes and sensations associated with sexual arousal can also be experienced with thoughts of anger, fear, or excitement, but what identifies such body changes as sexual is one's cognitions at the time. Focusing on the cognitive determinants of sexual arousal, a number of researchers have discussed a variety of processes including the use of imagery and fantasy, erotic dreams, the perception of internal and external cues and attributions related to such cues (Abel, Barlow, Blanchard & Mavissakalian, 1975; Barlow, 1986; Barlow, Sakheim & Beck, 1983; Briddell, Rimm, Caddy, Krawitz, Scholis & Wunderlin, 1978; Crepault & Couture, 1980; Dekker & Everaerd, 1989; Hite, 1981; Lansky & Wilson, 1981; Metcalf & Humphries, 1985; Rokach, Nutbrown & Nexhipi, 1988; Rook & Hammen, 1977; Wilson & Lang, 1981; Zilbergeld, 1984).

Walen (1980) proposed a sexual arousal cycle which involved both perception (detection, labelling, and attribution) and evaluation. Reisenzein (1983) identified causal attributions as playing a role in modifying emotions, and Rosen and Beck (1988) when referring to cognitive arousal therapy stated "a given situation will not be experienced as sexual, despite the presence of genital arousal, without the occurrence of the appropriate emotional attribution" (p. 28). Thus,
attributions appear to play a crucial role in linking sexual stimuli to arousal, and arousal to sexual behaviour.

Intimacy is also an important element in satisfactory sexual relationships (Marshall, 1989a). Metcalf and Humphries (1985) noted that most of the men who were referred to their clinical practice exhibited fear of closeness of intimacy with women, and they believed it was for this reason that men used pornography as a sexual outlet, thus avoiding intimacy. Child sex molestation and rape also enables men to have sex while avoiding intimacy. Marshall (1989a) postulated that men who sexually offend are to some extent motivated by an unrecognized need to seek intimate and supportive relationships, and another study identified deficiencies in intimacy in a group of sex offenders (Seidman & Marshall, 1990, cited in Marshall & Eccles, 1990). These men were found to lack an intimate and close relationship with a partner, and to be emotionally and at times isolated and socially lonely. Fear of intimacy appears to be related to a fear of rejection, and illicit sexual contact can be seen as a way of fulfilling needs for a close interrelationship without the need to develop intimacy.

It would appear that sex offenders’ attitudes towards sex differ from that of other men. Freund and Blanchard (1986) postulated that rape can be the result of a courtship disorder, and Darke (1990) reported that rapists lacked understanding about female sexuality. Rapists have also been shown to misconstrue negative cues received from women in simulated social situations (Lipton, McDonel, & McFall, 1987). It has also been shown that they lack compassion for others, and this may contribute to their rape behaviour (Marshall & Barbaree, 1984).

Goldstein, Kant and Hartman (1974) found child sex offenders reported more guilt or shame from looking at or reading erotic material than either rapists or controls, and Marshall and Eccles (1991) showed that child sex offenders
displayed prudish attitudes with respect to a number of appropriate forms of sexual expression. Saunders, McClure & Murphy (1986) identified substantial sexual relationship dysfunctions as reported by child sex molesters and their partners, and Tingle, Barnard & Robbins (1986) presented evidence that child sex offenders have problems relating to adult females. Likewise, Bard, Carter, Cerce, Knight, Rosenberg, & Schneider (1987) reported that for child sex molesters compared with rapists, the offence appeared to compensate for sexual/masculine inadequacies, and Walters (1987) found that child sex offenders displayed greater psychosexual concerns than rapists. Further, Araji and Finkelhor (1985) cited several studies which indicated that child sex offenders suffered from higher amounts of sexual anxiety and experienced difficulties in obtaining sexual and emotional gratification from adult relationships. Concerning cognitions associated with sexuality, both Abel, Becker, & Cunningham-Rathner (1984) and Salter (1988) found that when child sex offenders were compared to non sex offenders it was noted that they had different opinions, attitudes, and beliefs concerning their sexuality. Marshall, Earls, Segal, & Darke (1983) claimed that child sex offenders lacked sexual knowledge and sexual skills, and Marshall, Johnston, Ward, Jones & Hudson (1991) described a programme for imprisoned child sex molesters, and they noted that the inmates had rigid views about sexual matters, and that they lacked knowledge concerning issues related to sexual relationships.

In light of the above findings on sexual arousal and the contributing factors, it is likely that cognitive processes, including attributions, play a crucial role in linking sexual stimuli to arousal, and this in turn to sexual behaviour. Sex offenders, and in particular child sex offenders' attitudes towards sexual interactions, their level of sexual knowledge, and their ability to establish intimacy appears to differ from that of other men. Furthermore, these differences appear to have a destructive, and dysfunctional influence on their adult sexual relationships. In their attitude to adult sexual expression, there is evidence that child sex offenders adopt a less overt, and more repressed position. As indicated previously, a number of child sex offenders have reported
being compelled in their sexual offences by internal, stable drives and urges which they view as uncontrollable. Furthermore, these various dysfunctional influences may also result in child sex offenders seeing their sexual arousal as internally determined, stable over time, and uncontrollable. Conversely, other offender groups who appear to have contrasting characteristics may view their sexual arousal resulting from external stimuli, unstable, and controllable. All of these questions will be addressed in this study.

Research investigating offenders’ attributions concerning their own sexual arousal and behaviour may show that different groups of offenders attribute different causes for their sexual arousal. This in turn may identify important psychological components of sexual offending, and the information would be useful when designing programmes aimed at reducing sexual offending.

**SUMMARY**

Earlier in this study concern was expressed that criminal offending in our society is increasing, and that in the main punishment by way of imprisonment is the response to this offending. Imprisonment itself has not been shown to have an effect on further offending (Lovell & Norris, 1990), and the need to carefully evaluate criminals individually, and to develop personalised strategies to address offending has been stressed (West, 1985).

The summary of the literature highlighted the usefulness of attribution theory, and an attribution model incorporating the three dimensions of causality -- locus, stability, and controllability -- as a framework for explaining previous behaviour/offending and expectations related to future behaviour/offending.

Attention was drawn to a number of studies on a variety of topics which related self attributions to emotions and behavioural change. The application of an attribution framework to the study of criminal offending behaviour was
considered important to the understanding of such behaviour, and attributions were also thought to be instrumental in offenders' decisions to commit future crimes.

Child sex offenders, rapists, property offenders, and violent offenders were discussed in terms of personality characteristics, demographic characteristics, IQ levels, the influence of alcohol, physiological (plethysmograph) assessment, and cognitions. Inmate groups could not be distinguished according to any but the last of the six parameters discussed. It would appear that offenders' cognitions do play a role in sexual offending, and it is important that further research is conducted to clarify in what way these cognitions contribute to offending.

Emotions and cognitions associated with sexual arousal and behaviour were considered. Some differences between sex offenders and other male offenders have been tentatively identified, and the importance of pursuing further research in this area is evident.

Little, if anything appears to be known about criminal offenders' own attributions, attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions of their criminal behaviour. In particular, an attributional analysis of criminal offending suggests that in order to understand such behaviour it is important to know the beliefs that the offenders hold concerning the causes of their offending. Little research has addressed this topic, however, extrapolation from other areas show that individuals offer a variety of causal attributions, and these attributions contribute to and influence expectations, affect, and in turn behaviour.

An analysis of criminal offenders' attributions for the causes of their offending and sexual arousal will facilitate an understanding of the causal antecedents of crime. Moreover, the dimensions to which offenders attribute the causes of their offending will show the dimensional characteristics (locus, stability, controllability) that offenders' view as underlying their offending. More
specifically, it is important to know whether offenders' attribute their causes to dimensions which they view as internal rather than external, stable or unstable, and controllable rather than uncontrollable.

A study addressing offenders' attributions, with regards to the causes of their offending, sex offenders' attributions related to their emotions and cognitions surrounding their sexual arousal and sexual behaviour, and offenders' own perceptions of their personal characteristics and life experiences should provide information concerning how such cognitions contribute and relate to the initiation and maintenance of criminal behaviour. This in turn would offer information needed to change offenders' decisions to commit further crimes. In line with these issues, the present study was undertaken to:

(1) Investigate whether child sex offenders, rapists, property offenders, and violent offenders differ in the causal perceptions of their crimes, the planning of their crimes, or the perceived gain from their criminal offending.

(2) Whether there are differences as a function of offence type in the causal perceptions of their cognitions and emotions surrounding their sexual arousal, and behaviour, and whether there are differences in their sexual fantasies, and their basic sexual knowledge.

(3) Whether there are differences in the number and types of psychological and physical problems experienced by individuals within each offender group.

(4) Whether differences in childhood experiences of mental, physical, or sexual abuse is related to the type of offence the person commits.

(5) The relationship between inmate's causal perceptions of their criminal activity, and their participation in psychological treatment programmes will also be investigated (in New Zealand prisons participation in programmes is voluntary).
HYPOTHESES

Offending
As already indicated child sex offenders have reported distorted cognitions concerning children, and these cognitions appear to contribute to their offending behaviour. They frequently ruminate over sexual fantasies involving children. These deviant fantasies can result in compulsive and uncontrollable thoughts and urges, to carry out sexually deviant behaviour, which can be recurring and addictive. Therefore it was predicted that:

1. **Child sex offenders** will attribute their offending behaviour to internal, unchanging causes outside of their control (internal/stable/uncontrollable) (Figure 2).

While some researchers view rape as the use of sexual behaviour to express issues of power and anger, others claim that sexual desire is also a component in rape. At present there is no clear evidence to deny the possibility of sexual motivation contributing to rape. As rapists do not always resort to rape behaviour in an effort to resolve feelings related to a need for power or sex, it was predicted that:

2. **Rapists** will view their offending behaviour as stemming from internal causes, changing from time to time, and under their control (internal/unstable/controllable) (Figure 2).

Property offenders plan their offences in response to suggestions from peers or a need for money. It is clear they see their behaviour stemming from external sources, controlled, and changeable depending on the situation. Accordingly it was hypothesised that:

3. **Property Offenders** will attribute their offending behaviour to (external/unstable/controllable) causes (Figure 2).
Figure 2: Range of possible configurations of causal dimensions for offending, demonstrating predicted dimensions of offender groups.
It would appear that violent offenders utilise violent behaviour in response either to experiencing the emotion anger (hostile violence), or because they believe they can only achieve goals by using violent behaviour (instrumental violence). It has been noted that a number of these individuals consistently behave violently when in conflict situation. In light of these findings, the following prediction was made:

4. **Violent Offenders** will attribute their violent behaviour to *(internal/stable/uncontrollable)* causes associated with needs or emotions (Figure 2).

Attribution research has shown that people who attribute the causes of their behaviour to internal and controllable causes are likely to see themselves as able to change that behaviour. Also, when the causes of behaviour that result in a negative outcome such as prison are attributed to unstable dimensions, there is a greater likelihood that the behaviour will be viewed as changeable. Therefore it was predicted that:

5. Prison inmates who attribute the causes of their offences to *(internal/unstable/controllable)* causes will participate more in psychological treatment programmes than inmates who attribute the causes of their offences to other dimensions.

**Sexual Behaviour**

With reference to offender’s attributions related to their emotions surrounding their sexual arousal, it would appear that child sex offenders experience various dysfunctional influences concerning their sexuality. They have reported being controlled by recurring internal drives, urges and fantasies rather than reacting to adult erotic stimuli. Accordingly, it was hypothesised that:

6. When **child sex offenders** detect physiological arousal they are likely to attribute it to internal stable forces and believe that they cannot control their behaviour *(internal/stable/uncontrollable)* (Figure 3).
Figure 3: Range of possible configurations of causal dimensions for sexual arousal, demonstrating predicted dimensions of offender groups.
Non child sex offenders have been found to differ from child sex offenders in areas such as attitude to appropriate forms of sexual expression, psychosexual concerns, anxiety, sexual fantasies, and beliefs concerning their own sexuality. Because these men appear to differ from child sex offenders in their opinions, attitudes, and beliefs concerning their sexuality, they are likely to view their sexual arousal as stemming from adult erotic stimuli, which varies according to the availability of such cues in the environment, and they will consider their sexual behaviour controllable. Therefore it was predicted that:

7. Rapists, property, and violent offenders will attribute the causes of their sexual arousal to (external/unstable/controllable) causes (Figure 3).

Information from clinical accounts, and my own experience as a clinician suggests that child sex offenders have thoughts, attitudes, and sexual urges that differ from non sex offenders. In particular they report an inability to control their sexual behaviour. Therefore, it is predicted that:

8.1 Child sex offenders will perceive themselves as being less in control of their sexual behaviour than the rapists, property offenders, and violent offenders.

Feelings of guilt and shame, prudish attitudes concerning appropriate sexual expression, and deficiencies in intimacy have been reported. Accordingly it was hypothesised that:

8.2 Child sex offenders will repress their sexuality to a greater degree than rapists, property offenders, and violent offenders.

Researchers have reported that child sex offenders lack sexual knowledge, and clinical psychologists have stated the need to include a sexual education component in a treatment programme for child sex offenders, as they consider that child sex offenders may lack the sexual knowledge necessary to have a
satisfactory sexual relationship with an adult. Therefore it was hypothesised that:

9. **Child sex offenders** will have a lower score on the Basic Sexual Knowledge questionnaire than the rapists, property offenders, and violent offenders.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD AND STATISTICAL DESIGN

PROCEDURE

Prison inmates who had committed offences in one of the following areas were selected from seven prisons in New Zealand: Child sex offences (child under 16 years), rape (unlawful sexual connection), offences against property, and violent offences against persons. There were 50 inmates in each offence group. Only offenders who were in the first nine months of serving their sentence were included in the research. Individual offenders were selected from prison files and categorised solely on their present offence. These records were also used to ensure each inmate had no previous convictions in one of the other three offence groups being studied. The attributions elicited during this study were for their current offence.

Offenders who denied committing the offence, or who committed group offences, for example, group rape or group assault, and those who were under psychiatric medication were excluded from the study. This insured that attributions for offending would not be made to others, and that offenders' responses were not affected by medication. A total of 17 offenders were excluded for the above reasons. All data was collected during 1990 and 1991. The research was approved by the Ethics Committee, Massey University, the Department of Justice, and all ethical considerations of the New Zealand Psychological Society were observed.

Offenders were interviewed individually, questionnaires were completed for them, and all offenders interviewed were offered psychological treatment. Violent offenders were given the opportunity to join one of the Anger Management groups run by the researcher or other Department of Justice
psychologists, child sex offenders could join a sex offender treatment group run by the researcher, or if appropriate transfer to Kia Marama Sex Offender Treatment Unit at Rolleston Prison in the South Island. Rapists were involved in individual treatment by the researcher or other Department of Justice psychologists, and property offenders were offered whatever psychological treatment considered by the researcher or other Department of Justice psychologists to be appropriate.

At the commencement of each assessment all offenders were advised of the confidentiality of their responses. They all agreed to the conditions that their identity would not be revealed, and that their individual responses would not subsequently be identifiable. The information obtained from the psychological assessments of offenders was included in the research study only with their agreement, and they were advised that their decision to participate in the study would not affect their obtaining psychological treatment, or their prison conditions.

Care was taken to ensure that assessment interviews did not clash with any other activities the offenders were involved in, such as visits, sports, or educational activities.

**DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE**

Two hundred prison inmates (50 child sex offenders, 50 rapists, 50 property offenders, and 50 violent offenders) participated in this study. Table 1 shows that the majority of inmates in this sample were either New Zealanders or New Zealand Maoris, with smaller percentages being Pacific Islanders and other nationalities. These figures are similar to the ethnic background of male prisoners in New Zealand in 1990 (Department of Justice Statistics, 1991a).
### Table 1: Comparison of Ethnic Background of Research Sample with 1990 New Zealand Prison Inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ethnic Background</th>
<th>1990 Male Prison Inmates (%)</th>
<th>Research Sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ Maori</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islanders</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex Offenders</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ Maori</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ Maori</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Offenders</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ Maori</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Offenders</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NZ Maori</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows that the majority of the child sex offenders were in the 38-60 year age age group, whereas the majority of rapists, property offenders, and violent offenders were in the 17-30 year old age group.

**Table 2:** Age Distribution of Research Sample (number of persons by offender group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-23 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-37 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-45 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age distributions of the rapist, property, and violent offender groups closely mirror that of the general prison population during 1990 (Department of Justice, 1991a). However, this was not so for the child sex offenders who tended to be in an older age group. Hence, they contrasted with the three other offenders groups and with the overall New Zealand prison population.
With respect to education level, Table 3 shows that there was very little difference across groups, and the majority of inmates left school after completing three years or less of secondary education.

Table 3: Highest Education Level of Research Sample (number of persons by offender group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Offender Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Sex Offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form 7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment was categorised using the Elley-Irving Socio-Economic Index (Elley & Irving, 1985). This index was developed for males in the New Zealand labour force, and ranges from 1 for professionals to 6 for unskilled. There was no significant difference in employment level across the four groups, and the majority of offenders were in the unskilled categories (Table 4).
**Table 4:** Summary of Prior Employment of Research Sample Categorised using the Elley-Irving Socio-Economic Index (number of persons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elley-Irving Socio-Economic Index Number</th>
<th>Offender Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Sex Offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Worked</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that the majority of the child sex offenders were married, or in a de facto relationship at the time of assessment, while in the other three groups the majority of offenders were single.

**Table 5:** Marital Status of Research Sample (number of persons by offender group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Offender Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Sex Offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defacto/Married</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was little difference in alcohol consumption across the groups (Table 6). However, it is clear the child sex offenders use drugs to a lesser degree than the other three groups (Table 7).

**Table 6:** Alcohol Consumption of Research Sample (number of persons by offender group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Group</th>
<th>Alcohol Consumption</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7:** Drug Use of Research Sample (number of persons by offender group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Group</th>
<th>Drug Use</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 shows that the majority of child sex offenders in this sample were a member of the same family as their victim, and the next largest group included those who were acquainted with their victim.

**Table 8:** Summary of Child Sex Offenders’ Relationship to their Victim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Number of Child Sex Offenders (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>9 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defacto Stepfather</td>
<td>15 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>17 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEVELOPMENT OF SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW**

In this study the need to assess and examine prison inmates' thoughts, beliefs, and attributions has been highlighted. Clearly, there is a need to evaluate inmates' individual psychological status, and to understand their views free from the preconceived expectations of the researcher (Bennett & Wright, 1984; Blackburn, 1988; West, 1985). However, to date very little research has been carried out in prisons addressing these issues.

Swanson and Chenitz (1982) stated that large-scale surveys using quantitative methods cannot tap the meaning to subjects of their behaviour. Some progress
in addressing this problem can be made by using qualitative research methods, which, as pointed out by Averill (1983), Leninger (1985) and Sandelowski (1986) focus on the meaning of experiences, and the way such experiences are objectively and subjectively interpreted by subjects.

Both methods identify and label the differences and similarities in their data, and can be combined to give a more complete picture than can be obtained using either method alone (Bryman, 1988; Mash & Wolfe, 1991). In this study both qualitative (semi-structured clinical interviews), and quantitative methods (questionnaires) were utilised. In addition, a clinical psychological assessment was completed with each participant. This was a requirement of the researcher's employment as a senior psychologist, and also provided an opportunity to obtain further information relevant to this study.

The use of a semi-structured clinical interview with this sample had a number of advantages:

1. Spending time interacting with each inmate aided in establishing rapport. This in turn encouraged more valid responses to the structured questionnaires.

2. Interviews guided inmates through their offences, and this in turn aided their memory of the event and their thoughts, feelings and emotions experienced at that time.

3. Encouraging inmates to discuss their own views and beliefs was reassuring to them, in that it conveyed that their responses were being accepted and valued.

4. A number of the questions were of a sensitive nature, and when necessary a semi-structured clinical interview allowed for a flexible approach, and ensured an informed response.
5. A semi-structured interview allowed inmates to use their own concepts, and terminology, and to elaborate on their answers.

6. The questions were designed to elicit information about inmate's sexual thoughts and behaviour, which were likely to present potential problems if researched solely in a quantitative manner. For example, written responses may have resulted in obscene remarks, drawings, irrelevancies, or random responding.

7. Fewer and shorter structured questionnaires were needed, an important factor considering the low reading and writing level of this sample.

The semi-structured clinical interview began by gathering demographic variables including age, education, ethnic background, marital status, criminal history (number of crimes, types of crimes, number of prison sentences). The interview then focused on the current offence resulting in imprisonment, and thoughts, feelings, emotions, and possible factors contributing to the offence were examined. A cognitive behaviour assessment of the offender's past and current psychological well-being was carried out, and further background information about the offenders was obtained. Questions relating to their sexuality and sexual experiences were asked, and their behaviour when drinking or taking drugs was assessed. (Appendix A)
DEVELOPMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRES

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR CAUSES OF OFFENDING AND OF SEXUAL AROUSAL

Two 9-item questionnaires were developed in which inmates assigned the primary cause for their offence and their sexual arousal to each of three attributional dimensions. The Causal Dimension Scale (Russell, 1982) formed the basis for the structured section of these questionnaires, and the open-ended section consisting of self reported attributions provided a possible means of validation for the structured scales, and for the semi-structured interview. More importantly the self reports gave inmates an additional opportunity to offer their own unique causes.

The Causal Dimension Scale was developed by Russell (1982) in order to overcome researcher/participant differences in their perceptions of the causal attributions and assignment to causal dimensions. In this scale the research participant assigns causes in terms of three dimensions - locus of causality, stability, and controllability. Factor analysis carried out by Russell (1982) confirmed the three dimensional structure of this scale.

At the beginning of 1990 the Offence Questionnaire and the Sexual Arousal Questionnaire utilising a 9 point numerical scale were administered to 20 prison inmates, and their responses were, on the whole, at the extremes of the scale. After consultations with measurement experts and further administrations of the questionnaires to prison inmates, they were redesigned, and 5-point Likert numerical scales with each point labelled were used. Labelling each point of the scale aided offenders' understanding of the requirements of the scale, and the additional information resulted in more informed responding.

Russell (1982) used control, intent, and responsibility as measures of controllability. According to Weiner (1986), intent and control co-vary quite
substantially: "We intend to do what is controllable"; or "We can control what is intended". However, there were instances during the piloting of the questionnaires when intent and control did not co-vary. For example, some child sex offenders intended not to offend but considered they could not control their sexual desires; violent offenders intended to manage their aggressive outbursts, but could not control their emotional reaction, and behaviour in response to what was said to them.

On both the Offence and the Sexual Arousal Questionnaire the question "intended/not intended" was changed to "restrainable/unrestrainable", which for this sample did appear to be a measure of controllability. The question referring to responsibility posed a number of difficulties because the inmates surveyed admitted guilt for their offences (sexual, property or violent), but in some instances they did not believe they could have controlled their actions. Therefore this question was changed to "able to hold back your behaviour/not able to hold back your behaviour". For inmates contributing to the pilot studies this did equate with control. The Offence and Sexual Arousal Questionnaires are presented in Appendix B.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE INVENTORY

A third questionnaire, the Individual Response Inventory was constructed. It consisted of 30-items (10-items measuring socially desirable responses, and 20-items measuring sexual repression, attitudes, control, and confidence). Inmates in all groups in this study have digressed from socially acceptable behaviour, as evidenced by their being imprisoned. For this reason, a measure of social desirability may be considered to be of minor importance. However, it was deemed important to include some questions that would identify socially desirable response sets that may be operating within or between the four groups. Because of reading difficulties experienced by inmates, and also because some items in the 33-item Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale
MCSDS) (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) were considered inappropriate for prison inmates, it was decided not to use the full-scale MCSDS. Strategies offered by Smith (1967) to correct for socially desirable responses were examined, and as a result 10-items from the MCSDS were selected (Hesketh, 1982, Robinson & Shaver, 1976). The ten items consisted of five items denying 'bad behaviour', and five claiming 'good behaviour'.

The 20 items measuring sexual repression, attitudes, control and confidence were derived from the Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory (DSFI) (Derogatis, 1978), and the Sex Inventory (Thorne, 1966). Neither of the above scales was used in their entirety because: (a) The full DSFI scale includes measures of frequencies of sexual behaviours, and this was considered inappropriate to an incarcerated sample; (b) the Sex Inventory consists of 200 items, and was considered too long, while some of the items were considered to be outdated and inappropriate for this sample.

Early in 1990, the 30-item Individual Response Inventory was administered to 36 prison inmates. After reliability statistics had been computed it was decided to retain 8 questions measuring Control of Sexual Behaviour (Alpha .89), and 7 questions measuring Repression of Sexuality (Alpha .73). The 10 questions measuring Socially Desirable responses (Alpha .49) were discarded.

Short forms of the MCSDS have been used by a number of other researchers obtaining reliability statistics ranging from .16 to .86 (Greenwald & Satow, 1970; O'Gorman, 1974; Ray, 1981; Ray, 1984; and Ray & Kiefl, 1984). Therefore, it was decided to investigate the possibility of using a short form MCSDS.

A further pilot study was carried during 1990 with 36 prison inmates utilising 8 items from the MCSDS. These items were selected by choosing those that had the highest correlations with the total score (Greenwald & Satow, 1970). Four items were positively keyed (claiming good behaviour), and four were negatively keyed (denying bad behaviour). Statistical analysis showed a reliability
coefficient alpha .74. The final form of the Individual Response Inventory included 7-items measuring Repression of Sexuality, 8-items measuring Control of Sexual Behaviour, and 8-items measuring Social Desirability (Appendix C).

SURVEY OF BASIC SEXUAL KNOWLEDGE

A fourth questionnaire, The Survey of Basic Sexual Knowledge, was constructed from a number of questionnaires measuring sexual knowledge. Originally the questionnaire consisted of 25 items. It was piloted with prison inmates for several months during 1990, and on the basis of these preliminary studies modifications were made. The wording of the questions were simplified, and the number of questions in the final questionnaire was reduced to 18. The questions were carefully selected to tap knowledge not only of the person's own sexuality, but also of female sexuality. (Appendix D)

During 1990 the Basic Sexual Knowledge Survey was administered to 130 first and second year male university students whose ages ranged from 17 years to 50 years. This was to provide a comparison between the offender groups and a group of higher educated persons, and also to give an indication of the difficulty level of the questionnaire.

All four questionnaires were administered verbally in a standard form, with the questionnaire in clear view of the inmate. When necessity demanded, items on the Survey of Basic Sexual Knowledge were expanded for clarification.

Collection of data took place during 1990 and 1991, and each prison inmate participated in individual clinical interviews, in which the inmates were assessed over a period of approximately 2-3 hours.
DATA ANALYSES

STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRES

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS*), (SPSS Inc. 1986) was used for analysing the data collected from the semi-structured interviews and questionnaires. The following procedures were used:

Each hypothesis was tested by means of a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) with age as a covariate. This statistical treatment was considered to be an appropriate way of analysing the effects of independent variables on sets of correlated dependent variables (Afifi & Clark, 1984; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989).

Initially, two one-way MANCOVAs were performed, one on each set of three dependent variables. The dependent variables were the attribution dimensions: locus, stability, and control for offence; and locus, stability, and control for sexual arousal. The independent variable for both analyses was offender group, consisting of child sex offenders, rapists, property offenders, and violent offenders. Hence, the impact of the offender group on the attribution dimensions as a set was evaluated.

Where a significant multivariate effect was found, pairwise planned comparisons were computed to identify differences between groups on all dimensions. When pairwise differences were found, univariate F ratios were examined to detect differences on specific attribution dimensions.

In order to avoid the inflation of p values by multiple comparisons, a modified Bonferroni test was used to adjust the significance level and allow for the familywise (FW) rate of rejection across the entire set of planned comparisons ($\alpha_{\text{planned}} = \frac{\alpha_{\text{FW planned}}}{C}$) (Keppel 1982).
In the modified Bonferroni method, the selected alpha level for univariate analyses is multiplied by the number of degrees of freedom, and the product divided by the number of comparisons. For multivariate analyses, the alpha level is also divided by the number of dependent variables. This procedure adjusts for the number of comparisons and for the number of variables, and results in a new rejection probability for evaluating multiple planned comparisons. In the present case the computed probabilities for a modified Bonferroni test were Univariate $p < .008$ (equivalent to a standard significance level $p < .05$), and $p < .0003$ (equivalent to $p < .001$); and Bonferroni Multivariate value $p < .003$ ($p < .05$), and $p < .0001$ ($p < .001$). Each table provides two significance levels: $p < .05$ and $p < .001$.

Pillai's test was chosen as the multivariate test statistic for all the multivariate analyses, as it is the most robust criterion for statistical inference. Results of an evaluation of the assumptions regarding normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, linearity, and multicollinearity were satisfactory (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989).

**SELF REPORTED RESPONSES**

Chi square tests of independence were performed between pairs of offender groups to investigate any differences between the four offender groups' responses to the semi-structured interviews. These interviews obtained information on personal characteristics, and life experiences of the offenders, as well as their responses from the open-ended section of the attribution questionnaires. Chi squares were considered the appropriate nonparametric technique to test these categorical data (Gravetter & Wallnau, 1985; Marascuilo & McSweeney, 1977; Siegel, 1956), and sample selection and responses met the assumptions for the Chi square test. The modified Bonferroni method was not applicable as this was a post hoc exploratory component of the study.
AGE OF OFFENDERS

It was found that the child sex offenders' group had a greater number of people in the 38-60 year age group than the other groups (Table 2). Results from an analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed a significant group effect for age $F(3, 196) = 31.47, p < .001$. Scheffé individual comparisons of pairs of means indicated that child sex offenders were significantly older than offenders in each of the other three groups: child sex offenders compared with rapists $F(3, 196) = 61.72, p < .01$, compared with property offenders $F(3, 196) = 58.67, p < .01$, compared with violent offenders $F(3, 196) = 67, p < .01$. Hence, age was included as a covariate in the analyses of the questionnaire data, in order to correct for its potentially confounding effect.

ETHNIC BACKGROUND

The majority of prison inmates participating in this study were either Caucasian (48%) or New Zealand Maori (43%) (Table 1). Therefore it was considered important to investigate the possibility of ethnic background factors influencing their responses. A $4 \times 2$ MANCOVA with age as a covariate was performed with groups (4) and ethnic background (2) as the independent variables, and the six attribution dimensions (three each for offending and sexual arousal) as the dependent variables. The multivariate $F$ ratio was not significant, $F(18, 510) = 1.52, p > .05$. Hence the results for the different ethnic groups were combined for all subsequent analyses.

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY EFFECTS

The literature addressing the validity of prison inmates' responses raises the concern that they may distort the truth, or minimise their offences in an effort to present in a socially acceptable manner (Little, 1990; Rogers, 1988). In order
to examine possible socially desirable response sets, an eight-question scale was incorporated in the Individual Response Inventory. Analyses of these data using an ANCOVA (controlling for age) showed no significant group effects $F(1, 195) = 1.21, p > .05$ on social desirability. These data indicate that all groups had very low social desirability responses.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

ATTRIBUTIONS FOR THE CAUSES OF OFFENDING AND OF SEXUAL ARousAL

Results of the analyses of the attribution scores are presented in the order of the hypotheses (Chapter 2).

An offender's attribution score on each dimension in the Attributions for Offending, and the Attributions for Sexual Arousal scales ranged from a possible \(-3\) at the external/unstable/uncontrollable end of the relevant scale to a possible maximum of \(15\) at the internal/stable/controllable end of each scale.

ATTRIBUTIONS FOR OFFENDING

Causal attributions for offending behaviour were assessed by means of a One-way MANCOVA, and a significant group effect was observed \(F(9, 585) = 10.37, p < .001\) (see Figure 4).

Hypothesis 1 predicted that child sex offenders would tend to view their offending behaviour as internal/stable/uncontrollable. Results from pairwise planned comparisons showed significant group differences when the child sex offender group was compared with both the rapist \(F(3, 193) = 13.29, p < .001\), and the property offender groups \(F(3, 193) = 19.91, p < .001\) (Table 9). As predicted they did not differ from violent offenders in their attributions.
Univariate F statistics showed significant effects on all three dimensions when the child sex offender group was compared with both the rapist: locus $F(1, 195) = 15.71, p < .001$, stability $F(1, 195) = 27.11, p < .001$, control $F(1, 195) = 17.03, p < .001$, and the property offender groups: locus $F(1, 195) = 17.25, p < .001$, stability $F(1, 195) = 19.93, p < .001$, control $F(1, 195) = 46.46, p < .001$, (Table 10).

![Graph showing scores on attributions for offending scale as a function of offender group.](image)

**Figure 4:** Scores on attributions for offending scale as a function of offender group.

An inspection of each group's attribution mean score for causes of offending shows that child sex offenders's scores were in the hypothesised pattern of internal/stable/uncontrollable (see Figure 4).
Table 9: Pairwise Comparisons of Groups Controlling for Age: Multivariate F Statistic for Causes of Offending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFENDER GROUP</th>
<th>PILLAI'S CRITERION</th>
<th>F (df 3,193)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex and Rapists</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>13.29 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex and Property</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>19.91 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex and Violent</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists and Property</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists and Violent</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>15.45 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and Violent</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>23.76 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** modified p < .001 (see pages 57-58)
Table 10: Pairwise Comparisons of Groups Controlling for Age: Univariate F Statistics for Causes of Offending by Attribution Dimension (df 1,195).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Group</th>
<th>LOCUS</th>
<th>STABILITY</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapists</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex</td>
<td>15.71 **</td>
<td>17.25 **</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>7.84 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* modified p < .05
** modified p < .001 (see pages 57-58)
It was predicted in Hypothesis 2 that rapists would attribute their offending behaviour to *internal/unstable/controllable* causes. Pairwise planned comparisons showed significant group differences when the rapist group was compared with both the child sex offender $F(3, 193) = 13.29, p < .001$, and the violent offender groups $F(3, 193) = 15.45, p < .001$, (Table 9).

There were significant effects on all three dimensions when the rapist group was compared (univariate $F$) with the child sex offender group: locus $F(1, 195) = 15.71, p < .001$, stability $F(1, 195) = 27.11, p < .001$, control $F(1, 195) = 17.03, < .001$, two dimensions when compared with violent offender group: stability $F(1, 195) = 32.11, p < .001$, control $F(1, 195) = 20.85, p < .001$, and one dimension when compared with property offender group: control $F(1, 195) = 9.22, p < .05$, (Table 10).

The attribution mean scores shown in Figure 4 indicate that the rapist group’s score on the stability and control dimensions were in the hypothesised direction, however, their score on the locus dimension was in the external direction (low score) rather than the hypothesised internal direction (high score) and resulted in causes being attributed to *external/unstable/controllable* dimensions.

With respect to the attributions of property offenders it was predicted in Hypothesis 3 that they would attribute the causes of their offending behaviour to *external/unstable/controllable* dimensions. Significant group differences were shown by pairwise planned comparisons when the property offender group was compared with both the child sex offender ($F(3, 193) = 19.91, p < .001$, and the violent offender groups $F(3, 193) = 23.76, p < .001$ (Table 9).
Univariate F values indicated this offender group usually differed from all others on the three dimensions. There were significant effects on all three dimensions when the property offender group was compared with both the child sex offender: locus $F (1, 195) = 17.25, p < .001$, stability $F (1, 195) = 19.93, p < .001$, control $F (1, 195) = 46.46, p < .001$, and the violent offender groups: locus $F (1, 195) = 7.84, p < .05$, stability $F (1, 95) = 22.87, p < .001$, control $F (1, 195) = 57.74, p < .001$. Significant effects were also evident when the property offender group was compared with the rapist group on the control dimension $F (1, 195) = 9.22, p < .05$ (Table 10).

The attribution mean scores in Figure 4 show that the property offender group's scores represented the hypothesised dimensions of external/unstable/controllable.

It was predicted that violent offenders would attribute their violent behaviour to internal/unstable/uncontrollable causes (Hypothesis 4). Significant differences between offender groups were found in pairwise planned comparisons when the violent offender group was compared with both the rapist ($F (3, 193) = 15.45, p < .001$, and the property offender groups $F (3, 193) = 23.76, p < .001$ (Table 9).

Further analyses by calculation of the univariate F ratios showed there were significant effects on two dimensions when the violent offender group was compared with the rapist group: stability $F (1, 195) = 32.11, p < .001$, control $F (1, 95) = 20.85, p < .001$, and three dimensions when compared with the property offender group: locus $F (1, 95) = 7.84, p < .05$, stability $F (1, 95) = 22.87, p < .001$, control $F (1, 95) = 57.74, p < .001$ (Table 10).

Figure 4 shows that the attribution mean scores for the violent offender group represented the hypothesised dimensions of internal/stable/uncontrollable.
Hypothesis 5 predicted that inmates who attributed the cause of their offences to **internal/unstable/uncontrollable** dimensions would participate more in psychological treatment programmes than inmates who attributed the causes of their offences to other dimensions. In this study ninety five of the 200 offenders interviewed had already commenced, or agreed to participate in psychological treatment programmes to address their offending, (child sex offenders 30, 60%; rapists 15, 30%; property offenders 21, 42%; and violent offenders 29, 58%). It became clear during the interviews that a number of issues confounded the testing of this hypothesis. Some offenders had started psychological programmes and then discontinued the programme. A variety of reasons for this were given. For example, the offender had been transferred to another prison, or had had the opportunity to be outside the prison on work gangs, home parole, or other community programmes. At times, those that expressed an interest in being involved in a psychological treatment programme stated that they understood participation in a treatment programme would enable them to obtain privileges within the prison setting such as home leaves.

It was clear that opportunities to be outside the prison were of greater importance to offenders than addressing their offending. All these issues confused the links between attributions for offending and participation in treatment programmes.

**ATTRIBUTIONS FOR SEXUAL AROUSAL**

Causal attributions for sexual arousal were assessed by means of a One way MANCOVA, and significant differences between groups were observed $F (9, 585) = 14.30, p < .001$ (see Figure 5).
Hypothesis 6 predicted that child sex offenders would attribute their sexual arousal to internal/stable/uncontrollable causes. Pairwise planned comparisons showed significant group differences when the child sex offender group was compared with the rapist ($F (3, 193) = 28.33, p < .001$, property offender ($F (3, 193) = 47.69, p < .001$, and violent offender groups ($F (3, 193) = 38.87, p < .001$ (Table 11).

Univariate $F$ statistics showed significant effects when the child sex offender group was compared with all groups on all dimensions. Rapist: locus $F (1, 195) = 72.51, p < .001$, stability $F (1, 195) = 35.25, p < .001$, control $F (1, 195) = 9.35, p < .05$, property offender: locus $F (1, 195) = 91.41, p < .001$, stability $F (1, 195) = 74.82, p < .001$, control $F (1, 195) = 35.44, p < .001$, and violent offender group: locus $F (1, 195) = 59.31, p < .001$, stability $F (1, 195) = 71.32, p < .001$, control $F (1, 195) = 32.98, p < .001$, (Table 12).

Figure 5: Scores on attributions for sexual arousal scale as a function of offender group.
Table 11: Pairwise Comparisons of Groups Controlling for Age: Multivariate F Statistics for Causes of Sexual Arousal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFENDER GROUP</th>
<th>PILLAI'S CRITERION</th>
<th>F (df 3,193)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex and Rapists</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>28.33 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex and Property</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>47.69 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex and Violent</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>38.87 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists and Property</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>6.12 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists and Violent</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>7.46 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and Violent</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* modified p < .05
** modified p < .001 (see pages 57-58)
Table 12: Pairwise Comparisons of Groups Controlling for Age: Univariate F Statistics for Causes of Sexual Arousal by Attribution Dimension (df 1,195).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Group</th>
<th>LOCUS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>STABILITY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapists</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>Rapists</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>Rapists</td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex</td>
<td>72.51 **</td>
<td>91.41 **</td>
<td>59.31 **</td>
<td>35.25 **</td>
<td>74.82 **</td>
<td>71.32 **</td>
<td>9.35 *</td>
<td>35.44 **</td>
<td>32.98 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>9.30 *</td>
<td>8.85 *</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.74 *</td>
<td>9.90 *</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* modified p < .05
** modified P < .001 (see pages 57-58)
The attribution mean scores on each of the three dimensions shown in Figure 5 indicate that the child sex offender group attributed their sexual arousal to **internal/stable/uncontrollable** causes.

Significant effects for offender group sexual arousal attributions were also observed when the rapist group was compared with both the property offender $F(3, 193) = 6.12, p < .05$, and the violent offender groups $F(3, 193) = 7.46, p < .001$ (Table 11).

There were significant effects on two dimensions (univariate F) when the rapist group was compared with both the property offender: stability $F(1, 195) = 9.30, p < .05$, control $F(1, 195) = 10.74, p < .05$, and the violent offender groups: stability $F(1, 195) = 8.85, p < .05$, control $F(1, 195) = 9.90, p < .05$ (Table 12).

It was predicted in Hypothesis 7 that rapists, property offenders and violent offenders would attribute their sexual arousal to causes in the opposite direction to child sex offender, that is to **external/unstable/controllable** causes. Group effects and univariate F statistics from the analyses of dimensions were significant as reported above (Tables 11 and 12). The attribution mean scores in Figure 5 show that these three groups attributed their sexual arousal to **external/unstable/controllable** causes.

The child sex offender group displayed a response pattern across the three dimensions on both attribution scales which clearly distinguishes them from all other offender groups studied.
LACK OF CONTROL OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR

An offender's score on the Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour scale ranged from 0 (control) to 8 (lack of control). Responses to the Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour questions were analysed by means of an ANCOVA (with age as a covariate). A significant group effect was observed $F(3, 160) = 22.68$, $p < .001$ (see Figure 6).

![Graph showing scores on lack of control of sexual behaviour scale as a function of offender group.](image)

**Figure 6:** Scores on lack of control of sexual behaviour scale as a function of offender group.

Hypothesis 8.1 predicted that child sex offenders would perceive themselves as being less in control of their sexual behaviour than the rapist, property offender, and violent offender groups.
Table 13: Ancova Univariate F Statistics (controlling for age) by Offender Groups for scores on the Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFENDER GROUP</th>
<th>RAPISTS</th>
<th>PROPERTY OFFENDERS</th>
<th>VIOLENT OFFENDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex Offenders</td>
<td>18.54 **</td>
<td>91.01 **</td>
<td>52.56 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists</td>
<td>35.24 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.99 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*  p<.05
** p<.001
Pairwise planned comparisons showed significant group differences when the child sex offender group was compared with the other three groups: rapist $F(1, 195) = 18.54, p < .001$, property offender $F(1, 195) = 91.01, p < .001$, and violent offender group $F(1, 195) = 52.56, p < .001$ (Table 13).

Significant effects were also evident for the rapist group compared with both the property offender $F(1, 195) = 35.24, p < .001$, and violent offender group $F(1, 195) = 11.99, p < .05$. (Table 13).

An inspection of each group’s mean scores on this scale shows that the child sex offender group’s score was in the hypothesised direction (Figure 6). Therefore, offenders in the child sex offender group perceive themselves as lacking control of their sexual behaviour more than offenders in the rapist, property, and violent offender groups. In addition, offenders in the rapist group considered they lack control of their sexual behaviour more than property and violent offenders.

**REPRESSION OF SEXUALITY**

An offender’s score on the Repression of Sexuality scale ranged from 0 (no repression) to 7 (repression).

Responses to the Repression of Sexuality questions were analysed by means of an ANCOVA (with age as a covariate). A significant group effect was observed $F(3, 158) = 9.0, p < .001$ (see Figure 7).

Hypothesis 8.2 predicted that child sex offenders would repress their sexuality to a greater degree than rapists, property offenders, and violent offenders.
Pairwise planned comparisons showed significant group differences when the child sex offender group was compared with both the property offender group $F(1, 195) = 10.16, p < .05$, and the violent offender groups $F(1, 195) = 8.44, p < .05$ (Table 14).

An inspection of each group’s mean score on this scale shows that the child sex offender group’s score was in the hypothesised direction (Figure 7). This indicates that the offenders in the child sex offender group repress their sexuality to a similar extent as the offenders in the rapist group, but significantly more than offenders in the property or violent offender groups.

![Figure 7: Scores on repression of sexuality scale as a function of offender group.](image-url)
Table 14: Ancova Univariate F Statistics (controlling for age) by Offender Groups for scores on the Repression of Sexuality Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFENDER GROUP</th>
<th>RAPISTS</th>
<th>PROPERTY OFFENDERS</th>
<th>VIOLENT OFFENDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex Offenders</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>10.16 *</td>
<td>8.44 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
BASIC SEXUAL KNOWLEDGE

The maximum possible score on the Basic Sexual Knowledge scale was 18. This questionnaire was administered to 130 male university students for comparison with the offenders groups. The results for the student group were: $M = 13.59$, and $SD = 2.82$. Results for the offenders indicated a significantly lower score, being: $M = 10.14$, and $SD = 3.02$, $t (328) = 10.56$, $p < .001$.

Hypothesis 9 predicted that the child sex offender group would score lower on this scale than offenders in the other three groups.

Responses from the Basic Sexual Knowledge questionnaire were analysed by means of an ANCOVA (with age as a covariate). A significant group effect was observed $F (3, 196) = 3.48$, $p < .05$ (see Figure 8).

**Figure 8**: Scores on basic sexual knowledge scale as a function of offender group.
Table 15: Ancova Univariate F Statistics (controlling for age) by Offender Groups for scores on the Basic Sexual Knowledge Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFENDER GROUP</th>
<th>RAPISTS</th>
<th>PROPERTY OFFENDERS</th>
<th>VIOLENT OFFENDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Sex Offenders</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>9.01 *</td>
<td>8.09 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapists</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Pairwise planned comparisons showed significant group differences for the child sex offender group compared with both the property offender $F (1, 195) = 9.01$, $p < .05$, and the violent offender groups $F (1, 195) = 8.09$, $p < .05$ (Table 15, Figure 8). This indicates that offenders in the child sex offender group had a level of basic sexual knowledge similar to offenders in the rapist group, and that this was significantly lower than the basic sexual knowledge of offenders in the property and violent offender groups.

The Basic Sexual Knowledge score for the rapist group while similar to that of the child sex offenders, was not significantly different from that of the other two offender groups. This can be accounted for by the difference in mean age between the rapist and the child sex offender groups, and the age difference adjusted for in the pairwise planned comparisons.
SELF REPORTED ATTRIBUTIONS

The open-ended section of both the Offence and the Sexual Arousal Questionnaires advised offenders that there were probably a number of causes of them committing the offence/becoming sexually aroused. They were then instructed to list what they believed the causes to be. All offenders offered a cause which they believed to be the cause of their offending and sexual arousal, and a number of offenders also offered additional causes which they considered to be of lesser importance. Only the cause that was considered by each offender to be the most important one was used in the analysis.

SELF REPORTED ATTRIBUTIONS FOR OFFENDING

The self reported attributions for offending were classified into the following categories:

1. Emotional Needs (sexual or violent, power, revenge, excitement [the buzz], or a need to be loved)
2. Material Needs
3. A combination of emotional and material needs
4. Situation, as expressed in "she was there"
5. Helping Others.

Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 54.9 \ p<.001$, rapist $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 32.0 \ p<.001$ and violent offender groups $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 46.2 \ p<.001$ were each compared with the property offender group on the Emotional Needs cause. Significant differences on this cause were also observed when the child sex offender group was compared with the rapist group $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 4.16 \ p<.05$. The child sex offender, rapist, and violent offender groups reported more often that the causes of their offending stemmed from Emotional Needs.
than the property offender group, and more offenders in the child offender group reported Emotional causes than offenders in the rapist group.

Table 16: Self Reported Attributions for Causes of Offending by Offender Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributions</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
<th>Total Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Needs</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional/Material Needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences resulted when the property offender group was compared with both the rapist $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 21.04, p < .001$ and violent offender groups $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 13.7 p < .001$ on the Material Needs cause.
No offenders in the child sex offender or the rapist group offered this as a cause for offending.

Results showed that more offenders in the property offender group reported Material Needs as being the main cause of their offending, than offenders in the other three groups. Only those in the property offender group offered causes which were a combination of Emotional and Material needs as causes for their offending (N = 22).

Significant differences were observed when the rapist group was compared with the child sex offender $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 6.03 \ p < .05$, and violent offender groups $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 7.84 \ p < .01$ on the Situation "she was there" cause. While a number of offenders in the rapist group saw the situation as being an important cause for their offending, very few offenders in the other two groups offered this as an important cause. There were no significant differences between groups on the Helping Others cause.

The majority of offenders (130, 65%) reported Emotional Needs as being the cause of their offending (Table 16, Appendix E).

**SELF REPORTED ATTRIBUTIONS FOR SEXUAL AROUSAL**

The self reported attributions for sexual arousal were classified into the following categories:

1. Characteristics of Women (bodies, faces, personalities)
2. Characteristics of Children (immature male or female bodies)
3. Internal Urges (sexual urges, and urges for care/comfort)
4. External Urges (sexual urges stemming from external sources)
5. Adult Sex Material (books, videos).
Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender group was compared with the rapist \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 58.34 \ p<.001 \), property offender \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 79.47 \ p<.001 \), and violent offender groups \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 84.72 \ p<.001 \) on the Characteristics of Women cause. Only three offenders in the child offender group reported this as a cause for their sexual arousal, whereas the majority of offenders in the other three groups reported this as being the main cause of their sexual arousal.

Only men in the child sex offenders' group offered Characteristics of Children as the cause of their sexual arousal (N = 19).

**Table 17:** Self Reported Attributions for Causes of Sexual Arousal by Offender Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Group</th>
<th>Attributions</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
<th>Total Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of Women</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of Children 3-14 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Urges</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Urges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Sex Material</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant differences were observed when the child sex offender group was compared to the rapist group $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 13.0, P < .001$ on the Internal or External Urges cause. No offenders in the property offender or violent offender groups offered this as a cause of their sexual arousal. Internal Urges were reported only by child sex offenders ($N = 22$), and external urges were reported only by rapists ($N = 5$).

There were no significant differences between groups on the Adult Sex Material cause.

Nearly all offenders (144, 96%) in the rapist, property, and violent offender groups reported Characteristics of Women as the cause of their becoming sexually aroused. The child sex offender group reported Internal Urges and Characteristics of Children (41, 82%) as being the main causes for their sexual arousal (Table 17, Appendix F).

**OFFENDERS' SELF REPORTED EXPERIENCES**

**PERSONAL EXPERIENCES**

**Alcohol Use**
One hundred and sixty six (83%) offenders drank alcohol (child sex offenders 38, 76%; rapists 43, 86%; property offenders 42, 84%; and violent offenders 43, 86%). Chi-square tests showed no significant differences across groups $\chi^2 (3, N = 200) = 2.40$ n.s.

**Drug Use**
One hundred and thirty three (67%) offenders had used drugs (child sex offenders 10, 20%; rapists 37, 74%; property offenders 43, 86%; and violent
offenders 43, 86%). Chi-square showed significant differences across groups \(\chi^2 (3, N = 200) = 66.86, p < .001\). Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender group was compared with the other three groups: rapist \(\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 27.13, p < .001\); property offenders \(\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 41.1, p < .001\); and violent offenders \(\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 41.1, p < .001\). The rapists, property and violent offenders used drugs to a greater extent than the child sex offenders.

**Present Medical Problems**

Forty five (23%) of the 200 offenders had medical problems (child sex offenders 18, 36%; rapists 8, 16%; property offenders 13, 26%; violent offenders 6, 12%), and chi-square tests showed significant differences \(\chi^2 (3, N = 200) = 9.94, p < .01\). Tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender group was compared with rapists \(\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 4.2, p < .05\), and violent offenders \(\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 6.63, p < .01\). More child sex offenders than either rapists or violent offenders had medical problems in the following categories: asthma, arthritis, physical deformity, and heart problems.

**Present Psychological Problems**

Fifty two (26%) of the 200 offenders had psychological problems (child sex offenders 19, 38%; rapists 12, 24%; property offenders 9, 18%; violent offenders 12, 24%), such as anxiety, depression, and not being able to control temper or sexual urges. However, chi-square tests showed no significant differences across groups \(\chi^2 (3, N = 200) = 5.61, n.s.\)

**Teenage and Adult Peer Interaction**

Social interactions were divided into three categories: withdrawn, some friends, socially active. Chi-square tests showed no significant differences across groups for either teenage peer interaction \(\chi^2 (6, N = 200) = 4.55 > .05\), or adult peer interaction \(\chi^2 (6, N = 200) = 3.78, n.s.\)
Sport
One hundred and seven (54%) offenders participated in sport (child sex offenders 12, 24%; rapists 31, 62%; property offenders 33, 66%; violent offenders 31, 62%). Chi-square tests showed significant differences across groups $\chi^2 (3, N = 200) = 23.52, p < .001$. Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender group was compared to the other three groups: rapists $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 13.22, p < .001$, property offenders $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 15.6, p < .001$, and violent offenders $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 13.22, p < .001$. The rapist, property offender, and violent offender groups played more sport than the child sex offender group.

Hobbies
Sixty two (31%) offenders participated in hobbies (child sex offenders 15, 30%; rapists 16, 32%; property offenders 15, 30%; violent offenders 16, 32%). Chi-square tests showed no significant differences across groups $\chi^2 (3, N = 200) = .10$ n.s.

Caregivers During Childhood
People who cared for offenders until they were the age of twelve were divided into the following four categories, (numbers of offenders shown): two caregivers (137, 69%), one parent (43, 21%), several caregivers (8, 4%), and social welfare homes (12, 6%). Chi-square tests showed no significant differences across groups $\chi^2 (9, N = 200) = 13.66$ n.s.

Sexual Abuse During Childhood
Thirty (15%) of the 200 offenders had been sexually abused as children (child sex offenders 13, 26%; rapists 6, 12%; property offenders 6, 12%; violent offenders 5, 10%), and Chi-square tests showed no significant differences across groups $\chi^2 (3, N = 200) = 6.43$ n.s.
Mental Abuse During Childhood
Thirty (15%) of the 200 offenders had been mentally abused (prolonged ridicule, constantly being put down, or regularly informed that they were unwanted) as children (child sex offenders 4, 8%; rapists 10, 20%; property offenders 8, 16%; violent offenders 8, 16%), and Chi-square tests showed no significant differences across groups \( \chi^2 (3, N = 200) = 2.98 \) n.s.

Physical Abuse During Childhood
Sixty one (31%) of the 200 offenders had been physically abused (punishment that resulted in burns, broken bones, or hospitalisation for injuries) as children (child sex offenders 8, 16%; rapists 14, 28%; property offenders 19, 38%; violent offenders 20, 40%), and Chi-square tests showed significant differences across groups \( \chi^2 (3, N = 200) = 8.56 \) \( p < .05 \). Results from chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender was compared to both property offenders \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 5.07 \) \( p < .05 \) and violent offenders \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 6.0 \) \( p < .05 \). Both the property offender and the violent offender groups had experienced more physical abuse than the child sex offender group.

EXPERIENCES ASSOCIATED WITH OFFENDING

Offence Planning
Offence planning was divided into four categories:

1. Impulsive
2. Partially planned after encounter with victim or property
3. Planned before encounter with victim or property
4. Detailed prior planning and particular victim or property sought

Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender group was compared with the rapist \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 9.55 \)
\[ p < .01, \text{ and violent offender groups } \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 23.12 \quad p < .001, \text{ and when the property offender group was compared with the rapist } \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 8.24 \quad p < .01, \text{ and the violent offender groups } \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 26.24 \quad p < .001 \]
on the Impulsive category. Rapists and violent offenders reported Impulsive behaviour more than child sex offenders and property offenders.

On the Planned after Victim or Property Encountered category significant differences were shown when the child sex offender group was compared with the violent offender group \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 7.77 \quad p < .01 \). More child sex offenders planned their offence after they encountered the victim than offenders in the violent offender group. There was no difference across groups on the Planned before Victim or Property Encountered category.

**Table 18:** Nature of Offence Planning by Offender Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Planning</th>
<th>Offender Group</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
<th>Total Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned After Encounter</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Before Encounter</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the Detailed Prior Planning category significant differences were shown when the property offender group was compared with the rapist $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 8.68 \ p < .01$, and violent offender groups $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 10.56 \ p < .01$. More property offenders planned their offences in detail than offenders in the rapist and violent offender groups.

Eighty-six (43%) offenders reported that their offence had resulted from Impulsive behaviour. The next highest category was Planned after Victim Encountered (60, 30%). These two categories covered (146, 73%) of the responses, and show that the majority of offenders do not take time to plan their offences (Table 18).

**What Offenders Gained from Offending**

What offenders gained from offending was classified into the following categories:

1. Nothing Gained
2. Emotional Gain
3. Material Gain

Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender group was compared with the rapist group $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 7.04 \ p < .01$ on the Nothing Gained category. More rapists reported gaining nothing from their offence than offenders in the child sex offender group.

Significant differences resulted when the property offender group was compared with the child sex offender $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 39.45 \ p < .001$, rapist $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 14.33 \ p < .001$, and violent offender groups $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 23.58 \ p < .001$ on the Emotional Gain category. Fewer offenders in the property offender group reported Emotional Gain from their offending than offenders in the other three groups. There was also a significant difference between the child sex offender and the rapist group on Emotional Gain $\chi^2 (1,$
N = 100) = 7.04 p < .01. Fewer offenders in the rapist group reported Emotional Gain compared to those in the child sex offender group.

Table 19: Nature of Main Gain from Offending by Offender Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gain From Offending</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
<th>Total Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No child sex offenders or rapists reported Material Gain from their offending. Significant differences were shown when the property offender group was compared with the violent offender group $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 25.2 p < .001$ on the material gain category. The property offender group reported more Material Gain than the other three groups.

Ninety four (47%) offenders reported Emotional Gain from their offending, and seventy six (38%) reported gaining Nothing from their offending. Therefore, the majority of offenders (170, 85%) reported Emotional Gain or Nothing Gained from their offending (Table 19).
Offenders' Expectation of Getting Caught

Offenders' preoffence expectation of getting caught was classified into the following categories:

1. Did Not Think
2. No Chance
3. Some Chance
4. Certain

Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the property offender group was compared with the child sex offender \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 6.05 \ p < .05 \), rapist \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 31.68 \ p < .001 \), and violent offender groups \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 14.53 \ p < .001 \) on the Did Not Think category. More offenders in the child sex offender, rapist, and violent offender groups Did Not Think about the possibility of getting caught.

On the Some Chance of getting caught category there were significant differences when the property offender group was compared with the child sex offender \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 5.04 \ p < .05 \), rapist \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 23.25 \ p < .001 \), and violent offender groups \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 11.25 \ p < .001 \). More property offenders reported that prior to their offending they thought there was some chance they would get caught. There were no differences across groups on the No Chance and Certain would get caught categories. The majority of offenders (114, 57%) did not think about getting caught prior to their offending (Table 20).
Table 20: Summary of each Offender Group’s Preoffence Expectation of Getting Caught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of being Caught</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
<th>Total Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Think</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No chance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Chance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitude when Caught
The offenders' attitude when they were caught was classified into the following categories:

1. Welcomed Getting Caught
2. Worried
3. Not Worried
4. Angry

No violent offenders reported Welcoming Getting Caught. Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender group
was compared with the rapist group $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 6.73, p < .01$, and nearly reached significance with the property offender group. Offenders in the child sex offender group Welcomed Getting Caught more than offenders in the other three groups.

Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender group was compared with the property $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 5.78, p < .05$, and violent offender groups $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 7.92, p < .01$, and when the rapist group was compared with the property $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 5.78, p < .05$, and violent offender groups $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 7.92, p < .01$ on the Worried category. More child sex offenders and rapists were Worried when they were caught.

Table 21: Summary of each Offender Group's Attitude on Being Caught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude on being Caught</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
<th>Total Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcomed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Worried</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the Not Worried when they were caught category significant differences were shown when the child sex offender group was compared with the rapist \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 5.66 \ p < .05 \), property offender \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 18.29 \ p < .001 \), and violent offender groups \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 24.56 \ p < .001 \), and when the rapist group was compared with the violent offender group \( \chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 7.33 \ p < .01 \). More property and violent offenders were Not Worried when they were caught. There were no significant differences across groups on the feeling Angry category.

Overall, more offenders (92, 46%) reported feeling Worried when they were caught than any other emotion. One hundred and eight (54%) reported feeling either Not Worried, Angry, or Welcomed being caught (Table 21).

**EXPERIENCES AND COGNITIONS ASSOCIATED WITH SEX**

**Age of first sexual intercourse**

This category of self reported responses was analysed by ANOVA. Of the 200 inmates two inmates had not experienced sexual intercourse, one was in the child sex offender group, and the other in the property offender group.

Results from an analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed a significant group effect for age of first sexual intercourse \( F (3, 194) = 12.2 \ p < .001 \). In this post hoc analysis Scheffé individual comparisons of pairs of means indicated significant differences when the child sex offender group was compared with the rapist \( F (3, 194) = 15.02 \ p < .01 \), property offender \( F (3, 194) = 26.31 \ p < .01 \), and violent offender groups \( F (3, 194) = 26.48 \ p < .01 \). Offenders in the child sex offender group were older when they experienced their first sexual intercourse than offenders in the other three groups.
Sexual Concerns

Ninety nine (50%) of the 200 offenders reported that they had sexual concerns. The sexual concerns of offenders were classified into the following categories:

1. No Sexual Concerns
2. Sexual Dysfunctions
3. Gender Problems
4. Sexual Deviations
5. Sexual Needs Not Met
6. Ruminative Thinking (worries related to sexual performance, pleasing partner, or general concerns about sexual intercourse).

Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender group was compared with the rapist $\chi^2(1, N = 100) = 4.13 \ p < .05$, property $\chi^2(1, N = 100) = 10.28 \ p < .01$, and violent offender groups $\chi^2(1, N = 100) = 5.87 \ p < .05$ on the No Sexual Concerns category.

More offenders in the child sex offender group had Sexual Concerns, child sex offender 35, 70%; rapist 24, 48%; property offender 18, 36%; and violent offender group 22, 44%. However, chi-square tests of independence did not show any differences between groups on the different categories of Sexual Concerns (Table 22). Only seven of the ninety-nine offenders who expressed Sexual Concerns had sought professional help (child sex offenders 6, and violent offenders 1).
### Table 22: Summary of Current Sexual Concerns by Offender Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Sexual Concerns</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
<th>Total Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Sexual Concerns</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Dysfunctions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Deviations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Needs Not Met</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruminative Thinking</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sexual Values**

Seventy six (38%) of the 200 offenders reported having clear values associated with sexual relationships (child sex offenders 13, 26%; rapists 16, 32%; property offenders 23, 46%; violent offenders 24, 48%). The values were (number of offenders shown): loyalty (42), cleanliness (12), willing partner (18), and must
be in control (4). However, chi-square tests showed no significant differences across the groups $\chi^2 (3, N = 200) = 7.3 \text{ n.s.}$

**Sexual attractiveness**

Sixty two (31%) of the 200 offenders did not consider they were sexually attractive (child sex offenders 21, 42%; rapists 18, 36%; property offenders 12, 24%; violent offenders 11, 22%). They stated the following problems too fat (21), tattoos (11) and ugly and small penis size (30). Chi-square tests showed no significant differences across groups $\chi^2 (3, N = 200) = 6.45 \text{ n.s.}$

**Sexual Fantasies**

Sexual fantasies was classified into the following themes:

1. Sex with Children
2. Sex with one Adult
3. Group Sex
4. Sex with Two Women
5. Sex with both Children and Adults

Chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender group was compared with the rapist group $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 29.22 \ p < .001$ on the Sex with Children fantasy. No offenders in the property offender or violent offender groups offered this as a sexual fantasy. Results showed that more child sex offenders ($N = 26$) than rapists ($N = 1$) and no offenders in the other two groups offered this as their favourite sexual fantasy.

No offenders in the child sex offenders group offered sexual fantasies of Sex with one Adult. Offenders in the rapist ($N = 15$), property offender ($N = 20$), and violent offender groups ($N = 20$) offered Sex with one Adult as their favourite sexual fantasy.
Table 23: Summary of each Offender Group’s Favoured Sexual Fantasies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Fantasies</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
<th>Total Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex with Children</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex with One Adult</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex with Two Women</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex with Adults and Children</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant differences were observed when the child sex offender group was compared with the rapist $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 3.86 \ p < .05$, property offender $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 7.68 \ p < .01$, and violent offender groups $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 5.65 \ p < .05$ on the Sex with Two Women fantasy. A greater number of rapists, property offenders and violent offenders than child sex offenders offered this as
their favourite fantasy. There were no significant differences across groups on the Group Sex fantasy.

Only offenders in the child sex offenders group offered sexual fantasies of Sex with both Children and Adults (N = 16).

No offenders in the child sex offender group offered sexual fantasies of Bondage. Offenders in the rapist (N = 10), property offender (N = 6), and violent offender groups (N = 6) offered Bondage as their favourite fantasy.

One hundred and thirty five (90%) offenders in the rapist, property, and violent offender groups reported their favourite sexual fantasy as being adult sex with one partner, with two partners, or group sex. Forty two (84%) offenders in the child sex offender group reported sexual fantasies of sex with children or both sex with children and adults (Table 23).

**Previous sexual diseases**

Eighty four of the 200 inmates had previously experienced sexual diseases (child sex offenders 13; rapists 21; property offenders 23; violent offenders 27), and chi-square tests showed significant differences across groups $\chi^2 (3, N = 200) = 8.54 \ p < .05$. Results from chi-square tests of independence showed significant differences when the child sex offender group was compared with the violent offender group $\chi^2 (1, N = 100) = 7.04 \ p < .01$. More offenders in the violent offender group had experienced sexual diseases.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate four groups of criminal offenders' causal attributions related to their offending, their sexual arousal and sexual behaviour. The offenders' own perceptions of their personal characteristics, life experiences, and how these cognitions contributed to the initiation of their criminal behaviour was also investigated. It was considered that a knowledge of such information would enhance the understanding of the motivating factors for four categories of crime. This, in turn, would indicate the nature of the attribution dimension changes that may be necessary in the rehabilitation of these offenders.

Each offender group will be considered in turn, combining discussion of their attributions for offending as ascertained from the structured questionnaires with their self reported attributions. This will be followed by a discussion of the offenders' attributions for their sexual arousal. Next, other information concerned with their offending, their sexual behaviour, and the personal characteristics and life experiences of each offender group will be discussed. This will be followed by an integration of the attributions and personal characteristics in terms of their implications for offending. Finally, the significance of the outcomes of the present study's attributional analyses of criminal behaviour, and how such information may be used to change offenders' decisions to commit further crimes will be considered. Possible directions for future research will also be proposed.
OFFENDER GROUPS' ATTRIBUTIONS AND SELF REPORTED EXPERIENCES

CHILD SEX OFFENDERS

Attributions
The prediction that the child sex offender group would attribute their offending behaviour to *internal*/*stable/uncontrollable* causes was clearly supported by the results from the structured questionnaire. There were significant differences on all three attributional dimensions when they were compared with both the rapist and the property offender groups, and as predicted there was no difference between the child sex offender and the violent offender groups. A number of researchers have reported that child sex offenders experience impulsive thoughts, and compulsive urges to carry out sexually deviant behaviour, and that the urges can become uncontrollable (Abel & Rouleau, 1990; Pithers, Kashima, Cumming & Beal, 1988; Quinsey & Earls, 1990). Also, Pithers (1990) commented on the addictive quality of their offending behaviour. These researchers did not carry out an analysis of the attribution dimensions of child sex offending, and while the results from the present study support their findings, the present results also offer the underlying dimensional meanings for the offending behaviour.

During the clinical interview the majority of child sex offenders (45, 90%) reported emotional needs (*internal*) as being the cause of their offending, and the need to be loved or wanted (*stable/uncontrollable*) was reported more often than sexual needs (Table 16). It was evident in discussions with these offenders that they considered these emotional needs to be of paramount importance for their psychological well-being. Some described *stable* and *uncontrollable* impulses, urges, and yearnings either associated with needs to be physically close, cuddled, or to be wanted. Others described sexually arousing physical characteristics of young children as being a primary
motivating force for their offending (Appendix E), and they considered these to be **internal, stable, and uncontrollable**. Therefore members of this offender group fell into one of two distinct sub-groups. One sub-group had psychological needs to be accepted, and the other with sexual needs. Regardless of whether they reported emotional needs or the sexual characteristics of young children as being the causes of their offending, both groups attributed these causes to **internal, stable, and uncontrollable** dimensions.

Those with needs to be accepted considered that children provided a vehicle for these psychological needs because they viewed children as people unlikely to put them down or reject them, and assumed that the child would respond in a positive manner. They did, however, pursue their goal of acceptance, closeness, or to be loved irrespective of the child’s response. Groth, Hobson, and Gary (1982), Salter (1988), and Marshall and Eccles (1991) have commented that child sex offenders convert non-sexual problems into sexual behaviour, and the view held by these offenders that children would respond in a positive manner to their sexual advances is consistent with the findings of Stermac and Segal (1989).

With respect to the "sexual needs" subgroup, these child sex offenders’ attention appeared to be totally focused on their own sexual needs, and also they did not appear to consider the child’s reaction to their sexual advances. This "sexual needs" group of child sex offenders expressed sexual attraction to children’s immature bodies has been documented by many other researchers (Abel, Becker, & Cunningham-Rathner, 1984; Knopp, 1986; Langevin, 1985; Salter, 1988). Hence, there was general agreement between the structured and self-reported parts of the study as to the attributions by child sex offenders for their criminal behaviour.

The child sex offenders’ offences are sexual in nature, therefore their sexual arousal is a necessary component of their offending, and it is appropriate to consider it at this point. Researchers have identified differences between child
sex offenders and other men in their attitude and beliefs concerning their own sexuality (Marshall & Eccles, 1990; Salter, 1988). It has also been noted that child sex offenders experience high amounts of sexual anxiety (Araji & Finkelhor, 1985), and experience problems relating to adult females (Tingle, Barnard & Robbins, 1986). The present study offers support, for the idea that child sex offenders experience difficulties relating emotionally to adult women, and develops the view that they differ from other men concerning aspects of their sexuality.

The child sex offender group attributed their sexual arousal to **internal/stable/uncontrollable** causes, and this was significantly different from the attributions of the other three offender groups. There were also significant differences when this group was compared with the other three offender groups on the self reported causes of their own sexual arousal. Thus, just as the child sex offender group’s attributions for the causes of their offending made them appear as a distinct group that contrasted with the other offender groups, the same was true regarding their attributions for the causes of their sexual arousal. A substantial proportion (22, 44%) reported **internal** urges for closeness, to be loved, or for sexual gratification (Table 17, Appendix F). They considered that they experienced these urges most of the time (**stable**), and they did not feel they had control over them (**uncontrollable**). Others described physical characteristics of children (19, 38%), as being a cause of their sexual arousal. For example, children’s small bottoms, children’s thin legs, hairless bodies, and both male and female prepubescent bodies were arousing (Appendix F). Again, they saw these causes as stemming from within them (**internal**), being invariable (**stable**), and out of their control (**uncontrollable**). Other researchers have also noted that child sex offenders feel compelled by urges to carry out sexually deviant behaviours (Knopp, 1986; Johnston, 1987; Quinsey, 1986). Three of these offenders (6%) described the physical characteristics of women as causing their sexual arousal, and six (12%) reported in a similar manner for pornographic material involving children.
Child sex offenders' self reports attributed the causes of sexual arousal primarily to urges or the sexual characteristics of children, and the structured questionnaire showed that both these causes were attributed to **internal, stable, and uncontrollable** dimensions. Moreover, those causes which child sex offenders saw as bringing about their sexual arousal were those seen as leading them to commit sexual offences. They had an unremitting urge to satisfy an emotional need, and for diverse reasons, children within a sexual role provided the only means to satisfy that need.

**Self reported experiences**

Focusing on the personal experiences of the child sex offenders, there was no difference across groups concerning the number and type of people who had cared for them during their childhood. Nor were there any significant differences when the groups were compared on their experiences of sexual or mental abuse as children. Thirteen child sex offenders (26%) had experienced sexual abuse during their childhood, and four (8%) reported having experienced mental abuse (prolonged ridicule, constantly being put down, or regularly being informed that they were unwanted). However, there was a significant difference when this group was compared with property and violent offenders in terms of their experiences of physical abuse during childhood. Fewer child sex offenders (8, 16%) had experienced physical abuse during their childhood (punishment that resulted in burns, broken bones, or hospitalisation for injuries). Researchers are not consistent in their reporting of the incidence of sexual or physical abuse experienced by child sex offenders in their childhood (Bard, Carter, Cerce, Knight, Rosenberg, & Schneider, 1987; Hunter, Childers, Gerald, & Esmaili, 1990; Knopp, 1986; Salter, 1988), and it would appear that no studies have investigated the incidence of mental abuse in the childhood of these offenders. Furthermore, there does not appear to be data on the incidence of sexual, mental or physical childhood abuse in men who are not criminal offenders.
There was no significant difference across groups when child sex offenders' teenage and adult peer interactions were assessed. Nor were there significant differences across groups concerning the use of alcohol. However, there was a significant difference across groups concerning the use of drugs. Offenders in the rapist, property offender and violent offender group used drugs to a greater extent than the offenders in the child sex offender group. These findings are in agreement with Fiqia, Lang, Plutchik, and Holden, (1987)

There was a significant difference when the child sex offender group was compared with the rapist and violent offender groups concerning the number of offenders who were experiencing medical problems. More child sex offenders (18, 36%) were experiencing asthma, arthritis, heart problems, or had a physical deformity. There was no difference across groups concerning psychological problems experienced by offenders such as anxiety or depression. Fewer offenders in this group played sport than offenders in the other three groups, and this may have been because they suffered from a larger number of medical problems. They did not differ from the other three groups in their participation in hobbies.

Few child sex offenders (11, 22%) planned their offence in detail or planned their offence before they encountered the victim (Table 18), and many of those who did, described a history of previous sexual offending with other children. The majority of child sex offenders (34, 68%) either formulated ideas associated with the offence after they had seen a child whom they considered would meet their need to be accepted, or one who had the particular characteristics which they found sexually arousing, or they responded to their own urges or needs in an impulsive manner. However, these offenders were constrained, in that they offended only when they were alone with the victim. On the whole they did not give consideration to the fact that they may get caught (Table 20), and this is possibly related to the intense focus on their own emotional needs, and the impulsive nature of their offences. Similarly, Marlatt (1989) also observed that child sex offenders responded impulsively to opportunities for immediate
gratification with little concern for the consequences of their behaviour, and Pithers (1990) noted that the victims of child sex offending are sometimes selected in an opportunistic manner. Child sex offenders were not significantly different from the rapist or the violent offender group in these characteristics.

The majority of child sex offenders (37, 74%) reported obtaining emotional satisfaction from their offence, however 13 (26%) indicated that their emotional needs were not met, and they did not consider that there was any gain for them (Table 19). A similar proportion of the group (12, 24%) also reported that they welcomed getting caught, as they claimed they were experiencing feelings of guilt concerning their sexual behaviour with children (Table 21). Nevertheless, only one person voluntarily reported his behaviour to the authorities. It should be noted that analyses of the data showed that of the 13 (26%) who reported that their emotional needs were not met, and of the 12 (24%) who welcomed getting caught, only 40% were the same persons.

Significantly more offenders in the child sex offender group than the property and violent offender groups were worried when they were caught (Table 21). They appeared ashamed, and fearful, and these feelings are consistent with Weiner's contention that attributions to internal/stable/uncontrollable dimensions for behaviour that have a negative outcome (prison) can result in feelings of shame from the behaviour, and fear of further negative outcomes (Weiner, 1986). They were also very concerned about what other people in their community would think of their inappropriate sexual behaviour.

With respect to their sexual behaviour, the average age of offenders in this group when they first experienced sexual intercourse was significantly greater than for the other three groups, being at age 17 years, compared with 14 years in the other three groups. The range of ages in the child offender group tended to be greater than in the other three groups (12-29 years compared with rapists 10-25 years, property offenders 10-19 years, and violent offenders 10-21 years).
Other differences were also evident. For example there was a significant difference between the child sex offender group and the other three groups of offenders on the Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour scale indicating that child sex offenders experienced greater difficulties in controlling their sexual behaviour. This was consistent with their earlier emphasis on urges as a basis for their offending, and also their responses on the causality dimensions scale that they could not control their sexual arousal (uncontrollable). They also repressed their sexual behaviour to a greater extent than offenders in the property and violent offender groups, and lacked basic sexual knowledge to a greater extent than both the property and violent offenders. Child sex offenders’ propensity to repress their sexual behaviour, and their lack of basic sexual knowledge has been previously reported (Knopp, 1986; Marshall, Earls, Segal, & Darke, 1983; Marshall & Eccles, 1991). The combination of a high score on the Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour and Repression of Sexual Behaviour scales, and a low score on the Basic Sexual Knowledge scale would result in feelings of a constant lack of personal control over their sexual behaviour and attributions to internal, stable, and uncontrollable dimensions.

There were no significant differences across groups concerning the offenders’ own perception of whether they were sexually attractive or not. However, nearly half (21, 42%) of the child sex offenders perceived themselves as not being sexually attractive and they reported the following reasons: too fat, ugly, and small penis size. There were also no significant differences across groups in the sexual values offenders reported, and only 13 (26%) of the offenders in this group identified sexual values, and they were related to cleanliness, and loyalty. Significantly fewer offenders in the child sex offender group than those in the violent offender group had previously experienced a sexual disease.

No significant differences were evident across groups on the number of sexual concerns reported. However, a large number (35, 70%) of child sex offenders reported sexual concerns. The majority of these were their sexual deviancy, their sexual dysfunctions, or their ruminative thinking associated with sex. A
smaller number felt that their sexual needs were not being met, and two considered they had problems associated with gender uncertainty (Table 22). It was noteworthy that only six (12%) child sex offenders had sought help for the sexual problems about which they were concerned.

No known studies have considered child sex offenders' own perceptions of whether they consider themselves sexually attractive, or what sexual concerns they have. In this study nearly half of them viewed themselves as sexually unattractive, and nearly three quarters of them had sexual concerns which had not been successfully addressed by professionals. These unresolved sexual problems were viewed by offenders as internal, stable, and uncontrollable, and these problems are likely to be a deterrent and a hindrance to their seeking or forming intimate relationships with adult females.

The child sex offender group differed significantly from the other three groups concerning the sexual fantasies which they enjoyed experiencing (Table 23). They preferred fantasies of having sex with children (26, 52%), or sex with both children and adults (16, 32%). Sixteen percent of the offenders in this group reported adult fantasies of sex with two women (6, 12%), or group sex (2, 4%). Differences between child sex offenders and non sex offenders' sexual fantasies have been identified by Rokach, Nutbrown and Nexhipi (1988), and the importance of child sex offenders' sexual fantasies involving children has been documented as an important factor in maintaining their deviant sexual behaviour (Abel, Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, Rouleau, Kaplan & Reich, 1984; Langevin, 1985; Salter, 1988).

Profile of child sex offenders in this study
When he is sentenced the child sex offender tends to be older than offenders in three other offender groups. He attributes the causes of his offending to internal/stable/uncontrollable dimensions. The causes he offers are either needs of wanting to be accepted, or sexual needs. Similarly he attributes the causes of his sexual arousal (internal urges to seek acceptance, or an
uncontrollable response to the seen physical characteristics of children) to internal/stable/uncontrollable dimensions. Therefore, he has strong needs to feel loved and wanted, and experiences urges to satisfy these needs which he feels compelled to do through sexual contact with children.

He usually plans offences after he has encountered a victim, and does not think about the possibility of getting caught. He usually experiences an emotional gain from offending. When he gets caught he is ashamed, fearful, and worried about how others will judge him.

The child sex offender tends to be older than other offending groups when he first experiences sexual intercourse. He fantasises about sex with children, and sometimes sex with adults together with children. He has difficulty controlling his sexual behaviour, tends to repress his sexuality, and does not have a good basic sexual knowledge. He has sexual concerns usually associated with either his perceived sexual deviancy, or he suffers from sexual dysfunctions, and he perceives himself as being sexually unattractive.

On the whole he has not experienced sexual, mental or physical abuse as a child, he has had medical problems, and does not play sport or use drugs.

RAPISTS

Attributions
The prediction that rapists would attribute their offending behaviour to internal/unstable/controllable causes was supported on the stability and controllability dimensions but not on the locus dimension. Results showed they attributed offending behaviour to external/unstable/controllable causes. A number of offenders (36, 72%) in this group reported their emotional need for sexual gratification as being the cause of their offending. A smaller number (13, 26%) reported their offence resulted because they had been sexually aroused,
and a woman whom they considered acceptable to have sexual intercourse with had been accessible (Table 16, Appendix E). Surprisingly, offenders viewed both these causes as being external, unstable, and controllable.

Sexual gratification was clearly the dominant self-reported reason why rapists in this experimental group offended. A large proportion of them gave no consideration to the woman’s concerns, as they were solely interested in meeting their own needs, and forceful or violent behaviour on their part to satisfy these needs appeared to have been acceptable. A number of other rapists ultimately sought sexual gratification but somehow saw the woman as being responsible for their offending as expressed in “she was there”. Further, as these rapists had considered her acceptable to them for sexual intercourse, they also considered she must have viewed them as an acceptable sexual partner. These findings offer support for the role of cognitive factors in rape (Lipton, McDonel, & McFall, 1987). Clearly these men misinterpreted the women’s views of them as sexual partners, and misconstrued the cues in the situation. While this sub-group of rapists’ behaviour was forceful, the violence was not overt, and instead they used manipulative behaviour - for example, telling the woman they loved her, everything would be alright, and they would not harm her. This behaviour was not unlike that of college students who admitted to having forced sexual intercourse (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisnieski, 1987).

It is interesting that while these offenders recognise that they offend to satisfy an urge for sexual gratification (internal), they see the cause as not being something within themselves but externalise it to the (female body) stimulus that brought about the urge (external). These results appear to be at variance with the opinion that rape is motivated by the desire for power and control (Darke, 1990; Groth, 1979; Langevin, 1985; Segal & Stermac, 1990). However, they are compatible with findings that a desire for sexual gratification is a relevant mediator for rapists, that some rapists sexually arouse themselves prior to the rape, and that rapists consider they are justified in meeting their sexual desires.
regardless of the harm to the victim (Marshall & Barbaree, 1984; Palmer, 1988; Scully & Marolla, 1985; Scutt, 1990).

In this study, the rapists focused on meeting their own sexual needs, while assuming the victim would view them as an acceptable sexual partner. Other researchers have also noted that rapists are consumed with self interest and after the crime show little empathy with their victims (Burt, 1983; Shapcott, 1988). There was some similarity with the child sex offenders who in the conduct of their crime also sought to satisfy their needs regardless of the victim’s responses. However, while in the initiation of the offence the child sex offenders sought a weak child who would not reject them, the rapists chose to believe in the willingness of their adult victim.

As with the child sex offenders there is a sexual component to the rapist’s offending, in that overt sexual arousal is necessary for their offending. They attributed their sexual arousal to external/unstable/controllable causes, and this was significantly different from the child sex offender group. The majority of rapists in the present study (42, 84%) reported that they became sexually aroused in response to external stimuli such as women’s bodies, personalities, or sexy clothes, and these responses are similar to that of the property and violent offender groups (Table 17, Appendix F). Previous studies using phallometric assessment have yielded similar results. For example, data from Baxter, Marshall, Barbaree, Davidson, and Malcolm (1984), and Murphy, Krisak, Stalgaitis, and Anderson (1984) showed that rapists and non-rapists did not differ in terms of their sexual preference.

Self reported experiences
As previously discussed there were no significant differences across offender groups on personal experiences such as caregivers in childhood, or experiences of sexual or mental abuse in childhood. Nor did the rapist group experience significantly more or less instances of physical abuse in their childhood. They were not significantly different from the other groups
concerning teenage and adult peer interactions, alcohol use, psychological problems or participation in hobbies. They used drugs more than the child sex offender group, played sport more, and had fewer medical problems.

Only nine (18%) of the rapists planned their offence in detail or partially planned the offence before they encountered their victim. A larger number of offenders in this group (27, 54%) offended in an impulsive manner, and a smaller number planned the offence after the victim had been encountered (14, 28%) (Table 18). Either these responses were inconsistent with their reports that the causes of their offending were controllable, or, in the rape situations they chose not to exercise control. Marshall, Earls, Segal, and Darke (1983) have suggested that rapists do not care to control their behaviour. It would appear the rapists in this study considered they were responding to external stimuli, and this is in agreement with the claim by Prentky and Knight (1986) that the behaviour of rapists who offend in an impulsive manner can be determined by situational events. A number of offenders in the rapist group (27, 54%) reported that they gained nothing from their offending, which made them significantly different from the child sex offender group. The rest of the group reported emotional gain from their offending (Table 19).

On the whole rapists did not consider the possibility that they would get caught, and this was similar to the child sex and violent offender groups (Table 20). While the same number (27, 54%) of rapists who offended impulsively gained nothing (Tables 18 & 19), only (52%) of these offenders were the same persons. The majority of offenders were worried when they were caught, and this was significantly different from the property and violent offender groups (Table 21). The source of worry for some appeared to be related to their perception that their behaviour was not criminal, and they had not considered that the victim would view their behaviour as criminal. Similar responses from rapists have been recorded by Shapcott (1988). Some men in the present study expressed self pity, and anger towards their victim for having reported the offence. Others indicated feelings of guilt that they had not exerted control over
their behaviour. The emotion of guilt was compatible with Weiner’s proposition that attributions to external/controllable dimensions for behaviour with a negative outcome (prison) result in feelings of guilt. As a group, a few of the concerned offenders less clearly fitted Weiner’s model, as they expressed feelings of self pity and anger (with external/controllable attributions). This is explained by their perception that, in this case they had lost control over themselves (hence pity), or the victim had behaved in a manner the offender did not consider appropriate (anger) (Weiner 1986). A small number (11, 22%) were not worried about being caught.

The rapists in the present study reported becoming sexually aroused in response to a number of different aspects of adult women (external) that could vary over time (unstable), and they also reported that they considered they were in control of their sexual arousal. Three (6%) of them reported becoming sexually aroused as a result of adult sex material, and five (10%) reported sexual arousal in response to urges which they considered to emanate from external stimuli (Table 17).

The average age when rapists in this study first experienced sexual intercourse (14 years) was significantly lower than that age for offenders in the child sex offender group. There was a significant difference between the rapist group and the other three groups on the Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour scale, and it was shown that the rapists experienced greater difficulty than the property or violent offender groups in controlling their sexual behaviour, but that they were able to control their sexual behaviour to a greater extent than child sex offenders. These findings are in contrast with the rapists’ responses to the causal dimension scales of sexual arousal where they reported having control over their sexual arousal. Perhaps they felt they could control whether they became sexually aroused or not but once arousal was evident they could not control the subsequent sexual behaviour, or they actively decided not to control their behaviour. Results from the Repression of Sexuality Scale showed that offenders in the rapist group were not significantly different from the other three
groups, nor did they differ significantly from the other three groups on the Basic Sexual Knowledge scale.

Eighteen (36%) of the offenders in the rapist group considered themselves not to be sexually attractive, and the majority of them considered themselves to be ugly. Sixteen (32%) reported having sexual values of cleanliness and loyalty. A number of them (24, 48%) reported sexual concerns and the majority of their concerns were ruminative thinking associated with sex (Table 22). The majority of rapists reported sexual fantasies of adult sex with one partner, with two women, or group sex (39, 78%). A small number (10, 20%) reported fantasies of bondage with adult women, and one offender (2%) reported sexual fantasies of children (Table 23). This group was not significantly different from the others concerning the number of sexual diseases they had previously experienced.

On a number of aspects of their sexual behaviour the rapist group were similar to the property and violent offender groups. However, they reported less control over their sexual behaviour on the Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour scale, and this is at variance with their attributions to the controllable dimension on the Sexual Arousal causality dimensions scale.

Profile of rapists in this study
The rapist attributes the causes of his offending (being sexually attracted to a woman present, or the need for sexual gratification) to external/unstable/controllable dimensions. He attributes the causes of his sexual arousal (mainly the characteristics of women) to external/unstable/controllable dimensions.

While sometimes the rapist plans his offence after he has seen the victim, mostly he offends on impulse, which contrasts with his overall view that his behaviour is controllable. He does not consider the possibility of getting caught. Sometimes he gains nothing from his offence but other times he gains
emotionally. He is worried when he is caught, and his worry appears to stem from his not perceiving his behaviour as being a criminal offence.

He experiences difficulty in controlling his sexual behaviour, and he sometimes has sexual concerns, mostly ruminative thinking associated with sex. He fantasises about sex with adults. He did not experience sexual, mental, or physical abuse as a child. He plays sport, and uses drugs.

**PROPERTY OFFENDERS**

**Attributions**

There was support for the prediction that property offenders would attribute their offending to *external/unstable/controllable* causes. Significant differences were shown on all three dimensions when this group was compared with both the child sex offender and the violent offender groups. There was no significant difference between this group and the rapist group. Twenty-two (44%) of these offenders reported the cause of their offending was a combination of both emotional needs (excitement "the buzz"), and material needs, and they attributed both these causes to an *external* dimension. The next largest number (21, 42%) reported their offending resulted because of a need for material gain, and seven (14%) reported only emotional needs (excitement) (Table 16, Appendix E). Bennett and Wright (1984) also noted that property offenders reported excitement (kicks, fun, the charge, the thrill) as well as material gain as being the goals of their offending. In discussion with the offenders in this study, it was evident that the emotion they enjoyed ("the buzz") was experienced prior to or in the initial stages of the offending, whereas the material gain was an outcome from the offending.

The property offender group attributed their sexual arousal to *external/unstable/controllable* causes, and this was significantly different from the attributions of the child sex offender group. Forty-nine (98%) of these
offenders reported characteristics of women as being responsible for their sexual arousal, and they considered that different characteristics of women could result in them becoming sexually aroused depending on the occasion. Examples of the causes offered were: big breasts, legs with fish-net stockings, and long blonde hair. Only one (2%) reported adult sexual material as being the source of their sexual arousal (Table 17, Appendix F).

**Self reported experiences**

Property offenders were similar to violent offenders in that offenders in both these groups had experienced more physical abuse in their childhood than offenders in the child sex offender group. This group when compared with the child sex offender group used drugs and played sport more, and had significantly fewer medical problems.

Nearly half of the property offender group planned their offence either in detail (17, 34%) or partially planned the offence before they had encountered a suitable property (7, 14%) (Table 18). Significantly more offenders in the property offenders compared to the other groups planned their offence in detail, and this is consistent with results from the Bennett and Wright (1984) study where it was found that a over half of the burglars interviewed planned their offences. Fewer of the property offenders in this study acted impulsively than offenders in either the rapist or violent offender groups.

More than half of the property offenders (26, 52%) considered that there was some chance they would get caught for their offending, and this was significantly different from the rapist and the violent offender groups (Table 20). Although a large number of the property offenders reported expected emotional gains such as excitement or "the buzz" as being the reason why they chose to offend, very few of them (5, 10%) considered the transient excitement associated with their offending was a gain (Table 19). These responses are consistent with the notion that the excitement they sought was experienced early in the offending, and therefore not viewed as an outcome of the offending.
During the interviews many property offenders likened "the buzz" associated with offending to that obtained from drug taking. As a result, "the buzz" may be short lived. The low number of property offenders reporting emotional gain was significantly different from the other three offender groups. Rather, the majority of the property offenders (45, 90%) either considered they had obtained material gain (27, 54%) or nothing (18, 36%).

Some property offenders (17, 34%) were worried when they were caught (Table 21), while 21 (42%) were not worried when they were caught. This level of response was similar to that of offenders in the violent offender group. The property offenders do not necessarily view the outcome of their behaviour (prison) as a negative consequence, but rather viewed imprisonment as a tolerable consequence. On the other hand, offenders who worried were reproachful about their offending, which is compatible with Weiner's attribution-emotional links (Weiner 1986).

Focusing on their sexual behaviour, the average age when property offenders in this study first experienced sexual intercourse was 14 years, similar to offenders in the rapist and violent offender group but significantly younger than offenders in the child sex offender group. This group differed significantly from offenders in both the child sex offender and the rapist groups on the Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour scale. Results showed that the property offenders considered they had more control over their sexual behaviour, and this is consistent with their responses on the causality dimensions of the Sexual Arousal Questionnaire where they reported having control over their sexual arousal. Results from the Repression of Sexuality scale showed the property offender group was significantly different from the child sex offender group in that they repressed their sexuality to a lesser degree. They also scored significantly higher on the Basic Sexual Knowledge scale than offenders in the child sex offender group.
A quarter (24%) of the property offenders did not consider they were sexually attractive, and this was not significantly different from the other three groups. Again there was no significant differences across groups on sexual values offered, and 23 (46%) of the property offenders reported sexual values. The majority (32, 64%) of offenders in this group did not have any sexual concerns, and those who did have sexual concerns reported primarily ruminative thoughts associated with sex (11, 22%) and a few (5, 10%) reported sexual dysfunctions (Table 22).

On the whole, property offenders did not repress their sexuality, they scored at the control end of the Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour scale, scored higher on the Basic Sexual Knowledge scale, and reported fewer sexual concerns than the other three offender groups. This led to their reporting personal control over their sexual behaviour, and attributions to external, unstable, controllable dimensions.

The majority of property offenders (44, 88%) reported sexual fantasies of adult sex (with one partner, two women, or group sex), and six (12%) reported sexual fantasies of bondage with adult women (Table 23). This was significantly different from offenders in the child sex offender group. This group was not significantly different from the others concerning the number of sexual diseases they had previously experienced.

**Profile of property offenders in this study**
The property offender attributes the causes of his offending (material gain or "the buzz") to external/unstable/controllable dimensions. He attributes the causes of his sexual arousal (the characteristics of women) to external/unstable/controllable dimensions. Accordingly, he becomes sexually aroused to external stimuli which can vary, and he is confident that he can control his sexual arousal. On the whole he does not have sexual concerns, and he fantasises about adult sex.
He either plans the offence in detail, or he plans in a cursory manner close to the time of the offence once he has encountered a suitable property. At the time of offending he recognises there is a chance he will get caught. Sometimes he is worried when he is caught but the majority of the time he is not worried as he had accepted prior to the crime that there was a chance he would get caught. He either gains materially or he gains nothing.

He has not experienced sexual or mental abuse in childhood, but has been physically abused. He plays sport and uses drugs.

**VIOLENT OFFENDERS**

**Attributions**

This group attributed their offending to *internal/stable/uncontrollable* causes, and as predicted this was significantly different from the rapist and property offender groups and the same as the child sex offender group. The greatest proportion of them (42, 84%) reported emotional needs for power, revenge, urges to be violent, or feelings of hatred as being the causes of their offending. Four (8%) offended for material gain, two (4%) to help someone else, and two (4%) because of the situation (Table 16, Appendix E). It would appear the majority of these offenders experienced compelling emotions which resulted in them behaving in a violent manner, and very few used violence in an instrumental manner to achieve material gain.

They attributed the causes of their sexual arousal to *external/unstable/controllable* dimensions, and all offenders in this group reported similarly to property offenders, that they became sexually aroused in response to characteristics of women (Table 17, Appendix F).
Self reported experiences

Violent offenders similarly to property offenders had experienced more physical abuse in their childhood compared to child sex offenders, and they used drugs and played sport more than child sex offenders.

The majority of the offenders (36, 72%) offended in an impulsive manner, and only three (6%) of these offenders planned their offence in detail (Table 18). This is consistent with the responses from thirty-three (66%) of them who reported that they did not think about getting caught (Table 20). Violent offenders, similarly to child sex offenders, considered their criminal offending had been impulsive but the causes they gave showed that the offending was based on a background of unresolved personal conflicts (Appendix E).

Over half of the violent offenders (29, 58%) reported emotional gain from their offending, 18 (36%) reported no gain, and only three (6%) reported material gain (Table 19). Thirty-five (70%) of them were either not worried (25, 50%) or angry (10, 20%) that they had been caught (Table 21). These men considered that violent behaviour had been their only option, or that violent behaviour corresponded with, and was necessary for their own self image, and they did not necessarily view a prison sentence as a particularly aversive outcome. This is consistent with McDougall's finding (personal communication, 6 November, 1990) that some individuals do not know how else to act as they have always behaved angrily and violently in previous conflict situations. The violent offenders' previous experiences of violence, and their continued use of violence as a method of problem solving has been described by McKay, Rogers and McKay, 1989; and Sonkin and Durphy, 1989. These therapists presented evidence that expressing anger in a violent manner can lead to further angry and violent episodes. The 15 (30%) that were worried when they were caught were concerned that they were unable to control their violent behaviour (Table 21).
With respect to their sexual behaviour, the age when they first experienced sexual intercourse was 14 years, and this was significantly younger than child sex offenders. There was a significant difference between offenders in the violent offenders group and the child sex offenders on the Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour and the Repression of Sexuality scales, and this showed that violent offenders considered they could control their sexual behaviour more, and they repressed their sexuality less than child sex offenders. They scored significantly higher on the Basic Sexual Knowledge scale than offenders in the child sex offender group.

Eleven (22%) did not consider themselves to be sexually attractive, and 24 (48%) offered sexual values. Twenty-two (44%) had sexual concerns, however only one violent offender sought help for the sexual problems about which he was concerned (Table 22). None of these variables were significantly different across groups. Their sexual fantasies were very similar to the property offender group with 44 (88%) of them fantasising about sex with one woman, two women or group sex, and six (12%) reporting fantasies of bondage with adult women (Table 23). Significantly more offenders in the violent offender group than the child sex offender group had previously experienced sexual diseases.

Profile of violent offenders in this study
The violent offender attributes the causes of his offending (needs for power, or revenge, or urges to be violent) to internal/stable/uncontrollable dimensions. He attributes the causes of his sexual arousal (the visual characteristics of women) to external/unstable/controllable dimensions. Therefore, he considers that he becomes sexually aroused to external stimuli which varies, and that he can control his sexual arousal. Sometimes he has sexual concerns, mostly ruminative thinking associated with sex. He fantasises about adult sex, and has experienced sexual diseases.
He offends in an impulsive manner, and does not think about getting caught. When he is caught he can either be worried or not worried. Mostly he gains emotionally from his offending.

He has not experienced sexual or mental abuse in childhood, but has been physically abused. He plays sport and uses drugs.
CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Criminal offenders' attributions for their offending was the central issue in this study, and there was evidence that different offender groups attributed their offending behaviour to different causes, and also to different attribution dimensions. Child sex offenders were differentiated from the other groups, in that, they reported approaching children in a sexual manner either in order to have their non-sexual emotional needs for acceptance met, or because they found young immature bodies sexually arousing. Both these causes were attributed to internal, stable, and uncontrollable dimensions. Child sex offenders' level of basic sexual knowledge was lower, and they described more sexual concerns than offenders in other categories. Unlike other offender groups child sex offenders viewed their sexual arousal as stemming from causes which they considered to be internal, stable, and uncontrollable. Consequently, the above combination of factors, and child sex offenders' causal attributions to the above dimensions makes them prime candidates for future sexual offending with children. Child sex offenders were not differentiated from other offender groups on the majority of the personal experiences assessed, but as a group they reported a greater number of medical problems, played less sport, and had experienced less physical abuse in their childhood.

Focusing on the other offending groups, it was evident that a large percentage of rapists and violent offenders, and a small percentage of property offenders also reported emotional needs as being the most important cause of their offending. However, for the majority of these offenders the characteristics of their attribution dimensions differed from that of child sex offenders.

Rapists reported emotional needs that were sexual in nature. Power, revenge, and urges to be violent were the emotional needs offered by violent offenders, and property offenders' emotional needs were the enjoyable elevated feelings
associated with the excitement of offending. **Child sex offenders** and **violent offenders** viewed their emotional needs as being powerful forces which they experienced as **internal**, **stable**, and **uncontrollable**. On the other hand, **rapists** and **property offenders** considered their emotional needs to be **external** to them, **unstable** over time, and **controllable**. It is interesting that both **rapists** and **property offenders** labelled their emotional needs as being **external**, and therefore identified the source of their emotional needs as the cause of their offending. In the case of the **property offenders** it was the "buzz" which they saw "coming over them", not unlike a drug high. The **rapists**, even though they recognized it was their own emotional need which initiated the offending, identified the source of these emotions, namely women, as the cause of their offending. Clearly, this group of **rapists** viewed their offence as being sexual in nature. Both **rapists** and **property offenders** viewed these causes as being **unstable** and under their control (**controllable**).

During the clinical interviews many of the offenders in the **child sex** and **violent offender** groups who had offered emotional causes for offending described these causes as being personal problems for them, and the offending appeared to be a way of temporarily dealing with these problems. In contrast, the **property offenders**, rather than escaping from an emotional problem, saw the offending as a way of obtaining a pleasurable emotional experience. There was also some similarity between the **rapists** and the **property offender** group with respect to why they offended. While the **rapists** described a readiness or need for sexual gratification as being something that they had wanted to attend to, they did not view it as a personal problem, and like the **property offenders** they saw offending as a way of obtaining pleasure. Therefore, it would appear the **child sex offenders** and **violent offenders** offered attributions as to the causes of their offending which they also viewed as unsolvable personal problems, that is the causes were **internal/stable/uncontrollable**. The two other offender groups offered attributions as to the causes of their offending which they did not view as problems, but rather as gaining something positive, and the attributed causes were **external/unstable/controllable**.
With respect to their attributions for the causes of sexual arousal, the offenders in this study fell into two distinct groups. As outlined previously, men who had been convicted of child sex offences viewed the causes of their sexual arousal differently from men who had been convicted of other offences. The child sex offenders viewed the cause of their sexual arousal as being internal, stable, and uncontrollable. They considered either that their sexual arousal resulted from internal urges and forces which emanated from within, or that their sexual arousal resulted from external sources they saw as internal. Surprisingly, they perceived various physical characteristics of children which they found sexually arousing, as being internal causes. On the other hand, men in the three other offender categories viewed the cause of their sexual arousal as being external, unstable, and controllable, and they saw their sexual arousal as being caused by a variety of both psychological and physical characteristics of women. With respect to other sexual issues, when compared with the other groups, the child sex offender group scored lower on the Basic Sexual Knowledge scale, repressed their sexuality more, lacked control of their sexual behaviour, and reported sexual fantasies that differed markedly. Thus, the child sex offender group was differentiated from the other groups on a number of sexual parameters.

A significant outcome of this study, is that it provides support for the view, that researchers do not necessarily perceive causes as varying along the same dimensions as the person offering the causes (Russell, 1982; Weiner, 1986). In the present study, some offenders viewed their own emotional causes as external, and other offenders saw children’s characteristics as internal to themselves. There seems little doubt that these conceptualisations on the part of the offenders play an important part in their criminal behaviour. Both Heider (1958), and Weiner (1986) present the view that a person’s subjective causality is more important in determining subsequent behaviour than actual causality. More recently, French (1989) noted that when reality is shaped to meet inner needs, in time the person’s perceptions rather than the actual reality determine behaviour. Child sex offenders have notions that children are ready, and
suitable partners from whom they may obtain emotional security, and sexual satisfaction. These notions are based on unrealistic, and irrational cognitions. Nevertheless, to child sex offenders these cognitions are developed from their perception of reality. These cognitions in turn form the basis of the logic behind child sex offenders’ sexual behaviours, which are carried out to meet their own emotional needs.

Property offenders and rapists who view their emotional needs as external, while admitting to their offending, do not feel personal responsibility for the offence. Child sex offenders who view children’s characteristics as internal to themselves, see themselves in a helpless situation where offending is a consequence of their uncontrollable urges. In either case, offenders appeared to be propelled towards, or drawn towards offending in order to address their own needs with little concern for the consequences for others of their behaviour, or for the effect of their behaviour on themselves such as a prison sentence. Certainly, prior to their offence, a large number of offenders in the child sex, rapists and violent offender groups, did not consider the possibility of getting caught. On the other hand, 62% of the offenders in this study perceived that they gained from their offending. In particular, 74% of the child sex offenders reported an emotional gain. Thus, a large number of child sex offenders receive intrinsic reinforcement from their offending, and the powerful role of intrinsic motivation in reaching goals, and maintaining behaviour has been discussed by a number of writers (Watson & Tharp, 1977).

The results presented in this study endorse the importance of individual assessments of offenders in order to identify their attributions, and thereby the motivation behind their offending (Weiner, 1986). This research gives a useful guide to the attributions of a sample of four types of offenders. In this study the importance of offender’s own attributions in determining their lack of psychological wellbeing, which then led to their offending, was shown by the large number who offended for emotional reasons. The notion that a lack of psychological wellbeing, and the behaviour that follows, are closely related to
one's own internal dialogue has been proposed by many supporters of cognitive therapy programmes (Ellis, 1975; McKay, Davis, & Fanning, 1981; McKay & Fanning, 1991; Stermac & Segal, 1989). Also, the attributional model provides evidence of the links between a person's attributions, emotions, and behaviour (Weiner, 1986). It is clear then, that therapy designed to decrease criminal offending must include thorough assessment procedures to identify what offenders consider are the causes of their offending. The present research has identified a strong emotional component in child sex abuse, rape, and violent offending. A large number of both child sex and violent offenders lacked strength in inner resources to solve problems related to their negative perceptions of themselves, they harboured distorted beliefs about their victim's responses to their offending, and had faulty perceptions of how their offending against others would solve their own problems. Rapists did not view their offending as problem solving behaviour, but they also harboured distorted perceptions of their victim's attitude toward their behaviour, and the outcome of their offending.

Thus, it is important that offenders are individually assessed before being placed into a selected intervention programme, and not arbitrarily placed in whatever therapy happens to be available. As part of this assessment, the attributions that offenders consider to be associated with the causes of their offending must be identified in order for the therapist to understand events as the offenders experience and perceive them. With this in mind, offenders' attributions should have a central role in determining the nature of any programme for their behaviour change. An important part of such a programme should be to have offenders conceptualise the sources of their offending behaviour as being within themselves (internal), to view these issues as varying over time (unstable), and under their control (controllable). Hence, the recognition of offenders' causal attributions can be seen as pivotal in bringing about a change in their offending behaviour.
It would appear unnecessary in intervention programmes for *rapists* (and also *property* and *violent offenders*) to seek to change the attributions for their sexual arousal. However, *child sex offenders*’ attributions related to their sexual arousal should be targeted in therapy programmes. *Child sex offenders* view their deviant sexual arousal as resulting from *internal* recurring urges which are *uncontrollable* is detrimental to them changing their behaviour, and also a powerful and important link to further sexual offending. In this respect the aim of an attribution retraining programme would be to change *child sex offenders*’ attributions so that they experience the stimulus of their sexual arousal as being *external*, and varying over time (*unstable*). Further, it is desirable that their sexual behaviour in response to an age appropriate external stimulus is *controllable* by them. It may be important that the modification of *child sex offenders*’ attributions should begin with those dimensions that are the least strongly held. The offender would then be encouraged to challenge the evidence for his attributions to that particular dimension. It is particularly important that his attributions to *stable* dimensions for deviant behaviour are changed. Researchers have shown that attributions to *stable* dimensions for negative outcomes (prison sentence) can result in feelings of hopelessness, and the belief that one cannot change the outcome (Weiner, 1986). Alternatively, as reported earlier, *child sex offenders* gained intrinsically from their offending, thus, they may consider that their offending had a positive outcome. Nevertheless, the targeting of *stable* dimensions is still important, because such an outcome can result in feelings of hopefulness, and a repeat of the deviant behaviour. During treatment programmes *child sex offenders*’ sexual concerns should also be addressed. They should be taught basic sexual information and appropriate sexual behaviour with adults, and their sexual fantasies involving children obviously need to be modified.

For all offender groups, emotional issues featured prominently as causes of their offending. Therefore, it is necessary for offenders participating in therapy groups to be shown how to obtain emotional satisfaction, by having their own
needs met in a non-offending manner. This applies to dealing with emotional problems, emotional needs, and the attainment of pleasurable experiences.

Other researchers have identified power and anger as being major causes of rape behaviour (Groth, 1979; Langevin, 1986). However, these causes were of minor importance in the present study. Rather, the important conclusion of this study in regard to rape is that in the future it may be necessary to address other issues, and avoid preoccupation with anger management solutions. For example, during therapy it will be important to address and change rapists' distorted views concerning the appropriateness of them having sexual intercourse with whoever they wish. Their propensity to misconstrue cues and make incorrect attributions during social interactions with women would also need to be targeted during therapy.

The emotion of anger was not the main cause offered by violent offenders for their crimes. Therefore, rather than focusing during therapy on anger as being the major problem for violent offenders, programmes should focus on violent offenders' cognitions, in particular their attributions for their offending behaviour. They should then be taught non-violent problem solving methods for addressing a range of emotions. This will enable them to view their own emotions as internal, and under their control. They should also be taught ways in which they can achieve a self image acceptable to them, that does not necessitate the intimidation of others.

With respect to property offenders, while a large number reported expecting emotional gain from their offending, these gains were not achieved, and during therapy it will be necessary to show them non offending ways of achieving emotional satisfaction. Some of those seeking material gain did obtain such a gain, but in addition received a prison sentence. Their attributions for the causes of their offending, and their beliefs concerning the outcome of a prison sentence should be addressed, with a view to ensuring that future attributions
concerning precipitating events, and offending outcome, lead to non offending behaviour.

Changing criminal offenders’ attributions is of vital importance if they are going to be encouraged to replace their criminal activities with more socially acceptable behaviour. In New Zealand prisons participation in any programmes is voluntary, and in this study less than 50% of the offenders agreed to participate in psychological treatment programmes to address their offending. When offenders do not co-operate it is sometimes assumed that they want to maintain their criminal behaviour. However, in order to clarify processes that are taking place, it is essential to examine these offenders’ attributions.

There is no evidence that current psychological programmes in New Zealand prisons are identifying offenders’ attributions prior to the programmes, or addressing offenders’ attributions during the programmes. Therefore, it is proposed that it is important to develop programmes designed to investigate offenders’ attributions. Offenders would attend these programmes to enable both them, and the psychologist to gain understanding of their attributional patterns. These therapy sessions would then lead to attribution retraining programmes, and also psychological interventions to teach offenders new behaviours to address their needs.

Future research in the area of criminal offenders’ attributions should continue to focus on individual offender’s attributions for the causes of their offending, and the impulsive nature of the behaviour of many of the offender should also receive attention. In the case of child sex offenders, what they view as the causes of their sexual arousal warrants further investigation, and also these offenders own sexual concerns, and other negative perceptions they have of their sexuality. It will be important to investigate why child sex offenders view as internal, causes which are clearly external to them such as children’s bodies, and why offenders in other groups view as external, causes such as their own emotions which would be viewed by many professionals as being
internal to them. In addition, it will be important to further develop attributional questionnaires with special relevance to the assessment of criminal offenders. The results from further research will contribute to the development of attribution retraining programmes specially designed to meet the needs of different categories of criminal offenders.
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APPENDIX A

OUTLINE OF CLINICAL INTERVIEW
Age
Ethnicity
Marital status

GENERAL PROBLEMS
- Nature of problems
- Predisposing factors
- Frequency
- Duration
- Extent
- Antecedents
- Consequences
- Previous strategies eg seeking help, coping strategies

PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS
- Nature of problems
- Predisposing factors
- Frequency
- Duration
- Extent
- Antecedents
- Consequences
- Previous strategies eg seeking help, coping strategies

MEDICAL HISTORY
MEDICAL PROBLEMS
- Nature of problems
- Predisposing factors
- Frequency
- Duration
- Extent
- Antecedents
- Consequences
- Previous strategies eg seeking help, coping strategies

OFFENCE
- Why did they commit the offence
- Was the offence planned
- What was gained
- Will they do it again
- Perceived probability of getting caught for offence
- How did people find out
- With hindsight what would you have done differently
- Does he acknowledge his responsibility for the offence.

CRIMINAL HISTORY
- Years involved in crime
- Number of crimes
- Types of crimes
- Prison sentences
- Length of current sentence
ATTITUDE TOWARDS GETTING CAUGHT AND SENTENCED

CHILDHOOD

- Information about parents or caregivers
- Determine if there was disruption in the family
- Were they - Physically abused
  - Sexually abused
  - Mentally abused

PEER INTERACTION

- As a Teenager and now

EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENTS

OCCUPATIONAL HISTORY

RECREATIONAL INTERESTS

ANALYSIS OF DRINKING AND BEHAVIOUR

ANALYSIS OF DRUGS AND BEHAVIOUR
SEXUAL BEHAVIOURS

- Age of first sexual encounter homosexual/heterosexual
- How did they learn about sex
- Do they consider they suffer from a sexual disturbance
- Do they experience sexual anxiety
- Do they experience sexual obsessions or compulsions
- Can they control their sexual arousal and behaviour
- Sexual urges/desires. What are the causes of these
- Sexual fantasies
- Survey of Basic Sexual Knowledge
- Sexual values
- What concerns do they have with regards to their sexual competency, adequacy and attractiveness.
- Do they have any concerns about their virility, their genitalia, their sexual performance.
- Sexual behaviour in prison
- What sexual diseases have they had
- Have they had, or do they have concerns with regards to sexual diseases
APPENDIX B

ATTRIBUTION QUESTIONNAIRES
OFFENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

There are probably a number of causes of you committing the offence for which you are in prison. Please list the causes that you think led you to commit the offence.

Now, put these causes in order of importance. At the end of each cause put a number. A 1 next to your most important cause, a 2 next to the second most important cause, and so on until all your causes have been put in order.
OFFENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Think about the causes you have listed for your offending. The statements below concern your beliefs about the causes of your offence. Circle one number for each of the following questions.

1. Given that cause, in that situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You can control your behaviour</th>
<th>Behaviour is uncontrollable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly controllable 5</td>
<td>partly mostly uncontrollable 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly controllable 4</td>
<td>mostly uncontrollable 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Is the cause something:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About yourself</th>
<th>About the situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly yourself 5</td>
<td>partly mostly situation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly yourself 4</td>
<td>mostly temporary 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both 3</td>
<td>temporary 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Is the cause something that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always there</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly always there 5</td>
<td>partly temporary 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly always there 4</td>
<td>mostly temporary 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Given that cause, in that situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You can restrain your behaviour</th>
<th>Behaviour is unrestrainable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly restrainable 5</td>
<td>partly mostly unrestrainable 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly restrainable 4</td>
<td>mostly unrestrainable 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Is the cause something that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside of you</th>
<th>Inside of you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly outside</td>
<td>partly inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly outside</td>
<td>a bit inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both</td>
<td>mostly inside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Is the cause something that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varies over time</th>
<th>Does not vary over time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly variable</td>
<td>partly unvarying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly variable</td>
<td>mostly unvarying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Given that cause, in that situation you would:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be able to hold back your behaviour</th>
<th>Not be able to hold back your behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly hold back</td>
<td>partly not hold back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly hold back</td>
<td>mostly not hold back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Is the cause:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Something about you</th>
<th>Something about others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly you</td>
<td>partly others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly you</td>
<td>mostly others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Is the cause something that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unchangeable</th>
<th>Changeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>partly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unchangeable</td>
<td>unchangeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly</td>
<td>mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit</td>
<td>changeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEXUAL AROUSAL QUESTIONNAIRE

There are probably a number of causes of you becoming sexually aroused. Please list the causes that you think make you sexually aroused.

Now, put these causes in order of importance. At the end of each cause put a number. A 1 next to your most important cause, a 2 next to the second most important cause, and so on until all your causes have been put in order.
**SEXUAL AROUSAL QUESTIONNAIRE**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Think about the causes for your sexual arousal that you have listed. The statements below concern your beliefs about the causes of your sexual arousal. Circle one number for each of the following questions.

1. Given that cause, in that situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>You can control your sexual behaviour</th>
<th>Sexual behaviour is uncontrollable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>a bit of both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controllable</td>
<td>partly controllable</td>
<td>of both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncontrolable</td>
<td>uncontrolable</td>
<td>uncontrolable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Is the cause something:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>About yourself</th>
<th>About the situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>a bit of both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourself</td>
<td>yourself</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourself</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Is the cause something that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always there</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>a bit of both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Given that cause, in that situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>You can restrain your sexual behaviour</th>
<th>Sexual behaviour is unrestrainable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>a bit of both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restrainable</td>
<td>partly restrainable</td>
<td>of both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unrestrainable</td>
<td>unrestrainable</td>
<td>unrestrainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Is the cause something that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside of you</th>
<th>Inside of you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly outside</td>
<td>partly inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly outside</td>
<td>mostly inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Is the cause something that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varies over time</th>
<th>Does not vary over time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly variable</td>
<td>partly unvarying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly variable</td>
<td>mostly unvarying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Given that cause, in that situation you would:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Be able to hold back your behaviour</th>
<th>Not be able to hold back your behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly hold back</td>
<td>partly not hold back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly hold back</td>
<td>mostly not hold back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Is the cause:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Something about you</th>
<th>Something about others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly you</td>
<td>partly others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly you</td>
<td>mostly others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Is the cause something that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unchangeable</th>
<th>Changeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>partly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unchangeable</td>
<td>changeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partly</td>
<td>mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unchangeable</td>
<td>changeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a bit of both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE INVENTORY
INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE INVENTORY

1. No matter who I’m talking to I’m always a good listener
   AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way
   AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

3. I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake
   AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

4. Masturbation is a perfectly normal healthy behaviour
   AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

5. Before I came to prison sex thoughts almost drove me crazy
   AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

6. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget
   AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

7. I have a lot of sex appeal
   AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

8. Oral sex is as exciting as sexual intercourse
   AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)
9. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone

AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

10. I am not very attractive sexually

AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

11. I’m quick to admit making a mistake

AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

12. Sometimes I feel I need to be institutionalised for protection against my own sex impulses

AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

13. I’m always polite even to people who are disagreeable

AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

14. Before coming to prison I worried a lot about sex

AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

15. Before coming to prison sometimes sexual feelings overpowered me

AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)

16. I could get sexually excited at any time of the day or night

AGREE (1)  DISAGREE (2)
17. It is disgusting to see animals having sexual relations in the street

AGREE (1) DISAGREE (2)

18. At a party where there was group sex my behaviour would be out of control

AGREE (1) DISAGREE (2)

19. I have sometimes taken unfair advantage of another person

AGREE (1) DISAGREE (2)

20. I approve of being really close sexually to someone

AGREE (1) DISAGREE (2)

21. I have uncontrollable urges to masturbate

AGREE (1) DISAGREE (2)

22. Before coming to prison thoughts about sex disturbed me more than they should

AGREE (1) DISAGREE (2)

23. At times I have been afraid of myself for what I might do sexually

AGREE (1) DISAGREE (2)
## INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE INVENTORY

**MODEL ANSWERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socially Desirable</th>
<th>Repression of Sexuality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Agree</td>
<td>4 Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>7 Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agree</td>
<td>8 Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Disagree</td>
<td>10 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Disagree</td>
<td>16 Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Agree</td>
<td>17 Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Agree</td>
<td>20 Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lack of Control of Sexual Behaviour**

| 5 Agree            |
| 12 Agree           |
| 14 Agree           |
| 15 Agree           |
| 18 Agree           |
| 21 Agree           |
| 22 Agree           |
| 23 Agree           |
APPENDIX D

BASIC SEXUAL KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONNAIRE
**SURVEY OF BASIC SEXUAL KNOWLEDGE**

**Directions:** Check the appropriate box on this sheet True or False

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Men's orgasms are more intense than women's</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>When men who have not taken alcohol/drugs are not able to obtain an erection (impotence), it is most often due to psychological reasons</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Once the womb has been removed (hysterectomy), a woman cannot achieve orgasm.</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>If she has an orgasm, a woman is more likely to get pregnant.</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Certain foods increase the possibility of sexual arousal.</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>A woman is more likely to get pregnant if she is breast-feeding a baby.</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Some homosexual behaviour is a normal part of children growing up in our culture.</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Direct contact between the penis and clitoris is needed in order for females to achieve orgasm during intercourse.</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Impotence in men over 70 is nearly universal.</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>If you masturbate you are likely to have mental and emotional problems.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Uncircumcised males have more difficulty having sexual intercourse than circumsized males.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>On average it takes a woman longer than a man to become sufficiently aroused to achieve orgasm.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The bigger the man’s penis the greater the sexual enjoyment.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Men are capable of more varied types of orgasm than women.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Vaginal lubrication in women is the same as erection in men.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Using a different position during intercourse may increase sexual pleasure for women.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Good lovemaking requires both partners to reach orgasm at the same time.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Only gay men can get AIDS.</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

SELF REPORTED ATTRIBUTIONS FOR OFFENDING
## Self Reported Attributions for the Causes of Offending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributions for Offending</th>
<th>Offender Group</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
<th>Total Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urges to be Loved*</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urges to be Wanted*</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs to be Cuddled*</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urges for Sex with Children*</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs for Power*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of Hatred*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Build Up*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of Anger*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Buzz*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urges for Sex with Adult Female*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Needs and the Buzz</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To obtain Emotional Gain
APPENDIX F

SELF REPORTED ATTRIBUTIONS FOR SEXUAL AROUSAL
## Self Reported Attritions for the Causes of Sexual Arousal

### Offender Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributions for Sexual Arousal</th>
<th>Child Sex Offenders</th>
<th>Rapists</th>
<th>Property Offenders</th>
<th>Violent Offenders</th>
<th>Total Causes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive Faces&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodies&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexy Clothes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalities&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodies&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Sex Material</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urges Internal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urges External</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Characteristics of Women  
<sup>b</sup> Characteristics of Children