CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r.86/06)

Canada

Pedophilia: A Heterogeneous or Homogeneous Phenomenon ?

Deborah M. Bloomberg

Submitted to the Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa, in partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

ISBN 0-315-33276-X

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This writer is indebted to Dr. C.H.S. Jayewardene for his wisdom, guidance, and constructive criticism throughout the preparation of this thesis.

I am no less grateful to Dr. J. McD. W. Bradford, Director of the Forensic Unit at the Royal Ottawa Hospital for granting me permission to use his data as well as for the encouragement and assistance he provided me.

My sincere gratitude also is extended to Ann Pawlak for her patience and assistance in analyzing the data.

Finally, my heartfelt gratitude and love is extended to my parents for their continued optimism, confidence and pride in my scholastic endeavors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study is to ascertain whether the pedophiles sent to the Forensic Unit of the Royal Ottawa Hospital for assessment and treatment constitute homogeneous or heterogeneous groups.

This study divided the pedophiles first into the two groups of homosexual and heterosexual pedophiles and then into the three groups of adolescent, middle aged and senescent pedophiles in an attempt to ascertain whether or not these pedophiles constitute more than one group on the basis of sexual preference and age.

A post sample stratification was made first on the basis of the sexual preference of the offender. This preference was made on the basis of their charge (when they were charged) or on the basis of the disclosure of their sexual preference to their psychiatrist. These preferences were later substantiated by the various tests which were administered in the Forensic Unit. On the basis of the sexual preference it was found that the sample could be divided into two groups, heterosexual pedophiles and homosexual pedophiles. There were no cases falling into the bisexual group. Twenty one (40.4%) of the child molesters were heterosexual pedophiles and thirty one (59.6%) were homosexual pedophiles.

A second post sample stratification was made on the basis of the age of the offenders. The ages of the men at the time of their admission ranged from fifteen to

seventy five years. The post sample stratification resulted in the division of the sample into three pedophilic groups, adolescent, middle aged and senescent pedophiles. There were seven (13.5%) adolescent pedophiles who ranged in age from fifteen to ninteen years, thirty seven (71.1%) middle aged pedophiles whose ages ranged from twenty to fourty nine years and eight (15.4%) senescent pedophiles whose ages ranged from fifty to seventy five years.

The variables which were used in this study include:

(1) Characteristics of the offence:
- (a) The sex of the victim
- (b) The age of the victim
- (c) The victim's relationship to the accused
- (d) The amount of violence used

(2) Social and demographic characteristics of the offender.
- (a) The occupation of the pedophiles
- (b) The employment status of the pedophiles
- (c) The education levels of the pedophiles
- (d) The marital status of the pedophiles
- (e) The number of dependent children of the pedophiles
- (f) The age of the pedophiles

(3) Psychiatric assessment of the offender.
- (a) The patient status at the time of admission
- (b) The psychiatrist's perception of the level of dangerousness
- (c) The offender's mental state at the time of the offence
- (d) The psychiatric illnesses of the pedophiles
- (e) The likelihood of the offence to re-occur
- (f) The lack of guilt or remorse

(4) Psychological assessment of the offender.
- (a) The Wechsler Adult Intelligence Test (WAIS-R)
- (b) The Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)
- (c) The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)

(5) Biochemical assessment of the offender.
- (a) Testosterone
- (b) Follicle-stimulating Hormone (FSH)
- (c) Luteinizing Hormone (LH)

(6) Psychosexual assessment of the offender.
- (a) Penile Tumescence Test - slides and audio tapes
- (b) Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory (DSFI)
- (c) Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory
- (d) The Sexual Attitude Scale

The statistical method chosen for this study was Association Analysis which is a divisive grouping technique using a summated distance function (the chi-square test of statistical significance). The chi-square test is used as a measurement of similarity or dissimilarity in order to provide a criterion for dividing groups. For this study, the sample was divided first on the basis of the sexual preference and then on the basis of the age of the offender. The groups were then compared relative to the aforementioned variables to determine whether these variables support the division.

When the sexual preference of the offender based groupings were considered, it was found that: 1) the sex of the molested child,
2) anxiety neurosis,
3) the hypomania scale of the MMPI,
and 4) their attitudes about homosexuality in the Sexual Attitude Scale

would differentiate between homosexual and heterosexual pedophilia.

When the age of the offender based groupings were considered, it was found that:
1) the occupations of the pedophiles,
2) the employment status of the pedophiles,
3) the spelling variable of the WRAT
4) the "Drive" subtest of the DSFI,
5) the "Affect" subtest of the DSFI,
6) the "Resentment" scale of the Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory,
7) the "Assault" scale of the Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory,
8) the "Verbal Hostility" scale of the Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory,
9) the "Exhibitionism" scale of the Sexual Attitude Scale,
10) the "Voyeurism" scale of the Sexual Attitude Scale,
and 11) the child initiate-arouse, physical coercion-arouse and

sadism-arouse heterosexual pedophilic tapes of the Penile Tumescence Test

would differentiate between the three age groups.

While there was a wide variance within the total group of pedophiles on the variables analyzed, these differences were not related to the distinctions of the age and sexual preference, which were examined in this study. Despite the few statistically significant differences that emerged, the overall results indicate that the groups examined were legally, clinically and sociologically similar.

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The German psychiatrist Richard von Krafft-Ebing coined the term "pedophilia" in the late 19th century to describe a perversion in which an adult is erotically attracted to children. Literally translated, pedophilia means "love of children". This is an unfortunately ironic term since it is recognized that although a pedophile may be motivated by love, the impact of his or her behaviour on the victimized child rarely is experienced as love. In common parlance, a pedophile is referred to as a child molester.

Pedophilia has been defined as a sexual contact of a heterosexual or homosexual nature with a prepubertal child under the age of twelve by an adult who is not related to the child. The age distinction of twelve years old or younger has been arbitrarily set as sexual behaviour with pubertal youngsters - those between the ages of thirteen and sixteen - is more properly, although not legally referred to as hebophilia (love of youth) and has origins and dynamics different from those of pedophilia (love of children) Glueck (1952). In spite of these distinctions, there does not seem to be consensus about the age limit.

In recent times, there has been a surge in the coverage of child molestation in the media, and growing public and academic interest in the phenomenon. However, the actual extent of its incidence is undetermined. The May 14, 1984 publication of Newsweek Magazine estimated that between 100,00 and 500,000 American children would be molested in 1984. Studies which have investigated the problem also

indicate that it is more extensive than commonly assumed. Among the 4,441 women interviewed by Kinsey et.al. (1953) 9.2% reported having been approached sexually by an adult before reaching age thirteen. In a survey of college students, Landis (1956) found that 30% of the males and 35% of the females had been sexually molested during their childhood. Brongersma (1979) found that 13% of the males and 18% of the females of Dutch University students had been sexually molested during their childhood. Summitt and Kryso (1978) administered a questionaire to 450 female and 412 male college students. Almost 8% of the female students and almost 5% of the male students reported having been sexually approached in childhood. According to the Badgley report (1984), at sometime during their lives, about one in two females and one in three males have been victims of unwanted sexual acts. About four in five of these incidents first happened to these persons when they were children or youths. In the District of Columbia, Green (1979) reported the occurance of 1,000 sexual offences against children each year while, DeFrancis (1969) estimated that the number of child molestation cases per year in New York City alone was in excess of 3,000. This estimate is believed to be "conservative". Since most cases of child molestation are unreported or undetected, the known incidence of these cases is perhaps a very small fraction of the actual number.

Although theoretically, pedophiles could be either male or female, it appears that with almost negligible exception, they are all men. There is no reliable documentation of it, but if female pedophilia does occur, it is extremely rare (Freund 1982). Righton (1981) suggests that this may be due to the fact that in our society,

women have much greater licence than men to express affection for children physically, especially boys, so that quite different social meanings are attributed to male and female intimacy with a child. Kissing, hugging and cuddling, which cause no eyebrow to be raised when engaged in by a woman would, in other than carefully prescribed circumstances, be interpreted as signs of "unhealthy" sexual interest if practiced by a man. He goes on to state that if a woman is sexually attracted to children, she has many more opportunities than a man similarly inclined to express her feelings physically without risk of being labelled a pedophile. In short then, pedophilia is considered to be a "condition" afflicting only males and, if it does occur in females, it is rarely documented in either clinical or legal data that little is known of it.

In 1952, Guttmacher and Weihofen stated that there is doubtless no subject on which we can obtain more definite opinions and less definite knowledge. According to Bancroft (1983) the one thing that pedophiles have in common is their sexual attraction to children, in other respects, they are a heterogeneous group and we should therefore allow for a variety of causative factors. deYoung (1982) found that in the mind of the public, the child molester is many things from a dangerous anonymous psychopath who snatches unsuspecting children from playgrounds and grabs headlines in newspapers to a leacherous "dirty old man". Like any stereotype, these perceptions are only partially true. Perhaps as is suggested by Sgroi (1975), the stereotyping results from the problem closer to home. No parent relishes the idea of his or her child being a victim of sexual assault. Consequently, when a sexual

assault does occur, it is usually attributed to some "perverted stranger". The data however, indicate otherwise. According to Mathis (1972) the child is well known to the offender in almost three-fourths of the reported cases. In 75% (188) of the 250 cases selected for intensive study by DeFrancis (1969), the offender was well known to the victims. Mohr, Turner and Jerry (1964) cite a study in which the victims were familiar with the offender prior to the sexual experience in 80% of the cases. In a Danish study, Voight (1972) found that 73% of a sample of men convicted of, or under treatment for engaging in sex with children had been well known to the child and his or her family for a considerable time before sexual activity began, and that most of the remainder, while they were strangers to the child when they first approached him or her, did not make the first sexual overtures, until the acquaintance was already well established. In the 1953 California Sexual Deviation Research cited by Mohr et.al. (1964), 51% of the 144 child molesters were acquainted with the victim, 30% were related, and in only 19% were they strangers. According to the Badgley Report (1984) most of the child molesters they studied had known their victims prior to the offences, and only 26.9% were strangers. This was found to be more common with male victims than female victims. Davis (1962) reports from a study in Florida that two out of every three victims knew the offender prior to the offence. In his classification, 20% of the victims were relatives, 38% neighbors, 6% casual acquaintances, and 35% strangers. Revitch and Weiss (1962) also state that they gained a stong clinical impression that there was a frequent involvement of neighbors, family friends and relatives as offenders. Similarly, Mohr et.al. (1964)

found that contrary to the common public conception, the victim is seldom a total stranger to the offender. They found this to be especially true for heterosexual associations where in the great majority of cases the offender came from an environment closer to the child: in homosexual pedophilia, casual associations tended to play an even larger role. Finally, the findings of the four surveys studied in the Badgley Report (1984) show that in general, the types of association reported in the National Population Survey and the National Police Force Survey are approximately similar, but that both differ substantially from those reported in the National Hospital Survey, and the National Child Protection Survey. In the first two surveys between a third and a half of the suspected assailants were friends or acquaintances, about a quarter were strangers and the remaining were family members. In contrast, about half of the assailants of children examined in hospitals and slightly less than nine in ten suspected offenders of victims known to child protection workers were family members. About one in five patients examined in hospitals had been sexually assaulted by friends or acquaintances, and the proportion of victims falling into this catagory known to child protection services was about one in fourteen. In the latter public service, only 1% of the assailants were reported to have been strangers to the children. Hence, one fact that has been empirically established is that the molester is not usually a stranger but is known to the child. In spite of this, parents frequently teach their children to be wary of strangers and to avoid being alone with unknown men. This may be good general advice, but, as Mathis (1972) states, statistically it is of little value if protection of

the child from sexual molestation is the object.

Accordingly, this information has implications for the places where the offences occur. It is generally believed that child molestation occurs in secluded out-of-door places such as parks, laneways, movie theatres, automobiles, playgrounds and school yards. Donovan (1978) points out that if one considers the dynamics of the victim-offender relationship, it can be expected that the majority of offences occur in an environment familiar to the victim or the offender due to the fact that if the abuser is a family friend or an acquaintance of the child, it is not difficult for him to find privacy in such an environment. Empirical studies refute the classic belief and support the latter logic. This was demonstrated in the Badgley Report (1984) which stated that well over half (55.4%) of the molestations occured in the homes of the victims or the offenders. In the Toronto Forensic Clinic Study cited by Mohr et.al. (1964) the majority of the offences occured in the closer environment of the victim. Similarly, in the DeFrancis (1969) study, 62% of the sexual assaults occured in the victim's homes, and 28% occured in the offender's homes. Davis (1962) also found that the residence of the offender ranked highest, and the home of the victim ranked second as the place of the offence. He adds that, contrary to public opinion, movie theatres and automobiles were poor third and fourth choices of places for pedophilic offences.

von Krafft-Ebing, when he first described the phenomenon, pointed out that pedophiles could be heterosexually, homosexually, or bisexually oriented. Nevertheless, until recently, the majority of reported cases have involved

heterosexual pedophiles (men attracted towards little girls). The situation seems now to be changing. In the study conducted by Mohr et.al. (1964) it was found that only 10% of their subjects would molest both sexes while the heterosexual and homosexual pedophiles seem to appear in rather equal numbers. Researchers have variously estimated the occurance of homosexual pedophilia as 19% of reported molestations (Revitch and Weiss 1962), 25% (Swanson 1968), and 33% (Swift 1977). In deYoung's (1982) clinical sample of 45 child molesters, 12 (26.7%) were homosexual and 33 (73.3%) were heterosexual molesters. The rate is almost 3:1, similar to that found in an earlier study by Gibbens and Prince (1963). As well, the Badgley Report stated that the 695 convicted child molesters that were studied, had molested 129 male children and 545 female children. Contrary to this, Bernard in Holland (1975) and O'Carrol (1980) who surveyed members of the Paedophile Information Exchange in Britain, found an overwhelming preponderance of "boy-lovers" among their samples. Whatever the preference may be, all the studies indicate an invariance which permits the division of pedophiles from the point of view of the child involved into three catagories, homosexual, heterosexual, and undifferentiated or bisexual.

The literature on pedophiles identifies the "typical" heterosexual pedophile as an individual who is interpersonally awkward, psychosexually immature, with a childhood history of physical and sexual abuse. They have been found to compriss three types. The first called the fixated, or immature heterosexual pedophile constitutes the group whose psychosexual development appears to have been arrested in childhood and who has been mainly interested in children since

adolescence. Burgess et.al. (1978) described a fixated child molester as a person suffering from a temporary or permanent arrestment of psychosocial maturation resulting from unresolved formative issues that persist and underlie the organization of subsequent phases of development. According to deYoung (1982) 17 of the 33 heterosexual pedophiles in her clinical sample fell into this group. Along with this, it is generally felt that because he is emotionally and sexually still a child, he is therefore likely to be more comfortable around children than with adults. As well, because of their identification with their victims and their own immature level of psychosexual functioning, the fixated pedophiles are usually content with the fondling, kissing and caressing of their victims. According to Cohen and Seghorn (1969), and Groth and Birnbaum (1978), these pedophiles are passive, dependent persons who are noticeably socially awkward with adults and heterosexually anxious with adult women. Similarly, deYoung (1982) found that in their adult relationships, these pedophiles typically seek dominant or nurturing persons who gratify their needs to be dependent and protected. They may have adult sexual relationships, but they are usually passive in those relationships and do not initiate them. Finally, it must be noted that these pedophiles are not incapacitated by their fixation and they are not so childlike that they cannot assume adult responsibilities such as holding jobs, getting married and raising children.

The second and equally common type of heterosexual pedophile is described as the regressed offender.' According to deYoung (1982), these are men who turn to children for comfort and sexual satisfaction when their adult relationships have

ceased, diminished, or have become complicated, unsatisfying, stressful, or anxiety laden. In her sample of 33 heterosexual pedophiles, 14 fell into this catagory, and all had achieved some degree of adult interactional success before they had experienced the setback that led to the molestation of a child. Burgess et.al. (1978) defined these individuals as ones who originally preferred age-mates and who turn to children for sexual gratification when peer sexual relations become conflictive. As well, he states that this conflict with the peers usually constitutes a challenge to the person's sexual adequacy and may involve a situational crisis of a non-sexual nature which causes anxieties and inadequate feelings to surface. Geiser (1979) defined this type of man as usually a passive and emotionally dependent husband or lover. According to deYoung (1982) it is clear that a divorce, seperation, or dissolution of a relationship for such a passive, dependent person would resurrect unresolved dependency needs, just as the death of a family member could. She concludes by stating that for someone who is also psychosexually immature, sexual problems which challenge his adult sexual role can also be traumatic. Finally, it must also be noted that because the regressed pedophile is more adult in his behaviour than the fixated type, and because he has usually achieved some degree of interpersonal and sexual success before the molestation occured, he is also more likely to attempt (but rarely complete) intercourse with his victim.

The third and least common group of heterosexual pedophiles is the sadistic group for whom aggression is truly an issue. According to Groth and Burgess (1977), sex appears to be in the service of the need for power. Physical aggression becomes

eroticized for these individuals and sexual satisfaction is achieved only when the child has been hurt and humiliated. deYoung (1982) stated that the sadistic heterosexual pedophile sees the child victim as a representation of everything he hates about himself as well as the dreadful memories of his own childhood. Unfortunatly, because of these feelings, this pattern of pedophilia can result in the death of a child. Despite the fact that such cases grab a great deal of media and public attention, they are actually rare occurances statisticaly speaking. Swigert et.al. (1976) analyzed 444 homicides committed between 1955 and 1973 and found that only five out of that total were sexual homicides and only one of those five had as its victim a child. In addition, in deYoung's (1982) clinical sample of 33 heterosexual pedophiles, only two such cases were evident.

Homosexual pedophilia, a condition in which a child of the same sex is the preferred object, is just as common as heterosexual pedophilia, but more unacceptable in our culture. As such, it may be termed a double deviation due to the homosexual nature and the pedophilic act. Just as the literature identifies three types of heterosexual pedophiles, so too does it clasify three types of homosexual pedophiles. The first, called the socially inadequate had, according to Hammer and Jacks (1955) abusive and depriving early childhood experiences which have rendered him dependent, passive and essentially helpless in the face of life's demands. This group was further divided by deYoung (1982) into two subgroups. The first is the withdrawn homosexual pedophile who is the most noticeably passive and inadequate of the child molesters. He is also the most likely to have experienced a significant

degree of rejection and deprivation in his childhood as it is these experiences which have rendered him withdrawn and ineffectual as an adult. According to deYoung (1982) these men come from cruelly depriving and rejecting home environments which have rendered them so inadequate that they have trouble holding responsible jobs for any period of time if at all. They are also unable to maintain adult relationships. They see adult women as threatening, maintaining this perception by vesting them with all kinds of seductive and manipulative powers which would clearly cause them to be helpless and inadequate should they be forced to interact with these women. Even female children are perceived as powerful by these pedophiles. Consequently, their sexual attraction is channelled towards young boys. deYoung (1982) also states that these men do not see themselves as homosexuals and are very unlikely to engage in homosexual relationships with men their own age. This is probably true as any adult, regardless of gender is perceived as too threatening to them. This type of homosexual pedophile is not very inclined to hurt his victim. Perhaps because he identifies with the child or, because he has fixated himself at the child's level of psychosexual functioniung, he is usually gentle and, according to the literature, appears to be content with fondling and mutual masturbation. They do not generally engage in fellatio and anal intercourse. This seems to be the "typical" pattern as, hurting the child or even engaging in more active forms of sexual behaviour requires a certain degree of assertiveness and power that may be inconsistent with the dynamics of this molester's personality.

The second subgroup comprises the conforming socially inadequate homosexual

pedophile. These men have a facade of acceptability which may be initially misleading. According to deYoung (1982) they are usually a slightly older molester, in their twenties or thirties, are married, may have at least one child, and are employed. In her clinical sample of 12 homosexual pedophiles, three fell into this catagory, and all three led what is commonly referred to as a "double life". From outward appearances they were all socially acceptable, but under closer scrutiny they appeared to be isolated individuals. Her clinical sample suggests that this type of pedophile is not inclined to hurt his victims.. His sexual behaviour is likely to be more sophisticated than that of the withdrawn socially inadequate type. He is more likely to engage in fellatio and attempted anal intercourse. The second type of homosexual pedophile is the intrusive type. He is an individual who surrounds himself with young boys. According to deYoung's typolology, this is the pedophile who knows how to communicate and interact with boys and because of these skills is able to persuade the boys to engage in sexual acts with him. It does not appear that persuasion is the primary tact used to accomplish the molestation since force is sometimes, though rarely used. Since the victim usually has an ongoing relationship with the molester, he usually does not initially resist the sexual advances and does not immediatly disclose the sexual experience to another person. The intrusive type of homosexual pedophile does not appear to engage in homosexual behaviour with adult males more frequently than the socially inadequate type, yet he is more likely to label himself a homosexual, a label which most pedophiles actively resist. In deYoung's (1982) clinical sample, three of the twelve homosexual pedophiles fell into

this catagory and none of them appeared to have any great anxiety about being labelled a child molester. McGaghy (1967) accounted for these feelings by stating that it appears that many homosexual molesters have previously accepted a homosexual role which in itself represents a drastic departure from the sexual norms of conventional society. Being accused of molesting does not constitute a threat to their present self concepts as sexual deviants.

The third and final type of homosexual pedophile is the aggressive type whose sexual satisfaction is achieved through violence and the feeling of power he has over the child. According to Groth and Birnbaum (1978) and Groth (1979) these characteristics conform to the stereotyped perception of the homosexual pedophile but they do not appear to represent the "typical" homosexual molester as violence is infrequently a feature of homosexual molestations. According to deYoung (1982) these individuals are more likely to be strangers to the victims and are more likely to attempt or to achieve anal intercourse. Since the aggression is a predominant feature of their personalities, they are also more inclined to threaten the victim after the molestation itself. Finally, in deYoung's (1982) sample, three of the twelve homosexual pedophiles fell into this catagory and all three had extensive records of violent behaviour in their backgrounds.

The third catagory of pedophiles is the undifferentiated group where the sex of the victim appears inconsequential in the offender's search for sexual satisfaction. According to Mohr (1964) the sex of the victim is predetermined and invariant in most cases of pedophilia so that the undifferentiated group represents only a small

minority. Due to the small numbers of these pedophiles little research has been done on them.

Child molestation covers a wide range of behaviours with a sexual connotation. This can be anything from touching and kissing to rape. However adults who rape children are classified differently than adults who fondle or expose themselves to children. In the first case the adult is a rapist or a sexual offender while in the other instance he is, respectively a child molester or an exhibitionist. Gibbens (1963), Mohr (1964), Gagnon (1965), Gebhard et.al. (1965), Eglinton (1971), Ingram (1977), Brongerasma (1977), Rossman (1979), Righton (1981), and Bancroft (1983) reveal that the most characteristic pedophilic activities are cuddling, caressing and genital fondling, usually with the child's willing compliance and in many instances on the child's initiative. In addition to this, in some cases vaginal, oral and anal penetration are known to have occured but are extremely rare, as are buggery and violence in any form. Mohr (1964) found that penetration and intravaginal coitus are rare among sexual acts with children, not only because the act is anatomically unfeasible with the majority of the victims, but it is clearly not the intention of the vast majority of pedophiles as they do not usually wish to harm the child. Genital intercourse occurs only in those whose preference is for a child who is almost physically mature. As such, these acts are not based on a genuine pedophilic deviation, and, according to Mathis (1972) when this does occur, it frequently represents a symptom of a psychotic illness such as schizophrenia or of a damaged brain. Mohr (1962) maintains that the great majority of sexual acts in

heterosexual pedophilia, and the expressed desire for immature gratification with a prepubertal child consists of behaviour like looking, touching, fondling, kissing and showing of the genitals similar to that which can be observed among children themselves. Mathis (1972) agrees with Mohr's findings as he states that, most frequently the pedophile wishes to caress the child or to have him or her caress or admire his genetilia or both. Occasionally he may wish to fondle the child's genital region while he masturbates or he may attempt to get the child to stimulate him manually or orally. An extremely small percentage attempt to insert a finger into the vagina or anus, and even fewer (far less than 0.5%) may attempt intercrural intercourse. Finally, Mohr (1964) points out that in assessing the nature of the sexual act, two things have to be considered: the act itself, and the intentionality or direction of the act. For example, the exposure of the genitals of the adult male can have various intentionalities; it can be the final aim of gratification, in which case it would be exhibitionistic; it can be done with the purpose of being fondled as the final preferred aim, in which case he would consider it as truly pedophilic; and it can be a preliminary stage to coital activity.

Since the nature of the act differs in regard to the two sexes, they must be considered seperately. There is a general consensus among the researchers of homosexual pedophilia that the sexual acts seem to be the same as those of adult partners. According to Gebhard et.al. (1965), genital touching accounted for 45% of the sexual activity, and oral-genital contact accounted for 38%. As well, Mathis (1972) found that the homosexual pedophile is more apt to encourage oral-genital contact,

and it is generally assumed that he represents a more severe degree of psychosexual immaturity.

Apart from the sex of the victim, Mohr et.al. (1964) found it possible to classify pedophiles according to the age at which the pedophilic activity began. He classified them as adolescent pedophilia, middle-age pedophilia, and senescent pedophilia. In addition to these three groups, there was a small group of chronic offenders who remain prone to pedophilic acts. As such, we are dealing with four forms of the offender. According to Mathis (1972) and Mohr et.al. (1964) there is nothing magical about these ages, they simply represent times of increased emotional stress during the male life span. Mohr et.al. (1964) hypothesized the general causes of the different age groups and stated that the adolescent period represents delayed sexual explorations with a younger object whereby the age of the victims is significantly younger for this group than for the others. In the middle-aged period, it seems to represent a regression after failure of sexual relations with an equivalent-aged object, and in the older age group it is predominantly an escape from lonliness and impotence. In addition to this, it has been found that the middle-age group consistently emerges as the largest one, and the senescent group which is often thought of as the predominant one is actually small in comparison, as are the adolescent pedophiles. Finally, according to Mathis (1972) as there are many chronic pedophiles who manifest the condition continually from childhood to old age, these ages may represent "getting caught" rather than the inception of activity. In order to more fully comprehend the make-up of these groups, a more detailed analysis of

them is needed.

The age specific types showed other characteristics as well. Mohr (1981) found that the adolescent group is predominantly characterized by a lag in psychsexual maturation, where the average age of children involved with this group is about 6.5 years, and that the offenders have no experiences with adult sexual relationships, nor does there seem to be any desire for such. Shoor et.al. (1966) have made one of the most comprehensive studies to date of adolescent child molesters. They studied 80 such cases and drew the following profile of the adolescent: he is sexually naive and suffers from "panomaturity" in that he is socially naive as well. He is a loner who prefers the company of children because he is not intimidated by them as he is by adults and peers. He is an academic underachiever and is likely to identify most with his dominant mother. deYoung (1982) had 4 adolescent child molesters in her clinical sample. Their mean age was 16.2 years and the mean age of their victims was 5.1 years. All of the young men in question were profoundly psychosexually immature and one was psychotic. None of them had had a sexual experience with an age-mate and she felt that in many ways their molestation of little girls represented a "rehersal" for later adult sexual encounters.

The second group, the middle aged pedophile is characterized by regression rather than lack of progression or fixation which is characteristic of the former group. Mohr (1962) states that most of these people are, or have been married or at least had significant adult sexual experiences, and have experienced severe marital and social disorganization, with alcohol playing a major role. This group he found to

be the largest of the three groups in institutions, partly because of their age which deprives them of the special considerations afforded to the young and the old, and partly it seems, because of their generally disorganized situation. Gigeroff et. al. (1969) attribute this state to marital problems as well as social and economic stresses which may initiate a regressed pedophilic reaction in persons so disposed. deYoung (1982) was able to substantiate Mohr's findings that this group represents the largest number of heterosexual pedophiles as her clinical sample had 78% of the child molesters between the ages of 27 and 40.

The third group involves the aged or senescent offender. Bryant (1982) found that this molester is usually retired from an unskilled or semi-skilled job, and there may be a biological factor involved such as impotency or brain deterioration. In most cases however, the individual has few adult friends and simply comes to identify closely with the children he sees on a frequent basis. Mathis (1972) observed that the senile changes of aging combined with the loss of self-esteem that frequently comes with forced retirement and old age, may produce regression in the man. As such, he may see himself as becoming childlike and dependent in many ways, whereby one of the earliest manifestations of this may be in the sexual sphere. In addition, Mathis stated that his failing mental and physical powers, including sexual powers, may lead him to approach a child in a seductive manner simply because he unconsciously perceives himself to be the same age on an emotional level. He usually becomes friends with the child with no thought of overt sexuality, and he may be more shocked more than anyone else when he finds himself so deeply

involved. In deYoung's (1982) sample of 47 pedophiles, four were over the age of 60, and this appeared to be typical in all studies of that age group. Gigeroff et.al. (1968) suggests that these individuals typically have led impeccable lives and the child molestation occurs within the context of play and is not likely to involve force. This was substantiated by deYoung (1982) who stated that most senescent pedophiles are gentle with their victims and are usually content with fondling and kissing rather than intercourse or attempted intercourse. Their goal in molesting children is the gratification of needs for companionship and affection; the gratification of sexual needs appears to be of secondary concern. Finally, with the majority of these men, court appearance is a sufficient shock to prevent further occurences of acting out.

Pedophilia is a deviance which can be identified as such, only if there is a significant age difference between the offender and the object. According to the third edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM III) (1980), the difference in age with the adult with this paraphilic disorder and the prepubertal child is arbitrarily set at ten years or more. However, the deviation is related to the sexual maturity of the victim. Mohr et.al. (1964) in the Forensic Clinic Study took the natural break-off point to be the onset of puberty, determined by the presence or absence of secondary sex characteristics. In chronological terms, the onset of puberty not only differs generally between the sexes, but also with individual children. Despite this, they found that it does not present a major difficulty in heterosexual pedophilia where the majority of victims fall between the ages of 6 and 12 years. In homosexual pedophilia it does present a problem since the number of

victims increases right into puberty, resulting in a statistical overlap with adult homosexuality. In an earlier study, Mohr (1962) found the following trends: the preferred object of the heterosexual pedophile is between the age of six to eleven, with the peak at eleven and sharply decreasing (the mean age of victims for the adolescent group of offenders being around six years and for the older two groups around ten years). The age of objects of homosexual pedophiles does not show the same decrease of distribution but increases right up to the legal break-off point of sixteen. The peak in the age of the victims comes consistently between twelve and fifteen, and thus coincides with puberty. He also noted that the puberty of boys occurs at a later date than that of girls, but this would only account for one to two years of the difference in peaks of frequency in the two pedophilias which actually is around four years. In accordance with this, Righton (1981) found that the most frequently mentioned age at which children have their greatest sexual appeal for pedophiles is 13 for boys and 12 for girls which again corresponds roughly with the arrival of puberty in both sexes. In a major American study, Gebhard et.al. (1965) found that among 224 men sentenced for sexual activities with children under the age of 11, only two preferred prepubertal children as sexual partners. Of a further 269 convicted for offences against youngsters aged between 12 and 15, no more than 17 had commited the offences because of their preference for this age group. Hayman and Lanza (1971) who surveyed 2,190 victims of sex offences in Washington D.C. between 1965 and 1969, reported that 13% were 9 years old or younger and that 23% were 10 to 14 years old. According to the Badgley Report (1984) 45% of the male

victims and 35.9% of the female victims were under 12 years of age. Finally, O'Carrol (1980) substantiated these findings when he surveyed the Paedophile Information Exchange in Britain and found that the members were most attracted to girls age 8 to 11, and boys aged 11 to 15 years old.

Thus far, it has been demonstrated that pedophiles form a group which encompasses many individuals who all possess individual reasons, causes and preferences with regard to their deviation. Because of this, perhaps, criminological and sociological research exhibits controversy over the concepts, measures and explanations of deviant behaviour. There is also the question as to whether it is justifiable to consider a particular group of offenders as a meaningful group who are deemed to be the same because of their crime. Legally, any research on this phenomenon is faced with a problem of a lack of a definition, as there is no offence in the criminal code corresponding to the catagory of pedophilia. Prior to the amendments to the Canadian Criminal Code in 1984, heterosexual pedophilic acts could be charged under Indecent Assault Female (sec. 149(1)), Gross Indecency (sec. 157), Indecent Assault (sec. 169), or, Contributing to Juvenile Delinquency (Juvenile Delinquent Act sec. 33). In the rare cases involving heterosexual intercourse, charges could be laid under sec. 146(1) Sexual intercourse with a female under 14, and sec. 146(2) Sexual intercourse with a female between 14 and 16. Also, before 1984, homosexual acts could be charged under, Indecent assault male (sec. 156), Gross Indecency (sec. 157), or Contributing to Juvenile Delinquency (Juvenile Delinquent Act sec. 33). According to the Canadian Criminal Code as of 1984, any offence of this

nature would fall under the catagory of Sexual Assault (sec. 246.1), Sexual Assault with Threats, Weapon or Causing Bodily Harm (sec. 246.2), Aggrivated Sexual Assault (sec. 246.3), Buggery and Beastiality (sec 155), Sexual Intercourse with Step-daughter, Foster Daughter or Female Ward (sec. 146(1)), Sexual Intercourse with Female under 14 or 15 (sec. 146(2)), Parent or Guardian Procurring Defilement (sec. 166), Corrupting Children (sec. 168), Gross Indecency (sec. 157) and Indecent Assault (sec. 169). The greatest problem facing any charge of this nature is the legislative assumption that all offenders are the same. The law does not make a distinction with regard to the age difference between the accused and his victim. The DSM III states that for a pedophilic act to occur, there must exist a difference in ages between offender and victim arbitrarily set at 10 years. This is to differentiate between sexual acts involving a 10 year old girl and a 13 year old boy, and between a 10 year old girl and a 20 year old man. Nonetheless, in the prevention of the offence and the treatment of the offender, problems are encountered because, lumped together under an all encompassing definition and label are a multitude of phenomena. There are many instances where people considered a single group because of the generality of definition really constitute a number of distinct and different groups. Durkheim (1951) for example, has shown that suicide, people who kill themselves, predominantly indulged in by old single males, constitued not the single phenomenon of suicide but three morphologically and aetiologically distinct phenomena. According to Jayewardene (1976) who cited Okasaki (1976), Tsunenari et.al. (1971), and Ranasinghe and Jayewardene (1966), the recent findings that in

some societies, the predominant characteristics of suicide - old single males - do not prevail, tend to support the view that the once considered homogeneous phenomenon of suicide is in reality a heterogeneous one. Similarly, Jayewardene (1960) has shown that homicide, though by and large a highly personalized act and considered a homogeneous phenomenon, mainly because of its definition of the killing of an individual by another individual is comprised of several types which could be placed on a continuum reflecting the type of violence involved, when the victim-offender relationship is considered to be discriminant. Finally, Mohr (1964) has shown that the exploration of the primary phenomenological factors determining the concept of pedophilia - the sex of the victim chosen, the age of the offender, his personal and social characteristics, as well as the type of activity indulged in, reveals pedophilia to constitute not a single phenomenon but a number of them and pedophiles not to be a single group but to constitute a number of morphologically and aetiologically distinct and different groups.

One way adopted by the courts of dealing with pedophiles is to send them to a psychiatric institution for assessment and/or treatment. In these institutions, hopefully, the investigations to which the pedophiles are subjected, permits the seperation of the various groups that constitute the large legal catagory of pedophiles. The identification of their different morphologies as well as aetiologies and the different therapies adopted as best suited for them as a means of determining whether such is really the situation is the purpose of this study. As such, it entails a retrospective and descriptive survey of pedophiles at the Forensic

Unit of the Royal Ottawa Hospital in order to see if those who are lumped together and labelled pedophiles do not in fact constitute a number of morphologically and aetiologically different groups.

REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association. (1980) Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders - Third Edition

Bancroft, J. Human Sexuality and its Problems. London: Churchill Livingstone.

Bernard, F., (1975) An Enquiry Among a Group of Pedophiles. Journal of Sex Research. 11, 242-255.

Brongersma, E. (1977) On Living Relationships. Human and Humane. Childhood Rights. Vol. 1, No. 2.

Brongersma, E. (1979) The Unknown Pedophile. Unpublished Manual cited in T. O'Carrol (1980) Paedophilia: The Radical Case. Boston: Alyson Press.

Bryant, C. D. (1982) Sexual Deviancy and Social Proscription: The Social Context of Carnal Behavior. New York: Human Sciences Press Inc.

Burgess, A. W., et. al. (1978) Sexual Assault on Children and Adolescents. Lexington Mass: Lexington Books.

Canadian Criminal Code (1984).

Cohen, M., and Seghorn, T. (1969) Sociometric Study of the Sex Offender. Journal of Abnormal Psychology. 72, 249-255.

Davis, J. C. (1962) The Child Molester - Fact and Fiction. Unpublished Manuscript. Psychology Department. Florida State University. Chatahoochie Florida.

deFrancis, V. (1969) Protecting the Child Victim of Sex Crimes Committed by Adults. Denver: American Humane Association.

deYoung, M. (1982) The Sexual Victimization of Children. Jefferson N. C: McFarland and Company Inc.

Donovan, M. V. (1978) The Sexual Assault of Children Under Twelve Years of Age. M. A. Thesis. Toronto: University of Toronto Centre of Criminology.

Durkheim, E. (1951) Suicide. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Eglinton, J. (1971) Greek Love. London: Neville Spearman.

Freund, K., Hemsman, G. A., and Roper, V. (1982) Results of the Main Studies on Sexual Offences Against Children and Pubescents. Canadian Journal of Criminology. 4, 387-397.

Gagnon, J. H. (1965) Female Child Victims of Sex Offenders. Social Problems. 13, 176-192.

Gebhard, P. H., Gagnon, J. H., Pomeroy, W. B., and Christenson, C. V. (1965) Sex Offenders: An Analysis of Types. New York: Harper and Row.

Geiser, R. L. (1979) Hidden Victims: The Sexual Abuse of Children. Boston: Beacon Press.

Gibbens, T. C. N., and Prince, J. (1963) Child Victims of Sex Offenders. London: Institute for the Study and Treatment of Sex Offenders.

Gigeroff, A. K. (1968) Sex Offenders on Probation: Heterosexual Pedophiles. Federal Probation. 32, 17-21.

Glueck, B. D. (1955) Final Report: Research Projects for the Study and Treatment of Persons Convicted of Crimes Involving Sexual Aberrations. New York: Department of Mental Health.

Green, F. C. (1979) Introduction: Child Sexual Abuse - the Physician's Responsibility. Pediatric annals, 8, 286-288.

Groth, A. N. (1979) Sexual Traumas in the Life Histories of Rapists and Child Molesters. Victimology. 4, 10-16.

Groth, A. N., and Burgess, A. W. (1977) Motivational Intent in the Sexual Assault of Children. Criminal Justice and Behaviour. 4, 253-264.

Groth, A. N., and Birnbaum, H. J. (1978) Adult Sexual Orientation and Attraction to Underaged Persons. Archives of Sexual Behaviour. 7, 175-181.

Guttmacher, M. S., and Weihofen, H. (1952) Psychaitry and the Law. New York: Norton.

Hammer, E. F., and Jacks, I. (1955) A study of Rorschach Flexor and Extensor Human Movement Responses. Journal of Clinical Psychology. 11, 63-67.

Ingram, M. (1977) A Child Counsellor's Findings. Magpie - Pedophile Information Exchange. No. 5.

Jayewardene, C. H. S. (1960) Criminal Homocide: A Study in Culture Conflict. PhD. Dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Jayewardene, C. H. S. (1976) The Nature of Homocide: Canada 1961-1970. in Silverman and Teevan, Crime in Canadian Society. Toronto: Butterworth and Company.

Kinset, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., and Gebhard, P. H. (1953) Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.

Krafft-Ebing, (1934) Psychopathia Sexualis. (Translated from the 12th German Edition by F. J. Rebman) New York: Physicians and Surgeons Book Co.

Landis, J. T. (1956) Experiences of 500 Children With Adult Sexual Deviation. Psychiatric Quarterly. 30, 91-109.

Mathis, J. L. (1972) Clear Thinking About Sexual Deviation. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Co.

McGaghy, C. H. (1967) Child Molesters: A Study of Their Careers as Deviants. in Clinard and Quinsey, Criminal Behavior Systems. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 75-88.

Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, and The Minister of National Health and Welfare. (1984) Sexual Offences Against Children - The Badgley Report. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.

Mohr, J. W. (1962) The Pedophiles: Their Clinical, Social and Legal Implications. Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal. 7, 255-260.

Mohr, J. W., Turner, R. E., and Jerry, M. B. (1964) Pedophilia and Exhibitionism. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mohr, J. W. (1981) Age Structures in Pedophilia. in M. Cook, and K. Howells, Adult Sexual Interest in Children. London: Academic Press. 11-53.

Newsweek. (1984) May 14.

O'Carrol. T. (1982) Paedophilia: The Radical Case. Boston: Alyson Press.

Okasaki, A. (1976) Suicide of the Younger Generation in Japan. Acta. Criminol. Med. Leg. Japan. 33, 201-205.

Ranasinghe, H., and Jayewardene, C. H. S. (1966) Suicide in the Southern Province. Ceylon Journal of Medical Science. 15, 31-40.

Revitch, E., and Weiss, R. G. (1962) The Pedophilic Offender. Diseases of the Nervous System. 23, 73-78.

Righton, P. (1981) The Adult. in B. Taylor, Perspectives on Pedophilia. London: Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd. 24-30.

Rossman, G. P. (1979) Sexual Experiences Between Men and Boys. London: Temple Smith.

Sgroi, S. M. (1975) Molestation of Children. Children Today. May-June.

Shoor, M. et. al. (1966) syndrome of the Adolescent Child Molester. American Journal of Psychiatry. 12, 783-789.

Summit, R., and Kryso, J. (1978) sexual Abuse of Children: A Clinical spectrum. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 48, 237-251.

Swanson, D. W. (1968) Adult Sexual Abuse of Children. Diseases of the Nervous System. 29, 677-683.

Swift, C. (1977) Sexual Victimization of Children: An Urban Mental Health Center Survey. Victimology. 2, 322-326.

Swigert, V. L. et. al. (1976) sexual Homicide: Social Psychological and Legal Aspects. Archives of Sexual Behavior. 5, 391-401.

Tsunerari, S., Ogata, Y., Kakihara, Y., and Takahama, K. (1971) Statistical Observations in Kumamoto Prefecture in the Recent Five Years. Acta. Criminol. Medico. Legal. Japan. 37, 220-229.

Voight, J. (1972) Sexual Offences in Coppenhagen: A Medico-Legal Study. Forensic Science. 1, 67-76.

METHODOLOGY

The survey of the literature indicates that while pedophiles have in common their sexual attraction and actions towards children, in a number of other respects there exists sufficient similarities and dissimilarities for them to be regarded as, a heterogeneous rather than as a homogeneous group. The heterogeneity suggests differential causation and consequently the need for differential treatment. The purpose of this study is to ascertain whether the in-patient and out-patient pedophiles at the Royal Ottawa Hospital constitute a homogeneous or heterogeneous group and whether they have been treated there as a homogeneous or heterogeneous group. This determination involves the analysis of data collected at the Forensic Unit of the Royal Ottawa Hospital. This unit provides the services of assessment and treatment to psychiatric offenders who are referred pre-arrest, pre-preliminary, pre-trial, pre-sentence, before appeal, or without a charge. Once an offender is admitted as an out-patient or as an in-patient in the open or medium secure unit, an assessment is conducted by the attending psychiatrist. This entails an outline of the offence, a full set of biochemical tests, and a psychiatric history from childhood up to the time of admittance. In addition to this, a social worker and a psychologist each conduct an assessment, which entails a family and social history of the offender as well as a battery of psychological tests. For the patients who are sexual offenders, a further set of tests are conducted through the Sexual Behaviour Clinic

and include a series of psychosexual and physiological assessments. With this information, the psychiatrist obtains a complete picture of the offender and is able to decide on a treatment plan and if necessary, submit a report to the court.

Perusal of the dockets of the pedophiles indicates the existence of information on a number of variables falling into six distinct areas:

(1) Characteristics of the offence,
(2) Social and demograohic characteristics of the offender,
(3) Psychiatric assessment of the offender,
(4) Psychological assessment of the offender,
(5) Biochemical assessment of the offender, and
(6) Psychosexual assessment of the offender.

For the purpose of this study, only the variables identified as relevant in the literature were examined

Pertaining to the characteristics of the offence, the following four variables were considered:

(1) The sex of the victim, which enables us to speak of heterosexual pedophilia and homosexual pedophilia;

(2) The age of the victim, divided for the purpose of this study into three groups (a) under five years old; (b) five to ten years old; and (c) over ten years old;

(3) The victim's relationship to the offender catagorized as (a) nil; (b) casual acquaintance; and (c) good friend;

and, (4) The amount of violence used against the victim rated on a continuum ranging from no violence to excessive violence through some violence,

moderate violence and severe violence.

The sex of the victim is considered important because the sexual preference of the offender, previous research has indicated, serves to differentiate three distinct types of pedophilia. The age of the victim and the victim's relationship to the offender give an indication of the premeditation involved as well as of the resistence which the offender perhaps encountered, and consequently they indicate the seriousness of the disorder and the strength of the pedophilic urge. The amount of violence used could, of course, be considered an indication of the dangerousness of the offender.

The second group of variables relates to the social and demographic characteristics of the offender. The six variables examined are:

(1) The occupation of the pedophiles catagorized as a) no occupation, b) major professional i.e. High executive position, Proprietor of a large concern, Doctor, or Lawyer, c) minor professional i.e. Proprietor of a medium concern, or business manager, d) Administrative Personnel, i.e. Small Business owner, Foreman, or Supervisor, e) Clerical, Sales Worker, or Technician, f) Skilled Manual Worker, g) Semi-Skilled Worker or Machine Operator, h) Unskilled Worker i.e. Farm Worker, Laborer, or Housemaid), i) Homemaker, Housewife, j) student, and k) "other".

(2) The employment status of the pedophiles which is catagorized as unemployed, part-time employment, full-time employment, and retired;

(3) The education levels obtained by the pedophiles divided for the

purpose of this study into ten groups: (a) graduate professional training i.e. Law, Medicine; (b) college/university graduate; (c) partial university training; (d) diploma/certificate; (e) grade 12, high school, or equivalent; (f) grade 11; (g) grade 10; (h) grade 9; (i) grade 8; (j) less than 7 years of schooling; and (k) nil.

(4) The marital status of the pedophiles catagorized as (a) single; (b) married; (c) seperated; (d) divorced; (e) widowed and (f) common-law.

(5) The number of dependent children of the pedophiles catagorized according to the actual numbers.

and, (6) The age of the pedophiles at the time of their admission divided for the purpose of this study into three groups; (a) less than nineteen years old; (b) twenty to forty-nine years old; and (c) fifty to seventy-five years old.

These variables have been included in previous studies in an attempt to differentiate pedophiles from the general population and to differentiate the different types of pedophiles from each other. The information obtained from the pedophiles' occupations, education levels, and employment status' indicates whether or not their sexual disorder becomes an inhibitory factor in their day to day living and their achievements. Their marital status and the number of dependent children indicate whether or not their pedophilic tendencies prevent them from engaging in what is socially considered normal reproductive activity. Their age has enabled their division into three groups - adolescent, middle aged and senescent pedophiles.

The third group of variables relates to the psychiatric assessment of the offenders. The six variables analyzed are:

(1) The patient status at the time of admission which is classified as (a) in-patient in the medium secure unit; (b) in-patient in the open unit; and (c) out-patient status.

(2) The psychiatrist's perception of the level of dangerousness of the pedophile, rated on a continuum from (a) not dangerous; (b) conditionally dangerous; to (c) unconditionally dangerous.

(3) The offender's mental state at the time of the offence catagorized as (a) nil; (b) alcohol; (c) drugs; (d) mental disorder other than intoxication; (e) epilepsy; (f) automatism; (g) dissociation i.e. psychological causes; (h) sleep or hypnosis; (i) delusion; (j) hallucination; (k) "irresistible impulse"; or (l) "other".

(4) The apparent psychiatric illnesses of the pedophiles which are catagorized as (a) mental retardation; (b) anxiety neurosis; (c) hysterical neurosis; (d) obsessive compulsive neurosis; (e) depressive neurosis; (f) paranoid personality disorder; (g) explosive personality disorder; (h) hysterical personality disorder; (i) asthenic personality disorder; (j) antisocial personality disorder; and (k) inadequate personality disorder.

(5) The likeliness of the offense to re-occur rated on a continuum from not likely to re-occur to highly likely to re-occur through somewhat likely to re-occur, mildly likely to re-occur and fairly likely to re-occur.

and (6) The pedophile's lack of guilt or remorse which has been catagorized for the purpose of this study as (a) no guilt or remorse; (b) little degree of guilt or remorse; (c) mild degree of guilt or remorse; (d) moderate degree of guilt or

remorse and (e) a high degree of guilt or remorse.

The patient status at the time of admission and the psychiatrist's perception of the degree of dangerousness indicate the security level needed while under assessment. The offender's mental state at the time of the offence gives an idea of the possible external influences which may have been involved in the pedophilic activities of these men, while their psychiatric illnesses provide an indication of a possible relationship between pedophilia and mental disorder. The likeliness of the offence to re-occur indicates whether the pedophiles are habitual or circumstantial offenders. The lack of guilt or remorse provides some insight into the nature of, and their attitudes towards their pedophilic activities.

The fourth group of variables reflecting the results of the battery of standardized psychological tests include the following:

(1) The Wechsler Adult Intelligence Test - Revised (WAIS-R) which is composed of eleven sub-tests, six verbal and five performance. The verbal scale includes (a) information; (b) digit span; (c) vocabulary; (d) arithmetic; (e) comprehension and (f) similarities. The performance scale includes (g) picture completion; (h) picture arrangement; (i) block design; (j) object assembly and (k) digit symbol. Based on the test score, the subject is catagorized as (a) mentally retarded; (b) borderline retarded; (c) low average inteligence; (d) average intelligence; (e) high average intelligence; (f) superior intelligence or (g) very superior intelligence

(2) The Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised (WRAT-R) is composed

of three subtests which include (a) reading: recognizing and naming letters and pronouncing words out of context; (b) spelling: copying marks resembling letters and writing single words to dictation and (c) arithmetic: counting, reading number symbols, solving oral problems, and performing written computations.

(3) The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), is a test composed of printed statements to which one may answer "true", "false", or "cannot say" (undecided). These statements have been sorted into ten clinical scales and three validity scales. The clinical scales include (a) hypochondriasis; (b) depression; (c) hysteria; (d) psychopathic deviance; (e) masculinity/femininity; (f) paranoia; (g) psychasthenia; (h) schizophrenia; (i) hypomania and (j) social introversion. The three validity scales include (k) the L or lie scale which is intended to identify persons who are deliberately trying to avoid answering frankly and honestly; (l) the K scale which is intended to indicate defensiveness in the form of presenting oneself in a more socially desirable way and (m) the F scale which seeks to detect unusual or atypical ways of answering the test items.

The WAIS-R has been designed to measure major mental abilities. It provides information regarding the diversification of the intelligence levels of the population in general and in this instance, the pedophiles in particular. The WRAT-R has been designed as an adjunct to tests of intelligence and behaviour adjustment. It verifies and compliments the results and classifications of other intelligence tests and is a very accurate measurement of the three basic academic codes. The MMPI has been designed to deliver a symptom/personality profile of the pedophile which provides

information on the level and pattern of psychological symptoms. It is important to note that although sexual dysfunctions or disorders may not reveal unique MMPI profiles as such, it is, according to Derogatis (1980) the most useful psychological test in work with sexual disorders.

The fifth area of variables includes the determination of the levels of three sex hormones. These are:

(1) Testosterone rated on a continuum from (a) a low reading of 0 to 9.9 nmol/L; (b) an average reading of 10 to 27.9 nmol/L to (c) a high reading of 28 to 50 nmol/L.

(2) Follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH) rated on a continuum from (a) a low reading of 0 to 4.9 IU/L; (b) an average reading of 5 to 24.9 IU/L to (c) a high reading of 25 to 50 IU/L.

and (3) Luteinizing hormone (LH) rated on a continuum from (a) a low reading of 0 to 5.9 IU/L; (b) an average reading of 6 to 29.9 IU/L to (c) a high reading of 30 to 100 IU/L.

These hormones provide information on the biochemical make-up of the pedophiles with reference to biological factors which may influence their actions. Testosterone in males regulates spermatogenesis and is responsible for the development of secondary sex characteristics. Bradford (1983a) states that the present state of knowledge supports a correlation between plasma testosterone and sex drive. According to Gardwood (1979) and the Merck Manual (1982) FSH is a glycoprotein and is necessary for normal puberty in both sexes. In males, it causes the development

of the seminiferous tubules and spermatozoa. LH stimulates the secretion of testosterone by the testicular interstitial (Leydig) cells. This occurs when LH synergizes with FSH to increase testosterone secretion. Finally, a lack of the latter two gonadotropic hormones, FSH and LH leads to an impairment in both the reproductive and the steroid secretory functions of the gonads which would in turn inhibit or cause an overproduction of testosterone.

The sixth and final group of variables relates to the psychosexual assessment of the pedophile and includes two series of penile tumescence tests, and three psychosexual tests. The penile tumescence tests include

(1) Presentation of eight slides of nudes consisting of an (a) adolescent female, (b) female child (10 - 11 years old), (c) male child (11 years old), (d) adolescent male, (e) male child (7 - 8 years old), (f) adult female, (g) adult male and (h) female child (4 - 5 years old);

and (2) Audio taped narrations of heterosexual pedophilic acts and homosexual pedophilic acts. The heterosexual tapes include eight narratives which depict situations of (a) child initiated sexual acts; (b) mutually consenting sexual acts with a child; (c) non-physically coercive sexual acts; (d) sadistic sexual acts; (e) nonsexual assault; (f) heterosexual adult mutually consenting sexual acts; and (g) incest with a female child. The homosexual tapes are comprised of nine narratives which depict situations of (h) child initiated sexual acts; (i) mutually consenting acts with a child; (j) non-physically coercive sexual acts; (k) physically coercive sexual acts; (l) sadistic sexual acts; (m) nonsexual assault;

(n) heterosexual adult mutually consenting sexual acts; (o) homosexual adult mutually consenting acts and (p) incest. In these tests the subjects are seated alone in a soundproof room and each subject receives two sets of instrictions prior to the presentation of each stimulus. One set of instructions requires the subject simply to listen to the tape in order to provide an arousal condition. The second set instructs the subject to suppress his arousal. This is done in order to minimize the possibility of false negative readings which would occur if the men tried to suppress their arousal in the first series of tests. Previous research indicates that the suppress condition discriminates between "deviants" and "normals" more clearly than the arouse condition (Abel 1978). The subjects' responses are calculated as a percentage of their full erection which, when the actual measure cannot be obtained it is estimated as 20 mm. above baseline. Penile circumference is measured by a mercury-in-rubber strain gauge and is recorded in millivolts. The response to each tape yields a percentage which is deemed to be significant if a minimum of 5.0% of full erection is observed. Finally, pedophile and assault indices are calculated in both arouse and suppress conditions to ascertian whether the individual is more aroused by pedophilic and assaultive acts than by mutually consented adult sexual acts. The pedophile index is calculated by taking the highest responses to either Child Initiates or Child Mutual and dividing it by the Adult Mutual (hetero) response. The assault index is calculated by taking the highest response to Non-physical Coercion, Physical Coercion, Sadism or Assault and dividing it by the highest response to either Child Initiates or Child Mutual. Any index greater than 1 indicates

tendencies towards pedophilia or assault respectively but an index exceeding 1.5 is considered highly significant.

(3) The Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory (DSF I) which is a self-report inventory includes tensubsets. These are (a) Information, designed to measure the understanding and appreciation of the individual as to the fundamental facts about anatomy, physiology, psychology, and general hygiene regarding sexual functioning; (b) Experience which is designed to assess the spectrum of behaviours experienced by the individual; (c) Drive which measures the level of interest or investment in sexual relationships, usually referred to as libido or sex drive; (d) Attitude which relates to the individual's attitudes toward sexual matters, which affect the quality of sexual behaviour; (e) Gender Role Identity which reflects the gender role integration, that is, the adaptions to what constitutes the standard for male and female sexual behaviour; (f) Fantasy which is the catagory designed to assess the nature and range of an individual's sexual fantasy; (g) Body Image which is designed to measure the individual's attitudes towards his body; and (h) Satisfaction which is designed to assess the level of sexual satisfaction the individual experiences. In addition to these eight subsets there are two other distinct psychometric instruments, (i) The Brief Symptom Inventory which Bradford (1983b) states is a measure of psychological symptoms and reflects psychopathology via a nine symptom dimension score and three global scores; and (j) The Affect Balance Scale which according to Bradford (1983) is a measure of mood and affect and provides a profile of four positive and four negative affects plus three gobal measures. With

this then, we are provided with a multidimensional test that measures the current sexual functioning of each subject.

(4) The Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory is a self-report test which is designed to measure seven subclasses of hostility. Each subject is presented with a set of sixty-six questions and is asked to decide if each of the statements are true or false as they pertain to them. The subsets include (a) Negativism (oppositional behaviour, usually directed at authority); (b) Resentment (jealousy and hatred of others); (c) Indirect Hostility (roundabout and undirected aggression); (d) Assault (physical violence against others); (e) Suspicion (projection of hostility onto others); (f) Irritability (a readiness to explode with negative affect at the slighest provocation) and (g) Verbal Hostility (negative affect expressed in both the style and content of speech). In addition to these seven subsets which are combined for a measure of overall hostility, the Sexual Behaviours Clinic has added a Guilt catagory consisting of nine items and which is scored independently.

(5) The Sexual Attitude Score consists of a list of 25 concepts each of which the subject rates on four continuums ranging from (a) seductive to repulsive; (b) exciting to dull; (c) sexy to sexless, and (d) erotic to frigid. The responses to the 25 concepts in this test are analyzed and the scores in each of the following catagories are analyzed: (e) Heterosexuality; (f) Homosexuality; (g) Heterosexual Pedophilia; (h) Homosexual Pedophilia; (i)Fetishisms; (j) Transvestism; (k) Exhibitionism; (l) Voyeurism; (m) Frotteurism; (n) Sadism/Masochism and (o) Neutral.

The penile tumescence tests are considered important in the assessment of sexual

offenders as they aid in differentiating sexual arousal from other emotional states (Quinsey 1977, Freund 1971). Bradford (1983c) states that, in man, penile tumescence (plethysmography) has been established as a specific and reliable measure of sexual arousal and Rosen and Kopel (1978) claim that the correlation between penile tumescence measures and the subjective assessmant of sexual arousal is high and has been reported in the range of 0.55 to 0.74. According to Avery-Clark (1984) recent research results suggest that recording sexual offenders' erection responses to audiotape descriptions of different types of sexual and aggressive activities represents a very new and potentially useful assessment and treatment monitering procedure that poses few of the difficulties of the traditional approaches and which, if used in conjunction with the familiar schemes, may provide a more accurate classification and management of these offenders. This was also confirmed by Abel, Barlow, Blanchard, and Mavissakalian (1975), Abel and Blanchard (1976), Abel, Blanchard, Becker and Djendered jian (1978), Bancroft (1971), Bancroft, Jones and Pullan (1966), Barlow (1974), Barlow, Becker, Leitenberg and Agras (1970), Freund (1967), and Laws (1977). Finally, Abel et.al. (1975) states that investigators have used these measurements for three purposes. First, to diagnose heterosexual and homosexual pedophilic arousal patterns, confirming validity and reliability of erection in diagnosis. Second, as an integral part of treatment, and third, to evaluate results of experimental treatment. The three psychosexual tests are considered important because techniques of formal psychological assessment of sexual behaviour are vital in understanding normalities and abnormalities in the

sexual functioning of pedophiles. It is important to note though, that in themselves they do not form a complete psychological assessment, but in conjunction with the aforementioned physiological tests they form a psychosexual overview of the sexual activities, characteristics, and attitudes of abnormal sexual functioning.

The DSFI is designed to measure the adequacy of sexual functioning. According to Bradford (1983b) it is an omnibus-type of scale which provides a profile of the individual's sexual functioning and also contributes to a global score, the Sexual Functioning Index. This index combined with the profile is useful in determining whether or not pedophiles differ from each other or from the general population in sexual functioning.

The Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory is also an important test in analyzing pedophiles as it provides an indication of the levels of hostility of individual pedophiles and compares them to a global score taken from the general population.

The Sexual Attitude Score is designed to measure the meaning of certain sexual acts and concepts to the respondents by having them indicate their first impressions using a series of descriptive scales.

For this study, a technique had to be found which would enable us to ascertain whether the pedophiles studied constituted a homogeneous or heterogeneous group with reference to the variables. A review of the literature on grouping techniques utilizing quantitative data used in criminology (Maxim 1975) suggests the existence of two popular methods. One of these was the Ward's Hierarchical grouping technique which is an agglomerative technique that uses a general distance function

as its criterion for similarity. The Ward technique finds the difference between the values of two subjects on each variable, squares it, then summates the values across each variable. The distance between each group is then made proportionate to the number of individuals within each group. Those pairs with the least distance or error value are then combined, one pair at a time to form a group. If the error value is 0.0, then the pairs are identical and consequently form a totally homogeneous group.

The second method was Association Analysis which is a divisive grouping technique using a summated distance function (the chi-square statistic). The chi-square statistic is used as a measurement of similarity or dissimilarity in order to provide a criterion for dividing groups. According to the SPSS Manual, the chi-square is also a test of statistical significance, and is used to determine whether a systematic relationship exists between two or more variables. This is done by computing the cell frequencies which would be expected if no relationship is present between the variables given the existing rows and column totals. The expected cell frequencies are then compared to the actual values found. Thus, the chi-square indicates whether the variables are statistically independent or related.

For this study, Association Analysis was considered the preferred technique. Earlier research had indicated that pedophiles could be divided first on the basis of the sexual preference of the offender into three distinct groups and second on the basis of the age of the offender again into three distinct groups. What is more, earlier research has also indicated a relationship between the three groups based on

sexual preference and the three groups based on age. For this study the sample was divided first on the basis of the sexual preference and then on the basis of the age of the offender. The groups were then compared relative to the variables discussed to determine whether these variables support the division.

REFERENCES

Abel, G. G., and Blanchard, E. E. (1976) The Measurement and Generation of Sexual Arousal, in M. Hersen, R. M. Eisler and P. M. Miller Progress in Behavior Modification New York: Academic Press, 2, 99-136.

Abel, G. G., Blanchard, E. B., Barlow, D.H., and Mavissakalian, M. (1975) Identifying Specific Erotic Cues in Sexual Deviation by Audiotaped Descriptions. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 8, 247-260.

Abel, G. G., Blanchard, E. B., Becker, J. V., and Djenderedjian, A. (1978) Differentiating Sexual Aggressives with Penile Measures. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 5, 315-332.

Avery-Clark, C. A., and Laws, D. R. (1984) Differential Erection Response Patterns of Sexual Child Abusers to Stimulli Describing Activities with Children. Behavior Therapy, 15, 71-83.

Bancroft, J., (1971) Application of Psychophysiological Measures to the Assessment and Modification of Sexual Behavior. Behavior Research. 9, 119-130.

Bancroft, J., Jones, H. C., and Pullan, B. P. (1966) A Simple Transducer for Measuring Penile Erections with Comments on its Use in the Treatment of Sexual Disorders. Behavior Research and Therapy, 4, 239-241.

Barlow, D. H. (1974) The Treatmentof Sexual Deviation: Toward a Comprehensive Behavioral Approach. in K. S. Calhoun, H. E. Adams, and K. M. Mitchell, Innovative Treatment Methods in Psychotherapy. New York: Wiley, 122-147.

Barlow, D. H., Becker, R., Leitenberg, H., and Argas, W. S. (1970) A Mechanical Strain Gauge for Recording Penile Circumference Change. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 3, 73-76.

Bradford, J. McD. W. (1983a) The Hormonal Treatment of Sex Offenders. Booklet reprinted by The American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law. Vol. 11 No. 2.

Bradford, J. McD. W. (1983b) The Forensic Psychiatric Aspects of Schizophrenia. The Psychiatric Journal of The University of Ottawa. 8, 98-100.

Bradford, J. McD. W. (1983c) Research on Sex Offenders: Recent Trends. Psychiatric Clinics of North America. 6, 715-731.

Derogatis, L. R. (1980) Psychological Assessment for Psychosexual Functioning. The Psychiatric Clinics of North America

Freund, K. (1971) A Note of the Use of the Phallometric Method of Measuring Mild Sexual Arousal in the Male. Behavior Therapy. 2, 223-228.

Maxim, P. (1975) Quantatative Data Grouping Techniques as Applied to Criminology. M.A. Thesis. University of Ottawa.

Quinsey, V. L. (1977) The Assessment and Treatment of Child Molesters: A Review. Canadian Psychological Review. 18, 204-220.

Rosen, R. S., and Kopen, S. A. (1978) The Role of Penile Tumescence Measurement in the Behavioral Treatment of Sexual Deviation: Issues and Validity. Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology. 46, 1519-1521.

RESULTS

Data obtained from the Forensic Unit of the Royal Ottawa Hospital provided information on the 52 pedophiles who were admitted for assessment during the two year period between March 1, 1983 and March 15, 1985. Of these 52 men, twenty three (44.2%) were charged with Sexual Assault, sixteen (32.7%) with Indecent Assault, two (3.8%) with Gross Indecency, two (3.8%) with Murder, one (1.9%) with Common Assault, one (1.9%) with Indecent Exposure, one (1.9%) with Kidnapping and Forcible Confinement, one (1.9%) with Arson, and four (7.7%) had not been charged. Ten (19.2%) were referred to the Forensic Unit by a judge, four (7.7%) were referred by a justice of the peace, nineteen (36.5%) were referred by their defence counsel, two (3.8%) were referred by their probation officer, one (1.9%) was referred by his parole officer, another one (1.9%) by a social agency, six (11.5%) were referred by a psychiatrist, one (1.9%) by a general practitioner, and eight (15.4%) were self referrals.

A post sample stratification was made first on the basis of the sexual preference of the offender. The sexual preference of the offenders was established on the basis of their charge (when they were charged) or on the basis of the disclosure of their sexual preference to their psychiatrist. These preferences had been later substantiated by the various tests which were administered in the Forensic Unit. On the basis of the sexual preference it was found that the sample could be divided into two groups, heterosexual pedophiles and homosexual pedophiles. There were no

cases falling into the bisexual group. Twenty one (40.4%) of the child molesters were heterosexual pedophiles and thirty one (59.6%) were homosexual pedophiles.

A second post sample stratification was made on the basis of the age of the offenders. The ages of the men at the time of their admission ranged from fifteen to seventy-five years with a mean age of thirty-five years. The post sample stratification resulted in the division of the sample into three pedophilic groups, a) adolescent, b) middle aged, and c) senescent pedophiles. There were seven (13.5%) adolescent pedophiles who ranged in age from fifteen to ninteen years with a mean age of 17 years, thirty-seven (71.1%) middle aged pedophiles whose ages ranged from twenty to fourty-nine years with a mean age of 34.1 years, and eight (15.4%) senescent pedophiles whose ages ranged from fifty to seventy-five years with a mean age of 60.1 years. When the sexual preference was also taken into consideration, the 21 heterosexual pedophiles included 4 (7.7%) adolescents, 12 (23.1%) middle aged, and 5 (9.6%) senescent offenders. The 31 homosexual pedophiles included 3 (5.7%) adolescent offenders, 25 (48.1%) in the middle aged range, and 3 (5.8%) in the senescent group. (see table 1)

The pedophiles studied here were responsible for the victimization of 61 children - 37 boys and 24 girls. There were more victims than offenders as there were some cases of multiple victimization. When the sex of the victim was considered it was found that not all of the heterosexual pedophiles victimized girls, and not all of the homosexual pedophiles victimized boys in the alleged offence which resulted in their referral to the Forensic Unit of the Royal Ottawa Hospital. However,

homosexual pedophiles predominantly victimized boys, and heterosexual pedophiles predominantly victimized girls. The analysis of the sex of the victim resulted in a statistically significant difference in the sex of the offender based grouping [$X^2(1) = 52.93$, $p<.001$]. In the comparison of the age of the offender based grouping though, it was found that the actual sex of the victim did not differentiate between them [$X^2(2) = 1.20$, ns.]. (see tables 2 and 3)

The age of the victim did not differentiate between either the age of the offender based groups [$X^2(4) = 3.27$, ns.] or the sexual preference based groups [$X^2(2) = 5.06$, ns.]. As far as the age of the offender based groups are concerned, it was found that in the adolescent group 4 (80.0%) of the victims were between five and ten years of age, and 1 (20.0%) between ten and fifteen years of age. In the middle aged group 4 (8.5%) of the victims were under five years of age, 25 (53.2%) between five and ten years of age, and 18 (38.3%) between ten and fifteen years of age. In the senescent group 5 (55.6%) of the victims were between five and ten years of age, and 4 (44.4%) between ten and fifteen years of age. As far as the sexual preference based groups are concerned, in the heterosexual pedophilic group 2 (8.3%) of the victims were under five years of age, 17 (70.8%) between five and ten years of age, and 5 (20.8%) between ten and fifteen years of age. In the homosexual pedophilic group 2 (5.4%) of the victims were under five years of age, 17 (45.9%) between five and ten years of age, and 18 (48.7%) between ten and fifteen years of age. (see tables 4 and 5)

The third variable in the characteristics of the offence group of variables, that of the victim's relationship to the accused also did not differentiate between the

three age of offender based groupings [$X^2(4) = 2.14$, ns.] or between the two sexual preference based groups [$X^2(2) = 5.75$, ns.]. When the age of the offender based groups were considered, 4 (57.1%) of the adolescents, 5 (13.5%) of the middle aged group, and 1 (12.5%) of the senescent group offended or would offend against strangers. Casual acquaintances, were molested by 3 (42.9%) of the adolescents, 27 (69.2%) of the middle aged group, and 6 (75.0%) of the senescent group. Good friends, were not found to have been molested by the adolescents but, 5 (12.8%) of the middle aged group, and 1 (12.5%) of the senescent group did so. When the sexual preference based groupings were considered, it was found that 6 (27.3%) heterosexual and 4 (13.3%) of the homosexual pedophiles would molest children who were strangers to them. Sixteen (72.7%) of the heterosexual and 20 (66.7%) of the homosexual pedophiles would molest a casual acquaintance and 6 (20.0%) of the homosexual pedophiles would molest someone who was well known to him. (see tables 6 and 7).

The use of violence was found only in a few cases when the age of the offender based grouping was considered. Five (83.3%) of the adolescent pedophiles did not use any violence against their victims and 1 (16.7%) used a moderate amount. In the middle aged group, 29 (78.4%) used no violence, 4 (10.8%) used some violence, 2 (5.4%) used a moderate amount of violence, and 2 (5.4%) used an excessive amount of violence. None of the senescent offenders used any violence at all. When the consideration was on the basis of their sexual preferences, it was found that in the heterosexual group, 18 (85.7%) did not use any violence against their victims while 2 (9 .5%) used some violence, and 1 (4.8%) used a moderate amount of violence In the

homosexual pedophilic group, 24 (80.0%) did not use any physical violence against their victims, 2 (6.7%) used some violence, 2 (6.7%) used a moderate amount of violence, and 2 (6.7%) used an excessive amount of violence. The use of violence therefore did not help to differentiate between the three age of offender based groups [$X^2(6) = 4.32$, ns.] or between the two sexual preference based groups [$X^2(3) = 1.65$, ns.]. (see tables 8 and 9).

The data collected on the second set of variables pertain to the social and demographic characteristics of the offenders. The analysis of the occupations of the pedophiles, indicated that 2 (28.6%) of the 7 adolescent offenders were unskilled workers, and 5 (71.4%) were students. In the middle aged group, 6 (16.2%) of the 37 men didn't have a profession, 2 (5.4%) were major professionals, 1 (2.7%) was a minor professional, 3 (8.1%) were administrative personnel, 5 (13.5%) were clerical workers, sales workers or technicians, 4 (10.8%) were skilled manual workers, 7 (18.9%) were semi-skilled workers or machine operators, 7 (18.9%) were unskilled workers, 1 (2.7%) was a student, and another 1 (2.7%) fell into a catagory not mentioned above. In the senescent group, 4 (50%) were involved in administrative personnel work, 1 (12.5%) was a clerical worker, 1 (12.5%) was a skilled manual worker, and 1 (12.5%) fell into a catagory not mentioned above. The occupational distribution of pedophiles in the three age of offender based groups showed a statistically significant difference [$X^2(18) = 45.56$, $p<.001$,]. The analysis of the occupational distribution of the two sexual preference based groupings indicated that1 (4.8%) had no occupation, 1 (4.8%) of the heterosexual pedophiles was a major professional, 2 (9.5%) were involved in

administrative personnel work. 2 (9.5%) were either clerical workers, sales workers, or technicians, 3 (14.2%) were skilled manual workers, or machine operators, 4 (19.1%) were semi-skilled workers, 4 (19.1%) were unskilled workers, 3 (14.2%) were students, and 1(4.8%) fell into the "other" catagory. In the homosexual pedophilic group 5 (16.1%) had no occupation, 1 (3.2%) was a major professional, 1 (3.2%) was a minor professional, 5 (16.1%) were involved in administrative personnel work, 4 (12.9%) were clerical workers, sales workers or technicians, 2 (6.5%) were skilled manual workers, 4 (12.9%) were semi-skilled workers or machine operators, 5 (16.1%) were unskilled workers, 3 (9.7%) were students, and 1 (3.2%) fell into the "other" catagory. The differences in these distributions were not statistically significant [$X^2(9) = 4.16$, ns.]. (see tables 10 and 11)

Information on the employment status was obtained on 50 of the 52 pedophiles in this study. When the age of the offender based grouping was considered, it was found that 6 (85.7%) of the 7 adolescents were unemployed and only 1(14.3%) had a part-time job. The middle aged group indicated 18 (51.4%) unemployed, 1 (2.9%) with a part-time job, and 16 (45.7%) with full-time jobs. The senescent group contained 1(12.5%) who was unemployed, 1 (12.5%) who had a part-time job, 4 (50%) who had full-time jobs, and 2 (25%) who were unemployed. This analysis indicated a statistically significant difference [$X^2(8) = 19.75$ $p<.05$]. The analysis of the sexual preference based grouping indicated that among the heterosexual group 8 (40%) were unemployed, 2 (10%) had part-time jobs, 9 (45%) had full-time jobs, and 1 (5%) was retired. Among the homosexual group 17 (56.7%) were unemployed, 1 (3.3%) had a

part-time job, 11 (36.7%) had full-time jobs, and 1 (3.3%) was retired. The differences in these distributions though, were not found to be statistically significant [$X^2(4) = 2.13$, ns.]. (see tables 12 and 13).

When the educational achievements of the pedophiles were considered with respect to the age of the offender based grouping, it was found that 1 (14.3%) of the adolescent pedophiles had completed grade 11, 3 (42.8%) had completed grade 10, 1 (14.3%) had completed grade 9, 1 (14.3%) had completed grade 8, and 1 (14.3%) had less than a grade 7 education. In the middle aged group 2 (5.6%) had no education at all, 1 (2.8%) had completed a graduate degree, 5 (13.9%) were college or university graduates, 4 (11.1%) had completed grade 12, 4 (11.1%) had completed grade 11, 9 (25%) had completed grade 10, 4 (11.1%) had completed grade 9, and 7 (19.4%) had less than a grade 7 education, while in the senescent group 2 (25%) had a partial university education, 1 (12.5%) had completed grade 12, 2 (25%) had completed grade 10, 1 (12.5%) had completed grade 8, and 2 (25%) had less than a grade 7 education. The differences in the distribution were not statistically significant [$X^2(18) = 22.63$, ns.]. In the analysis of the sexual preference based grouping, it was found that 1 (5%) of the heterosexual pedophiles had no education at all, another 1 (5%) had completed a graduate program, 1 (5%0 had completed a university degree, 1 (5%) had a partial university education, 1 (5%) more had completed grade 12, 2 (10%) had completed grade 11, 7 (35%) had completed grade 10, 2 (10%) had completed grade 9, 1 (5%) had copmpleted grade 8, and 3 (15%) had less than a grade 7 education. One (3.2%) of the homosexual pedophiles had no education at all, 4 (12.9%) had completed a university

degree. 1 (3.2%) had a partial university education. 4 (12.9%) had completed grade 12. 3 (9.7%) had completed grade 11. 7 (22.6%) had completed grade 10. 3 (9.7%) had completed grade 9. 1 (3.2%) had completed grade 8. and 7 (22.6) had completed grade 7 or less. The differences in this distribution were also not statistically significant [$X^2(9) = 4.43$. ns.] (see tables 14 and 15)

The variable of the marital status of the offenders did not differentiate between the three age of offender based groupings [$X^2(8) = 13.97$. ns.] or between the two sexual preference of offender based groupings [$X^2(4) = 1.87$. ns.]. In this sample. only 25 (49%) of the 51 pedophiles who were assessed in this area had been previously married or were married at the time of their admission. In the age of the offender based grouping. none of the adolescent pedophiles had ever been married. Seventeen (47.2%) of the middle aged men were single. 8 (22.2%) were married. 3 (8.3%) were seperated. 6 (16.7%) were divorced. and 2 (5.6%) were living in a common-law relationship. Two (25%) of the senescent men were single. 5 (62.5%) were married. and 1 (12.5%) was divorced. In the sexual preference of offender based grouping. information was collected on all of the homosexual pedophiles and on only 20 of the heterosexual pedophiles. Nine (45%) of the heterosexual pedophiles had never been married. 6 (30%) were married at the time of admission. 2 (10%) were seperated. 2 (10%) were divorced. and 1 (5%) was living in a common-law relationship. Seventeen (54.9%) of the homosexual pedophiles were single. 7 (22.6%) were married at the time of admission. 1 (3.2%) was seperated. 5 (16.1%) were divorced. and 1 (3.2%) was living in a common-law relationship. (see tables 16 and 17)

The last variable in the characteristics of the offender group of variables, that of the number of dependent children, also did not differentiate between the three age of offender based groupings [$X^2(8) = 13.85$, ns.] or between the two sexual preference of the offender based groupings [$X^2(4) = 3.81$, ns.]. As far as the age of the offender based grouping is concerned, none of the 6 adolescent pedophiles who were assessed in this area had children. Thirteen (41.9%) of the 31 middle aged pedophiles had one or more children. 4 (12.9%) had three children, 6 (19.4%) had two children, 3 (9.7%) had one child, and 18 (58%) didn't have any children. One (12.5%) of the 8 senescent pedophiles who were assessed in this area had four children, 3 (37.5%) had three children, 1 (12.5%) had one child, and 3 (37.5%) were childless. In the sexual preference of the offender based grouping, 2 (10.5%) of the 19 heterosexual pedophiles who were assessed in this area had one child, 4 (21%) had two children, 3 (15.8%) had three children, 1 (5.3%) had four children, and 9 (47.4) had no children. Of the 26 homosexual pedophiles who were assessed in this area, 2 (7.7%) had one child, 2 (7.7%) had two children, 4 (15.4%) had three children, and 18 (69.2%) were childless. (see tables 18 and 19)

The third area which was investigated pertains to the psychiatric assessment of each offender. Upon referral to the Forensic Unit, each patient was given a status depending on the needs of that individual as well as the protection of society as a whole. The patient status though did not differentiate between the three age of offender based groupings [$X^2(4) = 4.49$, ns.] or the two sexual preference of the offender based groupings [$X^2(2) = 3.10$, ns.]. In the age of offender based grouping, 2 (28.6%) of

the adolescents were placed in the medium secure unit, and 5 (71.4%) had the status of out-patients. In the mid-thirties group, 25 (67.6%) were out-patients, 1 (2.7%) was in the open unit and 11 (29.7) were in the closed medium secure unit. Seven (87.5%) of the senescent offenders were out-patients and only 1 (12.5%) was admitted into the unit as an in-patient in the open unit. When the sexual preference of the offender based groupings were considered 2 (9.5%) of the heterosexual pedophiles were placed in the open unit, 5 (23.8%) were placed in the closed unit, and 14 (66.7%) were living in the community while under assessment. In the homosexual pedophile group, 8 (25.8%) were in the closed unit, and 23 (74.2%) were out-patients.

(see tables 20 and 21)

The status of the patient is also implied by the level to which the psychiatrist deems him to be dangerous. When the age of the offender based grouping was considered it was found that 4 (57.1%) of the 7 adolescents were not considered to be dangerous, while 2 (28.6%) were considered to be conditionally dangerous and, 1 (14.3%) was considered to be unconditionally dangerous. In the middle aged group, 25 (67.6%) were not considered to be dangerous, 11 (29.7%) were thought to be conditionally dangerous, and 1 (2.7%) was considered to be unconditionally dangerous. All (100%) of the senescent offenders were believed to be not dangerous. When the consideration was on the sexual preference of the offender based grouping, 16 (76.2%) of the heterosexual pedophiles were not considered to be dangerous, 4 (19.0%) were thought to be conditionally dangerous, and 1 (4.8%) was considered to be unconditionally dangerous. In the homosexual group, 21 (67.8%) were not

considered to be dangerous. 9 (29.0%) were considered to be conditionally dangerous, and 1 (3.2%) was considered to be unconditionally dangerous. The levels of dangerousness were not statistically significant for either the three age of offender based groupings [$X^2(4) = 5.98$, ns.] or for the two sexual preference of offender based groupings [$X^2(2) = 0.70$, ns.]. (see tables 22 and 23)

When one looks at the mental state of the pedophiles at the time of their offence, there arises the possibility that they were influenced by either drugs, alcohol, or by other medical causes. In this sample though, only drugs, alcohol and their own will were evident as influences in their molestations. The age of the offender based groupings did not show statistically significant differences for either alcohol [$X^2(2) = 1.63$, ns.] or drug [$X^2(2) = 0.79$, ns.] intoxication. In the adolescent group, none (0%) of them were influenced by alcohol or by drugs. In the middle aged group, it was found that 7 (18.9%) were influenced by alcohol and, 2 (5.4%) were influenced by drugs, and in the senescent group, 2 (25%) were influenced by alcohol and there were no cases of drug intoxication. The sexual preference of the offender based groupings also did not show statistically significant differences for either alcohol [$X^2(1) = 0.93$, ns.] or drug[$X^2(1) = 0.07$, ns.] intoxication. Five (23.8%) of the heterosexual pedophiles were influenced by alcohol and 1(4.8%) was influenced by drugs, while 4 (13.3%) of the homosexual pedophiles were infulenced by alcohol and 1 (3.3%) was influenced by drugs. (see tables 24 to 29).

Included in this section on the psychiatric assessment of the child molesters, is their possible psychiatric illnesses. Pedophilic offenders rarely suffer from psychotic

mental illnesses, they do however, tend to demonstrate several of the neuroses and personality disorders defined by the DSM III. As far as the age of the offender based grouping is concerned, the adolescent offenders demonstrated only 1 (14.3%) case of depressive neurosis and the senescent group demonstrated only 1 (12.5%) case of anxiety neurosis. The middle aged group though, demonstrated 2 (5.4%) cases of anxiety neurosis, 1 (2.7%) case of hysterical neurosis, 1 (2.7%) of obsessive compulsive neurosis, 4 (10.8%) cases of depressive neurosis, 1 (2.7%) case of paranoid personality disorder, 1 (2.7%) case of explosive personality disorder, 1 (2.7%) case of hysterical personality disorder, 1 (2.7%) case of asthenic personality disorder, 1 (2.7%) case of antisocial personality disorder, and 3 (8.1%) cases of inadequate personality disorder. As far as the sexual preference of the offender based grouping is concerned, the heterosexual pedophiles demonstrated 3 (14.3%) cases of anxiety neurosis, 1 (4.8%) case of paranoid personality disorder, and, 1 (4.8%) case of inadequate personality disorder. The homosexual pedophiles though, demonstrated 1 (3.2%) case of hysterical neurosis, 1 (3.2%) case of obsessive compulsive neurosis, 5 (16.1%) cases of depressive neurosis, 1 (3.2%) case of explosive personality disorder, 1 (3.2%) case of hysterical personality disorder, 1 (3.2%) case of asthenic personality disorder, 1 (3.2%) case of antisocial personality disorder, and, 2 (6.5%) cases of inadequate personality disorder. The following chart demonstrates the levels of statistical significance amongst all the pedophiles who demonstrated cases of neuroses.

Mental Illness	Total n	Total % of pop.	By Age	By Sexual Preference
Anxiety Neurosis	3	5.8	[$X^2(2) = 1.58$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 4.68, p<.01$]
Hysterical Neurosis	1	1.9	[$X^2(2) = .39$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = .69$, ns.]
Obsessive Compulsive Neurosis	1	1.9	[$X^2(2) = .39$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = .69$, ns.]
Depressive Neurosis	5	9.6	[$X^2(2) = 1.06$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 3.72$, ns.]
Paranoid Personality Disorder	1	1.9	[$X^2(2) = .39$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 1.32$, ns.]
Explosive Personality Disorder	1	1.9	[$X^2(2) = .39$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = .69$, ns.]
Hysterical Personality Disorder	1	1.9	[$X^2(2) = .39$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 69$, ns.]
Asthenic Personality Disorder	1	1.9	[$X^2(2) = .39$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = .69$, ns.]
Antisocial Personality Disorder	1	1.9	[$X^2(2) = .39$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = .69$, ns.]
Inadequate Personality Disorder	3	5.8	[$X^2(2) = 1.28$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = .05$, ns.]

This information therefore, indicates that a statistically significant difference occured only in the cases of anxiety neurosis and only in the sexual preference of the offender based grouping (see tables 30 and 31). The other type of mental illness which was evident among these pedophiles was mental retardation. In the age of the offender based grouping, 1 (14.3%) of the adolescents was diagnosed as being borderline retarded, 4 (10.8%) in the middle aged group were borderline and 3 (8.1%) were mildly retarded while only 1 (12.5%) of the senescent offenders was borderline retarded. In the sexual preference of the offender based grouping 3 (14.3%) heterosexual offenders were borderline retarded and 1 (4.7%) were mildly retarded while 3 (9.7%) of the homosexual offenders were borderline retarded and 2 (6.4%) were mildly retarded. Neither the age of the offender based grouping [$X^2(2) = 1.28$, ns.] nor the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(1) = .23$, ns.] indicated statistically significant differences. (see tables 32 and 33)

The variable of the likeliness to re-occur was categorized by each attending psychiatrist depending on the offender's past history and on their degree of

pedophilic tendencies. This variable though did not differentiate between either the age of the offender based grouping [$X^2(8) = 8.32$, ns.] or the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(4) = 5.17$, ns.]. As far as the age of the offender based grouping is concerned, 3 (50%) of the six adolescent pedophiles who were assessed in this area were deemed "somewhat" likely to re-offend, and 3 (50%) were "fairly" likely to re-offend. In the middle aged group, 6 (16.2%) were not likely to re-offend, 12 (32.5%) were "somewhat" likely to re-offend, 2 (5.4%) were "mildly" likely to re-offend, 10 (27.0%) were "fairly" likely to re-offend, and 7 (18.9%) were "highly" likely to re-offend. In the senescent group, 2 (25.0%) were not likely to re-offend, 5 (62.5%) were "somewhat" likely to re-offend, and 1 (12.5%) was "fairly" likely to re-offend. As far as the sexual preference of the offender based grouping is concerned, 5 (23.8%) in the heterosexual group were not likely to re-offend, 10 (47.6%) were "somewhat" likely to re-offend, 1 (4.8%) was "midly" likely to re-offend, 4 (19.0%) were "fairly" likely to re-offend, and 1 (4.8%) was "highly" likely to re-offend. In the homosexual group 3 (10.0%) were not likely to re-offend, 10 (33.3%) were "somewhat" likely to re-offend, 1 (3.3%) was "midly" likely to re-offend, 10 (33.3%) were "fairly" likely to re-offend, and 6 (20.0%) were "highly" likely to re-offend. (see tables 34 and 35)

The sixth variable in the psychiatric assessment of the offender group of variables that of the lack of guilt or remorse did not differentiate between the three age of offender based groupings [$X^2(8) = 10.97$, ns.] or between the two sexual preference of the offender based groupings [$X^2(4) = 2.40$, ns.]. Of the six adolescent pedophiles on which there was information, 2 (33.3%) felt no guilt or remorse,

2 (33.3%) had a "small" degree, 1 (16.7%) had a "moderate" degree, and 1 (16.7%) had a "high" degree. In the middle aged group, 5 (13.5%) experienced no guilt feelings, 7 (18.9%) had a "small" degree, 8 (21.6%) had a "mild" degree, 5 (13.5%) had a "moderate" degree and 12 (32.5%) experienced a "high" degree of guilt. In the senescent group, 4 (50.0%) experienced a "little" degree of guilt or remorse, and 4 (50.0%) more experienced a "high" degree. In the comparison of the two sexual preference of the offender based groupings, 2 (9.5%) of the heterosexual pedophiles experienced no guilt feelings, 4 (19.0%) experienced a "little" degree, 4 (19.0%) a "mild" degree, 2 (9.5%) a "moderate" degree, and 9 (43.0%) a "high" degree of guilt or remorse. In the homosexual pedophilic group on 5 (16.7%) of the 30 who were assessed in this area had no guilt feelings, 9 (30.0%) had a "little" degree, 4 (13.3%) had a "mild" degree, 4 (13.3%) had a "moderate" degree and 8 (26.7%) experienced a "high" degree of guilt feelings. (see tables 36 and 37)

In the fourth section of this study, three psychological tests were utilized in an attempt to establish differences amongst the various groups. The results of the tests indicated that the WAIS - R did not reveal statistically significant differences for either the age of offender based grouping [$X^2(10) = 14.02$, ns.] or the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(5) = 3.7$, ns.]. In the adolescent pedophilic group, 2 (33.3%) were below average in intelligence, and 4 (66.7%) had a low average level of intelligence. In the middle aged group, 1 (3.6%) was deemed to be mentally retarded, 6 (21.4%) were of below average intelligence, 7 (25.0%) were of low average intelligence, 11 (39.3%) were of average intelligence, 2 (7.1%) had a high average level of

intelligence, and 1 (3.6%) was of a supeior level of intelligence. In the senescent group, 5 (83.3 %) were of average intelligence, and 1 (16.7%) had a high average level of intelligence. As far as the sexual preference of the offender based grouping is concerned, the heterosexual group contained 1 (6.2%) who was mentally retarded, 3 (18.2%) who were of below average intelligence, 5 (31.3%) who had a low average level of intelligence, 5 (31.3%) who were of average intelligence, 1 (6.2%) who had a high average level of intelligence, and 1 (6.2%) who had a superior level of intelligence. In the homosexual pedophilic group, 5 (20.8%) had a below average level of intelligence, 6 (25.0%) had a low average level of intelligence, 11 (45.8%) who were of average intelligence, and 2 (8.3%) who had a high level of intelligence. (see tables 38 and 39)

In the Wide Range Achievement Test-Revised, it was found that the reading percentile did not yield statistically significant differences for either the age of the offender based grouping [$X^2(4) = 7.7$, ns.] or for the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(2) = .01$, ns.]. The math percentile also did not statistically differ for either the age of the offender based grouping [$X^2(4) = 7.8$, ns.] or for the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(2) = .13$, ns.]. The spelling percentile though was significantly different for the age of the offender based grouping [$X^2(4) = .02$, $p<.05$.] but not for the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(2) = .01$, ns.]. (see tables 40 to 45)

In the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), it was found that there were varying degrees of elevation levels in the fourteen areas of the test. The break off point in this test is generally a score of 70. Above this, the individuals are

deemed to be showing a deficit in their personality in the various areas. In illustrating this, it was found that only a small percentage of those who were tested demonstrated substantially elevated levels in the scales of question, lie, F, K, hypochondriasis, hysteria, masculinity/femininity and social introversion scales. As such, the results of these scales will not be expanded upon as their importance in this study is minimal.* The other scales though indicated deficiencies in the personalities of many of the pedophiles in this sample and will therefore be discussed in more detail. In the depression scale, 19 (46.3%) of the pedophiles showed an elevation in the depression score. The age of the offender based grouping though was not statistically significant [$X^2(2) = 1.31$, ns.] as 2 (40.0%) of the adolescents, 15 (51.7%) of the middle aged group and 2 (28.6%) of the senescent offenders showed high scores. The sexual preference of the offender based grouping was also not statistically significant [$X^2(1) = .07$, ns.] as, 7 (43.7%) of the heterosexual offenders and 12 (48.0%) of the homosexual pedophiles demonstrated levels of elevation. In the psychopathic deviance scale 22 (53.6%) of all of the child molesters in this sample showed elevations in their scores. Neither the age of the offender based grouping [$X^2(2) = 3.19$, ns.] nor the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(1) = .07$, ns.] demonstrated statistically significant difference whereby 4 (80.0%) of the adolescents, 16 (55.2%) of the middle aged, and 2 (28.6%) of the senescent group showed elevations as did 9 (56.2%) of the heterosexual pedophiles and 13 (52.0%) of the homosexual pedophiles. In the paranoia scale, neither the age of the offender based grouping [$X^2(2) = .62$, ns.] nor the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(1) = .79$, ns.] indicated

* This test is not exactly accurate as what is pertinent in the MMPI is not the level of the scores but the profile displayed by the scatter.

statistical differences amongst the groups. It was found though that, 2 (40.0%) of the adolescents, 13 (44.8%) of the middle aged group and 2 (28.6%) of the senescent offenders showed an elevation, as did 8 (50.0%) of the heterosexual pedophiles and 9 (36.0%) of the homosexual pedophiles. In the psycasthenia scale, neither the age of the offender based grouping [$X^2(2) = 1.77$, ns.] nor the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(1) = .27$, ns.] demonstrated statistically significant differences amongst the groups. This occured because 3 (60.0%) of the adolescent pedophiles, 16 (55.2%) of the middle aged group and 2 (28.6%) of the senescent group had elevations in this area, as did 9 (56.2%) of the heterosexual offenders and 23 (48.0%) of the homosexual offenders. In the schizophrenia scale, neither the age of the offender based grouping [$X^2(2) = .06$, ns.] nor the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(1) = .25$, ns.] were significantly different as 3 (60.0%) of the adolescents, 18 (62.1%) of the middle aged group, and 4 (57.1%) of the senescent offenders demonstrated elevated scores in this scale as did 9 (56.2%) of the heterosexual pedophiles and 16 (64.0%) of the homosexual offenders. The hypomania scale was found to be statistically different for both the age of the offender based grouping [$X^2(2) = 10.72$ $p<.01$] and the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(1) = 4.37$ $p<.05$]. These differences occured because 5 (100%) of the adolescent pedophiles, 7 (24.1%) of the middle aged pedophiles and 15 (36.6%) of the senescent pedophiles demonstrated elevated scores in this scale as did 9 (56.3%) of the heterosexual pedophiles and 6 (24.0%) of the homosexual pedophiles.

(see tables 46 and 47).

The fifth area of this study involved the biochemical or hormonal make-up of the child molesters. The testosterone levels of the men in this sample varied, but were not statistically different among either the three age of offender based groupings [$X^2(4) = 6.19$, ns.] or the two sexual preference of the offender based groupings [$X^2(2) = .77$, ns.]. This occured because 7 (100%) of the adolescents, 20 (58.8%) of the middle aged men, and 34 (69.4%) of the senescent men had "normal" or "average" levels of testosterone as did 15 (75.0%) of the heterosexual pedophiles and 19 (65.6%) of the homosexual pedophiles. The Leutinizing Hormone (LH) levels were also not statistically different among either the three age of offender based groupings [$X^2(2) = 2.24$, ns.] or the two sexual preference of offender based groupings [$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]. These results occured because 7 (100%) of the adolescents, 32 (86.5%) of the middle aged men, and 8 (100%) of the senescent men had "normal" or "average" levels of LH as did 19 (90.5%) of the heterosexual pedophiles and 28 (90.3%) of the homosexual pedophiles. The results of the analysis on the Follicle Stimulating Hormone (FSH) also demonstrated that neither the comparison of the age of the offender based grouping [$X^2(4) = 1.63$, ns.] nor by the sexual preference of the offender based grouping [$X^2(2) = 5.94$, ns.] yielded statistally significant differences. This occured because 6 (85.7%) of the adolescents, 23 (71.9%) of the middle aged men and 7 (87.5%) of the senescent men had "average" or "normal" levels of FSH as did 18 (94.7%) of the heterosexual pedophiles and 18 (64.3%) of the homosexual pedophiles. (see tables 48 to 53)

The sixth and final group of variables in this study involved the psychosexual

analysis of three written tests and a battery of audio and visual Penile Tumescence tests. The first of the three written tests in the area of the psychosexual assessment is the Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory (DSFI). In this test there were no statistically significant differences amongst the sexual preference of the offender based grouping but, it was found that the age of the offender based grouping differed in two areas. The first statistically significant difference was noted in the Sexual Drive catagory [$X^2(2) = 8.99$ $p<.05$] whereby 2 (28.6%) of the adolescent pedophiles, 24 (64.9%) of the middle aged pedophiles and 1 (12.5%) of the senescent pedophiles indicated strengths. The second statistically significant difference was noted in the Affect catagory [$X^2(2) = 7.31$ $p<.05$] whereby none (0%) of the adolescent pedophiles, 10 (27.0%) of the middle aged pedophiles and 5 (62.5%) of the senescent pedophiles indicated strengths. (see tables 54 and 55)

The second written test in the psychosexual catagory is the Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory. In this test there were no statistically significant differences in the sexual preference of the offender based grouping, but in the age of the offender based grouping, differences were found in three catagories. The catagories include: Resentment [$X^2(2) = 6.29$ $p<.05$] whereby 6 (85.7%) of the adolescents, 15 (40.5%) of the middle aged men and 2 (25.0%) of the senescent men indicated high levels of hostility. Assault [$X^2(2) = 7.18$ $p<.05$] whereby 5 (71.4%) of the adolescents, 8 (21.6%) of the middle aged men, and 2 (25.0%) of the senescent men indicated high levels of hostility, and Verbal Hostility [$X^2(2) = 5.99$ $p<.05$] whereby 5 (71.4%) of the adolescents, 12 (32.4%) of the middle aged men, and 1 (12.5%) of the senescent men indicated high levels of

hostility. (see tables 56 and57)

The third and final written psychosexual test is the Sexual Attitude Score. As far as the sexual preference of the offender based grouping is concerned, statistically significant differences were found in their attitudes regarding homosexuality [$X^2(2) = 12.96$ $p<.01$]. These differences occured because 13 (41.9%) of the homosexual pedophiles and only 1 (4.8%) of the heterosexual pedophiles indicated a positive attitude towards homosexuality and 18 (58.1%) of the homosexual pedophiles and 16 (76.2%) of the heterosexual pedophiles had a negative attitude towards it. With regard to the age of the offender based grouping, it was found that the men were statistically different regarding their attitudes towards Exhibitionism [$X^2(4) = 10.69$ $p<.05$] and Voyeurism [$X^2(4) = 10.68$ $p<.05$]. These differences were found due to the high number of middle aged men who indicated positive attitudes towards these two paraphilias while the majority of the other men indicated negative or neutral attitudes. (see tables 58 and59)

The second section of the psychosexual tests involved tapes and slides for the penile tumescence test. The first series of tests utilized the slides and was conducted on thirty-five of the men in this sample. These tests did not indicate statistically significant differences amongst the comparisons of either the age of offender based grouping or the sexual preference of offender based grouping. (see tables 60 and 61) The following figure indicates the levels of statistical significance which were found by the analysis.

FIGURE 1

Levels of Significance of Penile Tumescence Slides

SLIDE	AGE GROUP OF OFFENDERS	SEXUAL PREFERENCE OF OFFENDERS
Adolescent Female	[$X^2(2) = 0.99$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 1.13$, ns.]
Female Child	[$X^2(2) = 1.53$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 1.76$, ns.]
Male Child (11)	[$X^2(2) = 0.01$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.38$, ns.]
Adolescent Male	[$X^2(2) = 0.49$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Male Child (7-8)	[$X^2(2) = 2.96$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Adult Female	[$X^2(2) = 1.53$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.31$, ns.]
Adult Male	[$X^2(2) = 1.75$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Female Child (4-5)	[$X^2(2) = 0.50$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.31$, ns.]

In the heterosexual pedophilic tapes only twenty five of the men in this sample were tested. This test did not differentiate between the sexual preference of offender based grouping, but statistically significant differences were found in the age of offender based grouping for the "arousal" tapes of the child initiated Acts, physical coercion, and sadism. The following figure indicates the levels of statistical significance which were found in this analysis.

FIGURE 2

LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF PENILE TUMESCENCE HETEROSEXUAL PEDOPHILE TAPES

TAPES	AGE GROUP OF OFFENDER	SEXUAL PREFERENCE OF OFFENDER
Child Initiates - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 7.27$ $p<.05$]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Child Initiates - supress	[$X^2(2) = 2.84$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.07$, ns.]
Child Mutual - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 3.26$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.003$ ns.]
Child Mutual - supress	[$X^2(2) = 2.84$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.07$, ns.]
Non-physical Coercion - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 1.65$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.18$, ns.]
Non-physical Coercion - supress	[$X^2(2) = 3.26$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Physical Coercion - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 7.27$ $p<.05$]	[$X^2(1) = 0.003$ ns.]
Physical Coercion - supress	[$X^2(2) = 3.26$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Sadism - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 7.27$ $p<.05$]	[$X^2(1) = 0.003$ ns.]
Sadism - supress	[$X^2(2) = 2.50$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Assault - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 3.22$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.32$, ns.]
Assault - supress	[$X^2(2) = 1.92$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (hetero) - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 2.94$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 2.09$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (hetero) - supress	[$X^2(2) = 2.94$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Incest - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 0.20$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.95$, ns.]
Incest - supress	[$X^2(2) = 1.65$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 2.03$, ns.]
Pedophile Index - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 2.43$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Pedophile Index - supress	[$X^2(2) = 0.76$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.1$ ns.]
Assault Index - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 1.65$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Assault Index -supress	[$X^2(2) = 2.30$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.01$, ns.]

The statistically different results of the three tapes occured because all 3 (100%) of the adolescents and 13 (76.5%) of the middle aged group revealed high levels of arousal while only 1 (20.0%) of the senescent group was aroused by these methods of sexual activity. (see tables 62 and 63)

The final set of tests which were conducted on 28 of the 52 pedophiles in the

sample consisted of the homosexual pedophile penile tumescence audio tapes. No statistically significant differences were found among either the age of the offender based grouping or the sexual preference of the offender based grouping. (see tables 64 and 65). The following figure indicates the levels of statistical significance which were found in this analysis.

FIGURE 3

LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF PENILE

TUMESCENCE HOMOSEXUAL PEDOPHILE TAPES

TAPES	AGE GROUPS	SEXUAL PREFERENCE
Child Initiates - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 1.55$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Child Initiates - supress	[$X^2(2) = 0.75$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Child Mutual - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 5.95$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Child Mutual - supress	[$X^2(2) = 0.75$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Non-physical Coercion - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 4.04$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Non-physical Coercion - supress	[$X^2(2) = 1.13$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.001$ ns.]
Physical Coercion - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 0.89$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Physical Coercion - supress	[$X^2(2) = 0.89$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Sadism - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 1.52$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Sadism - supress	[$X^2(2) = 0.89$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Assault - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 4.11$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.01$, ns.]
Assault - supress	[$X^2(2) = 1.51$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.02$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (hetero) - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 1.73$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (hetero) - supress	[$X^2(2) = 2.84$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.02$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (homo) - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 1.52$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (homo) - supress	[$X^2(2) = 1.04$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Incest - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 1.30$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Incest - supress	[$X^2(2) = 1.51$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Pedophile Index - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 0.33$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.07$, ns.]
Pedophile Index - supress	[$X^2(2) = 0.79$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Assault Index - arouse	[$X^2(2) = 1.34$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.46$, ns.]
Assault Index - supress	[$X^2(2) = 0.81$, ns.]	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Many studies have been conducted since the pioneers such as Krafft-Ebing. Glueck and Mohr originally investigated the legal, social and clinical implications of pedophilia. Since Mohr, Turner and Jerry's 1964 study of this phenomenon, all subsequent studies have indicated that pedophiles do not constitute one homogeneous group, but three distinct groups of homosexual, heterosexual and bisexual pedophiles. The research has also indicated that there exists a trimodal distribution of ages in which this sexual deviation arises. This allowed researchers to speak of adolescent, middle aged and senescent pedophiles. Finally, Mohr discovered that the three groupings were inter-related whereby the senescent pedophiles tended to be heterosexual in their orientation, the middle aged pedophiles tended to be homosexual in their orientation, and the adolescent pedophiles tended to be bi-sexual in their orientation. This study of pedophies treated at the Forensic Clinic of the Royal Ottawa Hospital though, has shown results which have differed from these previous studies. It has shown that pedophiles do not comprise distinct discernable groups.

This study divided the pedophiles first into the two groups of homosexual and heterosexual pedophiles and then into the three groups of adolescent, middle aged and senescent pedophiles in an attempt to ascertain whether or not the pedophiles who were sent to the Forensic Unit of the Royal Ottawa Hospital constituted more than one group on the basis of sexual preference and age. It utilized many of the

same variables as those used by Mohr et. al.,(1964), as well as psychiatric, biochemical, and psychosexual variables to make this determination. The variables which were used in this study include the following:

(1) Characteristics of the Offence:
- (a) The sex of the victim
- (b) The age of the victim
- (c) The victim's relationship to the accused
- (d) The amount of violence used

(2) Social and Demographic Characteristics of the offender
- (a) The occupation of the pedophiles
- (b) The employment status of the pedophiles
- (c) The education levels of the pedophiles
- (d) The marital status of the pedophiles
- (e) The number of dependent children of the pedophiles
- (f) The age of the pedophiles

(3) Psychiatric Assessment of the Pedophile
- (a) The patient status at the time of admission
- (b) The psychiatrist's perception of the level of dangerousness
- (c) The offender's mental state at the time of offence
- (d) The psychiatric illnesses of the pedophiles
- (e) The likliness of the offence to re-occur
- (f) The lack of guilt or remorse

(4) The Psychological Assessment of the Pedophile
- (a) The Wechsler Adult Intelligence Test (WAIS - R)
- (b) The Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)
- (c) The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)

(5) The Biochmical Assessment of the Offender
- (a) Testosterone
- (b) Follicle-stimulating Hormone (FSH)
- (c) Luteinizing Hormone (LH)

(6) The Psychosexual Assessesment of the Offender
- (a) Penile Tumescence Test - slides and audio tapes
- (b) Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory (DSFI)
- (c) Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory
- (d) The Sexual Attitude Score

The Chi Square test of statistical significance was used to determine if differences occured amongst the various groups of pedophiles. This test indicated statistically significant differences in only a small number of the variables which were used. As such, these results will be discussed first.

When the sexual preference of the offender based grouping was considered, it was found that: 1) the sex of the molested child,
2) anxiety neurosis,
3) the Hypomania Scale of the MMPI,
and 4) their attitudes about homosexuality in the Sexual Attitude Scale would differentiate between homosexual and heterosexual pedophilia. According to these variables, heterosexual pedophiles molested little girls, suffered from anxiety neurosis more often than homosexual pedophiles, tended to dwell upon their ailments more than homosexual pedophiles and had a negative attitude towards homosexuality, while the homosexual pedophiles molested little boys, did not suffer from anxiety neurosis, did not dwell on their ailments and had a more positive attitude towards homosexuality.

When the age of the offender based grouping was considered, it was found that:
1) the occupations of the pedophiles,
2) the employment status of the pedophiles,
3) the spelling variable of the Wide Range Achievement Test,
4) the "Drive" subtest of the Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory,
5) the "Affect" subtest of the Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory,
6) the "Resentment" scale of the Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory,
7) the "Assault" scale of the Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory,
8) the "Verbal Hostility" scale of the Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory,
9) the "Exhibitionism" scale of the Sexual Attitude Score,
10) the "Voyeurism" scale of the Sexual Attitude Score
and 11) the child initiate-arouse, physical coercion-arouse and sadism-arouse heterosexual pedophilic tapes of the Penile Tumescence Test
would differentiate between the three age groups.

According to these variables, the adolescent pedophiles were more likely to be either students and unskilled workers, or unemployed, average in their spelling abilities, deficient in their sexual drive, deficient in their affect, resentful, assaultive, verbally hostile, have negative attitudes towards exhibitionism, have neutral or negative attitudes towards voyeurism and be highly aroused to heterosexual pedophilia. The middle aged pedophiles worked in all types of occupations and showed equal numbers of unemployed part-time and full-time workers. The majority of them were below average in their spelling abilities, strong in their sexual drive, deficient in their affect, not resentful, not assaultive, not verbally hostile, tended to have positive attitudes towards exhibitionism and voyeurism, and indicated high levels of sexual arousal to heterosexual pedophilia. The senescent pedophiles worked in administrative, clerical, skilled and semi-skilled occupations and were employed full time, they were either average or above average in their spelling ability, were deficient in their sexual drive, strong in their affect, not resentful, not assaultive, not verbally hostile, had negative attitudes towards exhibitionism and voyeurism, and were not sexually aroused to heterosexual pedophilia.

As far as the other variables in this study are concerned, though they did not show any statistically significant differences between the groups, they tended to indicate special characteristics for the groups. The adolescents for example, prefered female victims who were between five and ten years of age, prefered to molest strangers or good friends and were not violent. With regard to the social and

demographic characteristics of the offender, they had a high school education and were single with no children. Their psychiatric assessment indicated the majority of them had an outpatient status, were not dangerous, were not influenced by either drugs or alcohol, did not suffer from mental disorders, were not likely to re-offend and felt some degree of guilt or remorse. Their psychological assessment revealed them to be of low or below average level of intelligence as was indicated by the results of the WAIS-R, average in their reading and math abilities as was indicated by the results of the WRAT-R and to have had significant levels of a psychopathic deviant personality as was indicated by the MMPI. Their biochemical asssessment revealed the majority of them to have average or "normal" levels of testosterone, FSH and LH. The DSFI of the psychosexual assessment indicated they were deficient in their sexual information, sexual experience, sexual attitudes, symptoms, gender role identity, fantasy, body image and satisfaction. The Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory indicated they had high levels of hostility in all areas except irritability and, the Sexual Attitude Score indicated that the majority of them had negative attitudes towards homosexuality, homosexual pedophilia, transvestism, and sadism and masochism. The slides and the heterosexual tapes of the penile tumescence test revealed an equal distribution of those who were aroused as those who were not aroused. The homosexual tapes though, revealed more adolescents who were aroused than those who were not aroused. The indexes of the heterosexual tapes revealed low levels of arousal for the adolescents while the homosexual tapes revealed high levels of arousal for both the arouse and supress commands.

The middle aged pedophiles tended to prefer male victims who were between five and fifteen years of age, preferred to molest casual acquaintances and were often violent. With regard to their social and demographic characteristics, their educational achievements ranged from no education to a graduate degree, the majority of them were, or had been married and were childless. Their psychiatric assessment indicated they were generally outpatients and were not considered dangerous. The majority were not influenced by either alcohol or drugs, did not suffer from mental illnesses, were likely to re-offend and felt some degree of guilt or remorse. Their psychological assessment revealed the intelligence levels of them ranged from mental retardation to a superior level of intelligence as was indicated by the WAIS-R, and they were average in their reading and math abilities as was indicated by the WRAT-R. The MMPI revealed the majority showed significant levels in the depression, psychopathic deviance, psychasthenia and schizophrenia scales. Their biochemical assessment revealed they had average or "normal" levels of testosterone, FSH and LH. The DSFI of their psychosexual assessment indicated they were deficient in their sexual information, sexual experience, sexual attitudes, symptoms, gender role identity, fantasy, body image and satisfaction. The Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory indicated they were indirectly hostile, suspicious and had feelings of guilt. The Sexual Attitude Score indicated they had negative attitudes towards homosexuality, heterosexual pedophilia, homosexual pedophilia, fetishes, transvestism, frotteurism and sadism and masochism. The penile tumescence tests indicated high levels of arousal for only the male child slide and all of the

heterosexual and homosexual pedophilic tapes. The indexes of the heterosexual pedophilic tapes indicated low levels of arousal and those of the homosexual pedophilic tapes indicated high levels of arousal for both the arouse and supress indexes.

With regard to the senescent pedophiles, it was found that the majority tended to prefer male victims between five and ten years of age, they preferred to molest casual acquaintances and were not violent. The social and demographic characteristics of the offender indicated the majority had obtained some high school education, had been married at some time in their lives and had at least one child. Their psychiatric assessment indicated they were generally outpatients and were not considered to be dangerous. They were not influenced by either drugs or alcohol, did not generally suffer from mental illnesses, were likely to re-offend and felt some degree of guilt or remorse. Their psychological assessment revealed they had an average or high average level of intelligence as was indicated by the WAIS-R, and were at least average in their math abilities and average or below average in their reading abilities as was indicated by the WRAT-R. The results of the MMPI indicated non-significant levels for the majority of the men in all the scales. Their biochemical assessment revealed average or "normal" hormone levels of testosterone, FSH and LH. The DSFI in their psychosexual assessment indicated deficiencies in their sexual information, sexual experience, sexual attitudes, symptoms, gender role identity, fantasy, body image and satisfaction, and the Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory revealed average or "normal levels of hostility in all

scales. The Sexual Attitude Score indicated negative attitudes towards homosexuality, heterosexual pedophilia, homosexual pedophilia, fetishes, transvestism, and sadism and masochism. The penile tumescence slides indicated an equal number of both high and low levels of arousal. The heterosexual pedophilic tapes indicated low levels of arousal for the majority of the men in all tapes excluding sadism - supress, assault - supress, adult, mutual (hetero) - suppress and arouse, and incest - supress and arouse. The homosexual pedophilic tapes revealed a wide range of their levels of arousal and the indexes for both the heterosexual and homosexual series indicated low levels of arousal.

As far as the sexual preference of the offender based grouping is concerned, the heterosexual pedophiles preferred to molest casual acquaintances between five and ten years of age. They were typically nonviolent. The social and demographic characteristics of the offender indicated they worked in all types of occupations and they tended to be either unemployed or working part-time. Their educational achievements ranged from no education to a graduate degree. There was an equal number of married pedophiles as unmarried pedophiles and the number of dependent children ranged from zero to four children. Their psychiatric assessment indicated they were generally outpatients and were not considered to be dangerous. They were not influenced by either drugs or alcohol and did not suffer from mental illnesses. They were likely to re-offend and they tended to have feelings of guilt or remorse. Their psychological assessment revealed a slight majority of the men were below the average level of intelligence as was indicated by the WAIS-R test, they

tended to be average or above average in their reading, spelling and math abilities as was indicated by the WRAT-R and the majority indicated significant levels in the psychopathic scale, the psychasthenia scale, the schizophrenia scale and the hypomania scale of the MMPI. Their biochemical assessment indicated these men had average or "normal" levels of testosterone, FSH and LH. Their psychosexual assessment revealed they had deficiencies in their sexual functioning as was indicated by the DSFI. These included deficiencies in sexual information, sexual experience, sexual drive, sexual attitudes, symptoms, affects, gender role identity, fantasy, body image and satisfaction. The results of the Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory indicated the majority of these men were indirectly hostile, suspicious and guilt ridden and the Sexual Attitude Score indicated they had negative attitudes towards heterosexual and homosexual pedophilia, fetishes, transvestism, exhibitionism, voyeurism, and sadism and masochism. The penile tumescence slides indicated a tendency for them to be aroused by images of adolescent females, and female children while the tapes indicated a tendency for them to be aroused by all of the homosexual and heterosexual pedophilic tapes. The indexes of the heterosexual pedophilic tapes revealed low levels of arousal while high levels of arousal were indicated in the pedophile index of the homosexual tapes.

As far as the homosexual pedophiles are concerned, the data revealed a preference for them to nonviolently molest casual acquaintances between five and fifteen years of age. The social and demographic assessment of the offenders indicated these men worked in all types of occupations and tended to be employed as

often as they were unemployed. The educational achievements of these pedophiles also indicated a range of levels from no education to university graduates, and the majority of them were not married and did not have children. Their psychiatric assessment revealed they had an outpatient status and were not considered dangerous. They were not influenced by alcohol or drugs and did not suffer from mental illnesses. These men were likely to recidivate and they also tended to feel some guilt or remorse. Their psychological assessment revealed the majority of them were at least of average intelligence as was indicated by the WAIS-R. The WRAT-R revealed they were average in their reading abilities and average or below average in their spelling and math abilities. The MMPI revealed the majority of them indicated significant levels in their personality of psychopathic deviance and schizophrenia. Their biochemical assessment indicated they had average or "normal" levels of testosterone, FSH and LH. Their psychosexual assessment revealed they were deficient in their sexual functioning as was shown in the DSFI. These deficiencies included, sexual information, sexual experience, sexual attitudes, symptoms, affects, gender role identity, fantasy, body image and satisfaction. The Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory revealed these men were verbally hostile, suspicious and guilt ridden while the Sexual Attitude Scale revealed they had negative attitudes towards heterosexual and homosexual pedophilia, fetishes, transvestism, frotteurism and sadism and masochism. In the Penile Tumescence tests, they indicated high levels of arousal for the male child slides and all of the tapes excluding the homosexual pedophilic nonphysical coercion-supress, assault-arouse and

supress, adult mutual (hetero) - supress, adult mutual (homo) - supress, and incest-arouse.

The findings of this study did not always agree with the findings of previous research. Since 1964, the vast majority of clinical research conducted on pedophiles has followed the outline of the study conducted by Mohr, Turner and Jerry. The study conducted at the Royal Ottawa Hospital utilized many of those same variables as well as an additional number of variables which have been utilized by the researchers in the forensic unit. Previous research has indicated that the male victims tended to be older than the female victims. While male victims commonly fell in the age group 11 - 15 years old, female victims tended to fall into the age group 8 - 11 years old. The age of the victims thus constituted a distinguishing feature of different groups of pedophiles. In this study, this was not found to be the case. Though male victims, on the average tended to be older than the females, the female victims were concentrated in the age group 6 - 10 years old while the male victims were found concentrated in the 6 - 10 years old age group as well as the 11 - 15 years old age group.

Previous research has also indicated that the offender is most often a good friend of the victim or the victim's family. Mohr (1964) found this to be especially true for the heterosexual pedophiles but not for the homosexual pedophiles. This was not the case in this sample as the vast majority of all victims were only casual acquaintances of their molesters and none of the heterosexual pedophiles molested children who were well known to them.

With regard to the marital status of the pedophiles, Mohr et. al. (1964) found that the majority of pedophiles marry at some stage in their lives although they tend to marry later than the general population. deYoung (1982) found that 79% of the pedophiles in her sample were also married. The pedophiles in the Royal Ottawa Hospital sample did not tend to be married: only 49% had been married at one time in their lives.

With regard to parenthood among the pedophilic population, deYoung (1982) found that 58% of the pedophiles in her sample had at least one child and Mohr et. al. (1964) reported that more than two thirds of the married pedophiles in their sample had children with an average of two to three children per subject. The research has also indicated that more heterosexual pedophiles than homosexual pedophiles had children. The results of the data collected at the Royal Ottawa Hospital indicate that only 40% of the pedophiles who were married had children, and only slightly more heterosexual than homosexual pedophiles were parents.

Research has indicated that the use of violence is rare among pedophiles. According to Bancroft (1983) the vast majority of molestations are not violent and in many cases the child not only consents, but appears to enjoy the experience. Geiser (1979) stated that because the child molester may feel like a child himself when in the presence of adults, and perhaps more like an adult when involved with a child, children are nonthreatening objects to him and he therefore does not usually harm or threaten them. Sadoff (1975) stated that pedophiles are typically nonviolent in their molestation of children, a statement supported by Kopp (1962) who added that

pedophiles are no threat to the physical safety of children. Kroth (1979) in his analysis of 24 cases of pedophilia found that only 2 (8.3%) of the men in question used physical force in gaining their victim's cooperation. Groth et. al. (1977) reported though that 15% of the incarcerated pedophiles in his sample used some degree of violence. This was studied by Christie et. al. (1978) who reported that 58% of incarcerated sex offenders against children used excessive force. Marshall and Christie (1981) who studied pedophiles in the Kingston Penitentiary discovered that 75% of their sample either physically injured their victim or verbally threatened to do so. Mathis (1972) and Freund et. al. (1982) state that acts of violence tend to appear more frequently among the homosexual pedophiles which they say results from their greater degree of immaturity. The information collected on 51 of the pedophiles in the Royal Ottawa Hospital sample indicated 2 (3.9%) used an excessive amount of violence, 3 (5.9%) used a moderate amount of violence, 4 (7.8%) used some degree of violence and 42 (82.4%) did not use any violence against their victims. The homosexual pedophiles were only slightly more violent than the heterosexual pedophiles.

Previous studies indicate that the intelligence levels of pedophiles are essentially those of the general population with a slight tendency to the lower end of the scale. This was substantiated by Mohr et. al. (1964) who found that 85% of the 55 pedophiles who were tested in their forensic clinic study fell into this range. Of the 60 men tested by Bryant (1982) 12% were feeble minded, 32% were below the average level of intelligence and 54% were in the average or above average levels of

intelligence. Peters (1970) found in his study of 224 probationed adult sex offenders the mean IQ of the pedophiles (94.5) to be lower than that of the other sex offenders whose mean IQ was 97. Gebhard et. al. (1965) described their pedophilic population as uneducated and simple minded. Mohr et. al. (1964) stated that no obvious difference could be discerned between the heterosexual and the homosexual pedophiles. The men in the Royal Ottawa Hospital sample indicated an even distribution of those with a below average level of intelligence as those with an average or above average level of intelligence.

These different results may be due to shortcomings in the data which was used in this study. The data on the subjects was collected for research purposes by each attending psychiatrist. Not all of the doctors however, appeared to have the same enthusiasm. As such, this left room for selected areas to be completed and other areas to be left incomplete. The accuracy of the demographic information which was collected and of the psychosexual tests which were conducted may also be questioned. Subjects who are referred by the courts may not always give factual responses because they might want to avoid appearing deviant. The fact that the sample consisted of only 52 men may be an additional influencing factor in the results. The findings may have been different with a larger sample. A further influencing factor is the sample studied. The men in this sample were those who were referred to the Forensic Unit of the Royal Ottawa Hospital. Although Mohr et. al. (1964) studied a similar type of sample, there arises the possibility that both samples were not representative of pedophiles in general. The results of two studies therefore may

have been different. If the pedophiles studied were convicted offenders, the results could again be different from the results obtained in a study of pedophiles referred to a forensic unit for assessment and/or treatment. It may be interesting to note that this sample of pedophiles was composed of thirty-one homosexual and twenty-one heterosexual pedophiles. According to the literature, findings of a two-to-one ratio of heterosexual to homosexual pedophiles have been documented. Four possibilities arise which may explain this difference. First, there is the possibility that homosexual pedophiles are still thought to be more deviant and are therefore more often referred to the Forensic Unit for assessment than heterosexual pedophiles. Second, there is the possibility that the homosexual pedophiles demonstrated more violence against their victims and therefore had more referrals. Third, there is the possibility that homosexual pedophiles were simply discovered and charged more often, and fourth, there is the possibility that there are more homosexual than heterosexual pedophiles in the city of Ottawa. Finally, there is the problem of the classification of the pedophiles in the Forensic Unit. The pedophiles in this sample were classified according to their charge (when they were charged) or by the disclosure of their sexual deviation to their psychiatrist, usually on the basis of one incident. It is not always possible to determine though, whether the subject is a homosexual or a heterosexual pedophile based on one incident. If the pattern of their pedophilic history had been established, the classification may have been different. Mohr et. al. (1964) collected his own data and was able to collect information that permitted him to make a more accurate classification.

Despite these possible shortcomings, the findings of this study indicate that the sexual preference of the offender based groupings and the age of offender based groupings did not reveal statistically significant differences which would result in distinct discernable groups. A final possibility is that the nature of pedophilia is changing and that this study is indicating the direction of the change.

REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association. (1980) Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders - Third Edition.

Bancroft, J. (1983) Human Sexuality and its Problems. London: Churchill Livingstone.

Bryant, C. D. (1982) Sexual Deviancy and Social Proscription: The Social Context of Carnal Behavior. New York: Human Sciences Press Inc.

Christie, M., Marshall, W., and Lanthier, R. (1978) A Descriptive Study of Incarcerated Rapists and Pedophiles. Unpublished Manuscript.

Derogatis, L. R. (1980) Psychological Assessment of Psychosexual Functioning. The Psychiatric Clinics of North America. 3, 113-131.

deYoung, M. (1982) The Sexual Victimization of Children. Jefferson N. C.: McFarland and Company Inc.

Fisher, G. (1969) Psychological Needs of Heterosexual Pedophiliacs. Diseases of The Nervous System. 30, 419-421.

Fisher, G., and Howell, L. M. (1970) Psychological Needs od The Homosexual Pedophiliac. Diseases of The Nervous System. 31, 623-625.

Freund, K., Hemsmen, G. A., and Roper, V. (1982) Results of the Main Studies on Sexual Offences Against Children and Pubescents. Canadian Journal of Criminology. 4, 387-397.

Frosch, J., and Bromberg, W. (1939) The Sex Offender - A Psychiatric Study. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 9, 761-777.

Gebhard, P. H., Gagnon, J. H., Pomeroy, W. B., and Cheistenson, C. V. (1965) Sex Offenders: An Analysis of Types. New York: Harper and Row.

Geiser, R. L. (1979) Hidden Victims: The Sexual Abuse of Children. Boston: Beacon Press.

Groth, A. N., and Burgess, A. W. (1977) Motivational Intent in the Sexual Assault of Children. Criminal Justice and Behavior. 4, 253-264.

Kopp, S. B. (1962) The Character Structure of Sex Offenders. American Journal of Psychiatry. 16, 64-70.

Kroth, J. A. (1979) Child Sex Abuse: Analysis of a Family Therapy Approach. Springfield Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Marshall, W. L., and Christie, M. M. (1981) Pedophilia and Aggression. Criminal Justice and Behavior. 8, 145-158.

Mathis, J. L. (1972) Clear Thinking About Sexual deviations. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Co.

Mohr, J. W., Turner, R. E., and Jerry, M. B. (1964) Pedophilia and Exhibitionism. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Peters, J. J., and Sadoff, R. L. (1970) Clinical Observations on Child Molesters. Human Sexuality.

Sadoff, R. L. (1975) Treatment of Violent Sex Offenders. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology. 19, 75-80.

Stevenson, I., and Wolpe, J. (1960) Recovery From Sexual Deviations Through Over-coming Non-Sexual Neurotic Responses. American Journal of Psychiatry. 116, 737-742.

Swanson, D. W. (1968) Adult sexual Abuse of Children. Diseases of the Nervous System. 29, 677-683.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abel, G.G. and Blanchard, E.E. (1976) The Measurement and Generation of Sexual Arousal, in M. Hersen, R.M. Eisler and P.M. Miller Progress in Behaviour Modification New York: Academic Press, 2, 99-136.

Abel, G.G., Blanchard, E.B., Barlow, D.H., and Mavissakalian, M. (1975) Identifying Specific Erotic Cues in Sexual Deviation by Audiotaped Descriptions. Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis, 8, 247-260.

Abel, G.G., Blanchard, E.B., Becker, J.V., and Djenderedjian, A. (1978) Differentiating Sexual Aggressives With Penile Measures. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 5, 315-332.

American Psychiatric Association. (1980) Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders - Third Edition.

Avery-Clark, C.A., and Laws, D.R. (1984) Differential Erection Response Patterns of Sexual Child Abusers to Stimuli Describing Activities with Children. Behaviour Therapy, 15, 71-83.

Bancroft, J., (1971) Application of Psychophysiological Measures to the Assessment and Modification of Sexual Behaviour. Behaviour Research, 9, 119-130.

Bancroft, J. (1978) The Relationship Between Hormones and Sexual Behavior in Humans. in J. B. Hutchinson. Biological Determinants of Sexual Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Son. 493-519.

Bancroft, J. (1983) Human Sexuality and its Problems. London: Churchill Livingstone

Bancroft, J., Jones, H.C., and Pullan, B.P. (1966) A Simple Transducer for Measuring Penile Erections with Comments on its use in the Treatment of Sexual Disorders. Behavior Research and Therapy, 4, 239-241.

Barbaree, H.E. Alcohol Intoxication and Inhibition of Sexual Arousal to Rape Cues. Paper presented to the Annual Convention of the Ontario Psychological Association. Toronto: February 1980.

Barlow, D.H. (1974) The Treatment of Sexual Deviation: Toward a Comprehensive Behavioral Approach. in K.S. Calhoun, H.E. Adams, and K.M. Mitchell, Innovative Treatment Methods in Psychotherapy. New York: Wiley, 122-147.

Barlow, D.H. Becker, R., Leitenberg, H., and Agras, W.S. (1970) A Mechanical Strain Gauge for Recording Penile Circumference Change. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 3, 73-76.

Baron, R.A. and Bell, P.A. (1977) Sexual Arousal and Aggression by Males: Effects of Types of Erotic Stimuli and Prior Provocation. Journal of Social Psychology 35, 79-87.

Bell, A., and Hall, C.S. (1971) The Personality of a Child Molester. Chicago: Atherton.

Bender, L., and Blau, C.S. (1973) The Reactions of Children to Sexual Relationships With Adults. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 22, 825-837.

Bernard, F., (1975) An Enquiry Among a Group of Pedophiles. Journal of Sex Research 11, 242-255.

Borzecki, M. (1985) Report on the Royal Ottawa Hospital Sex Offender Study Unpublished Manuscript.

Bradford, J. McD. W. (1983) The Forensic Psychiatric Aspects of Schizophrenia. The Psychiatric Journal of the University of Ottawa. 8, 98-100.

Bradford, J. McD, W. (1983a) The Harmonal Treatment of Sex Offenders. Booklet reprinted by the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law. Vol. 11 No. 2.

Bradford, J, McD, W. (1983b) The Forensic Psychiatric Aspects of Schizophrenia. The Psychiatric Journal of The University of Ottawa. 8, 98-100.

Bradford, J. McD. W. (1983c) Research on Sex Offenders: Recent Trends. Psychiatric Clinics of North America. 6, 715-731.

Bradford, J. McD. W., Adams, J., and Lynch, B. (1979) Ottawa Forensic Psychiatry Questionnaire.

Brongersma, E. (1977) On Living Relationships, Human and Humane. Childhood Rights Vol. 1, No. 2.

Brongersma, E. (1979) The Unknown Pedophile. Unpublished Manuscript cited in T. O'Carrol (1980) Pedophilia: The Radical Case. Boston: Alyson Publications.

Brownmiller, S. (1975) Against Our Will. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Bryant, C.D. (1982) Sexual Deviancy and Social Proscription: The Social Context of Carnal Behavior. New York: Human Sciences Press Inc.

Burgess, A.W. et.al. (1978) Sexual Assault on Children and Adolescents. Lexington Mass: Lexington Books.

Buss, A.H. and Durkee, A. (1957) An Inventory for Assessing Different Kinds of Hostility. Journal of Consulting Psychology. 21, 343-349.

Canadian Criminal Code (1984)

Cassity, J. H. (1927) Psychological Considerations of Pedophilia. Psychoanalytic Review. 14, 189.

Cohen, M. L. and Boucher, R. J. (1972) Misunderstanding About Sex Criminals. Sexual Behaviour. 2, 56-62.

Cohen, M., and Seghorn, T. (1969) Sociometric Study of the Sex offender. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 72, 249-255.

Christie, M., Marshall, W., and Lanthier, R. (1978) A Descriptive Study of Incarcerated Rapists and Pedophiles. Unpublished Manuscript.

Girdwood, R. H. (ed) (1979) Clinical Pharmacology, 24th Edition. London: Bailliere Tindall.

Davis, J. C. (1962) The Child Molester - Fact and Fiction. Unpublished Manuscript. Psychology Department. Florida State Hospital. Chatahoochee Florida.

deFrancis, V. (1969) Protecting the Child Victim of Sex Crimes Committed by Adults. Denver: American Humane Association.

Derogatis, L. R. (1980) Psychological Assessment of Psychosexual Functioning. The Psychiatric Clinics of North America. 3, 113-131.

deYoung, M. (1982) The Sexual Victimization of Children. Jefferson N. C: McFarland and Company Inc.

Donovan, M. V. (1978) The Sexual Assault of Children Under Twelve Years of Age: M. A. Thesis. Toronto: University of Toronto Centre of Criminology.

Doshay, L. J. (1943) The Boy Sex Offender and His Later Career. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Durkheim, E. (1951) Suicide. Glencoe: The Free Press

Earls, C. M. and Marshall, W. L. (1983) The Current State of Technology in the Laboratory Assessment of Sexual Arousal Patterns. in J. G. Greer and I. R. Stuart The Sexual Aggressor: Current Perspectives on Treatment. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company. 336-362.

East, N. (1955) Sexual Offenders. London: Delisle.

Eglinton, J. (1971) Greek Love. London: Neville Spearman.

Farkas, G. M., Evans, S. M., Sine, L. F., Eifet, G., Wittlieb, E., and Vogel-Sine, S. (1979) Reliability and Validity of the Mercury-in-Rubber Strain Gauge Measure of Penile Circumference. Behavior Therapy. 10, 555-561.

Fisher, G. (1969) Psychological Needs of Heterosexual Pedophiliacs. Diseases of the Nervous System. 30, 419-421.

Fisher, G., and Howell, L. M. (1970) Psychological Needs of the Homosexual Pedophiliacs. Diseases of the Nervous System. 31, 623-625.

Fitch, J. H. (1962) Men Convicted in Sexual Offences Against Children. British Journal of Criminology. 3, 89-94.

Ford, C. S., and Beach, F. A. (1951) Patterns of Sexual Behavior. New York: Harper and Row.

Freund, K. (1965) Diagnosing Heterosexual Pedophilia by Means of a Test for Sexual Interest. Behavior Research and Therapy. 3, 229-234.

Freund, K. (1967) Diagnosing Homo- or heterosexuality and Erotic Age-preference by Means of a psychophysiological Test. Behaviour Research and Therapy. 5, 209-228.

Freund, K. (1967) Erotic Preference in Pedophilia. Behavior Research and Therapy. 5, 339-348.

Freund, K. (1971) A Note of the Use of Phallometric Method of Measuring Mild Sexual Arousal in the Male. Behaviour Therapy. 2, 223-228.

Freund, K., Hemsman, G. A., and Roper, V. (1982) Results of the Main Studies on Sexual Offences Against Children and Pubescents. Canadian Journal of Criminology. 4, 387-397.

Frisbie, L. (1959) Treated Sex Offenders and What They Did. Mental Hygiene 43, 263-267.

Frosch, J., and Bromberg, W. (1939) The Sex Offender - A Psychiatric Study. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 9, 761-777.

Gagnon, J. H. (1965) Female Child Victims of Sex Offenders. Social Problems 13, 176-192.

Gebhard, P. H., Gagnon, J. H., Pomeroy, W. B., and Christenson, C. V. (1965) Sex Offenders: An Analysis of Types. New York: Harper and Row

Geiser, R. L. (1979) Hidden Victims: The Sexual Abuse of Children. Boston: Beacon Press.

Gibbens, T. C. N., and Prince, J. (1963) Child Victims of Sex Offenders. London: Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency.

Gigeroff, A. K. (1968) Sex Offenders on Probation: Heterosexual Pedophiles. Federal Probation. 32, 17-21.

Girdwood, R. H. (1979) Clinical Pharmacology - Twenty-fourth Edition. London: Bailliere Tindall.

Glueck, B. D. (1955) Final Report: Research Projects for the Study and Treatment of Persons Convicted of Crimes Involving Sexual Aberrations. New York: Department of Mental Health.

Green, F.C. (1979) Introduction: Child Sexual Abuse - the Physician's Responsibility. Pediatric Annals. 8, 286-288.

Greer, J. G., and Stewart, I. R. (1983) The Sexual Aggressor: Current Perspectives on Treatment. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Groth, A. N. (1979) Sexual Trauma in the Life Histories of Rapists and Child Molesters. Victimology. 4, 10-16.

Groth, A. N., and Burgess, A. W. (1977) Motivational Intent in the Sexual Assault of Children. Criminal Justice and Behavior. 4, 253-264.

Groth, A. N. and Birnbaum, H. J. (1978) Adult Sexual Orientation and Attraction to Underaged Persons. Archives of Sexual Behaviour. 7, 175-181.

Groth, A. N. (1978) A Study of Child Molesters: Myths and Realities. LAE Journal of the American Criminal Justice Association. 4, 17-22.

Gruber, K. J. (1981) The Child Victim's Role in Sexual Assault by Adults. Child Welfare. 40, 305-311

Guttmacher, M. S. and Weihofen, H. (1952) Psychiatry and the Law. New York: Norton.

Hadley, E. (1926) Comments on Pedophilia. Medical Records. 124, 157-166.

Hammer, E. F. (1955) A Comparison of H-T-P's of Rapists and Pedophiles: III. The Dead Tree as an Index of Psychopathology. Journal of Clinical Psychology. 11, 67-69.

Hammer, E. F., and Gleuck, B. C. (1957) Psychodynamic Patterns in Sex Offenders Psychiatric Quarterly. 31, 325-345.

Hammer, E. F., and Jacks, I. (1955) A Study of Rorschach Flexor and Extensor Human Movement Responses. Journal of Clinical Psychology. 11, 63-67.

Hayman, C. R., and Lanza, C. (1971) Sexual Assault on Women and Girls. American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. 109, 180-186.

Henn, F. A. (1976) Forensic Psychiatry: Profiles of Two Types of Sex Offenders. American Journal of Psychiatry. 133, 694-696.

Howells, K. (1979) Some Meanings of Children for Pedophiles. in M. Cook, and G. Wilson, Love and Attraction. Oxford: Pergamon. 519-526.

Ingram, M. (1977) A Child Counsellor's Findings. Magpie - Pedophile Information Exchange. No. 5.

Ingram, M. (1979) The Participating Victim: A Study of Sexual Offences Against Prepubertal Boys in M. Cook, and G. Wilson Love and Attraction. Oxford: Pergamon, 511-517.

Jayewardene, C. H. S. (1960) Criminal Homicide: A Study in Culture Conflict. PhD. Dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Jayewardene, C. H. S. (1976) The Nature of Homicide: Canada 1961-70. in Silverman and Teevan, Crime in Canadian Society. Toronto: Butterworth and Company.

Katz, S., Mazur, M. A. (1979) Understanding Rape Victims: A Synthesis of Research Findings. New York: Wiley.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E. and Gebhard, P. H. (1953) Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.

Kopp, S. B. (1962) The Character Structure of Sex Offenders. American Journal of Psychiatry. 16, 64-70.

Krafft-Ebing, R. (1934) Psychopathia Sexualis (Translated from the 12th German Edition by F. J. Rebman) New York: Physicians and Surgeons Book Co.

Kroth, J. A. (1979) Child Sex Abuse: Analysis of a Family Therapy Approach. Springfield Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Landis, J. T. (1956) Experiences of 500 Children With Adult Sexual Deviation. Psychiatric Quarterly. 30, 91-109.

Laws, D. R. and Holmen, M. L. (1978) Sexual Response Faking by Pedophiles. Criminal Justice and Behaviour. 5, 343-356.

Marshall, W. L., Abel, G. G., and Quinsey, V. L. (1983) The Assessment and Treatment of Sexual Offenders . in S. Simon-Jones, and A. A. Keltner, Sexual Aggression and the Law. Criminology Research Centre, Simon Fraser University.

Marshall, W. L. and Christie, M. M. (1981) Pedophilia and Aggression. Criminal Justice and Behavior. 8, 145-158.

Masters, H. and Johnson, V. E. (1966) Human Sexual response. Boston: Little Brown and Company.

Mathis, J. L. (1972) Clear Thinking About Sexual Deviations. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Co.

Maxim, P. (1975) Quantitative Data Grouping Techniques as Applied to Criminology. M.A. Thesis. University of Ottawa.

McCaghy, C. H. (1967) Child Molesters: A Study of Their Careers as Deviants. in Clinard and Quinsey, Criminal Behavior Systems. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 75-88.

McCreary, C. P. (1975) Personality Differences Among Child Molesters. Journal of Personality Assessment. 39, 591-593.

Merck Manual of Diagnosis and Therapy (1982) Rahway New Jersey: Merck, Sharp, and Dohme Research Laboratories.

Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, and The Minister of National Health and Welfare. (1984) Sexual Offences Against Children - The Badgley Report. Ottawa: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.

Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) Manual.

Mohr, J. W. (1962) The Pedophiles: Their Clinical, Social, and Legal Implications. Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal. 7, 255-260.

Mohr, J.W. (1963) A Short Survey of Sexual Offenders in The ontario Reformatory Millbrook. Canadian Journal of Corrections. 5, 229-235.

Mohr, J.W., Turner, R.E., and Jerry, M.B. (1964) Pedophilia and Exhibitionism Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mohr, J.W. (1967) Sexual Behaviour and the Criminal Law. Part IV: Indecent Assault on a Female. Research Report. Toronto: Clarke Institute of Psychiatry.

Mohr, J.W. (1981) Age Structures in Pedophilia. in M. Cook, and K. Howells Adult Sexual Interest in Children. London: Academic Press. 11-53.

Mrazek, P.B., and Kempe, C.H. (1981) Sexually Abused Children and Their Families. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Newsweek. (1984) May 14.

O'Carroll, T. (1982) Paedophilia: The Radical Case. Boston: Alyson Publications.

Okasaki, A. (1976) Suicide of the Younger Generation in Japan. Acta. Criminol. Med. Leg. Japan. 33. 201-205.

Pacht, A.R., and Cowden, J.E. (1974) An Exploratory Study of 500 Sex Offenders. Criminal Justice and Behavior. 1, 13-20.

Panton, J.H. (1979) MMPI Profile Configurations Associated With Incestuous and Non-Incestuous Child Molesters. Psychological Reports. 45, 335-338.

Peters, J.J., and Sadoff, R.L. (1970) Clinical Observations on Child Molesters. Human Sexuality.

Peters, J.J. (1976) Children who are Victims of Sexual Assault and the Psychology of the Offenders. American Journal of Psychotherapy. 30, 398-421.

Quinsey, V.L. (1977) The Assessment and Treatment of Child Molesters: A Review. Canadian Psychological Review. 18, 204-220.

Quinsey, V.L., Chaplin, T.C., and Carrigan, W.I. (1979) Sexual Preferences Among Incestuous and Non-Incestuous Child Molesters. Behavior Therapy. 10, 562-565.

Quinsey, V.L. (1983) Prediction of Recidivism and the Evaluation of Treatment. Programs For sex Offenders. in, S. Simon-Jones, and A.A. Keltner. Sexual Aggression and the Law. Criminology Research Centre, Simon Fraser University.

Ranasinghe, H., and Jayewardene, C. H. S. (1966) Suicide in the Southern Province. Ceylon Journal of Medical Science. 15, 31-40.

Reifen, D. (1958) The Sexual Offender and His Victim. International Child Welfare Review. 12, 109-124.

Revitch, E., and Weiss, R. G. (1962) The Pedophilic Offender. Diseases of the Nervous System. 23, 73-78.

Righton, P. (1981) The Adult. In, B. Taylor, Perspectives on Pedophilia. London: Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd. 24-40.

Rosen, R. C., and Keefe, F.J. (1978) The Measurement of Human Penile Tumescence. Psychophysiology. 15, 336-376.

Rosen, R. S., and Kopen, S. A.. (1978) Role of Penile Tumescence Measurement in the Behavioral Treatment of Sexual Deviation: Issues of Validity. Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology. 46, 1519-1521.

Rosenberg, G., Mayer, K., and Brunet-Aubry, L. (1977) Canadian Criminology Annotated Bibliography. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada.

Rossman, G. P. (1979) Sexual Experiences Between Men and Boys. London: Temple Smith.

Sadoff, R. L. (1975) Treatment of Violent Sex Offenders. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology. 19, 75-80.

Schiavi, R. C., and Schreiner-Engel, P. (1980) Physiological Aspects of Sexual Function and Dysfunction. Psychiatric Clinics of North America. 3, 81-95.

Sgroi, S. M. (1975) Molestation of Children. Children Today. May-June

Shoor, M. et. al. (1966) Syndrome of the Adolescent Child Molester. American Journal of Psychiatry. 12, 783-789.

Stevenson, I.. and Wolpe, J. (1960) Recovery From Sexual Deviations Through Over-coming Non-sexual Neurotic Responses. American Journal of Psychiatry. 116, 737-742.

Stricker, G. (1967) Stimulus Properties of the Blacky to a Sample of Pedophiles. Journal of General Psychology. 77, 35-39.

Summit, R., and Kryso, J. (1978) Sexual Abuse of Children: A Clinical Spectrum. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 48, 237-251.

Swanson, D. W. (1968) Adult Sexual Abuse of Children. Diseases of the Nervous System. 29, 677-683.

Swift, C. (1977) Sexual Victimization of Children: An Urban Mental Health Center Survey. Victimology. 2, 322-326.

Swigert, V. L. et. al. (1976) Sexual Homicide: Social Psychological and Legal Aspects. Archives of Sexual Behavior. 5, 391-401.

Toobert, S., Barteleme, K. F., and Jones, E. S. (1959) Some Factors Related to Pedophilea. International Journal of Social Psychiatry. 4, 272-279.

Tsunerari, S., Ogata, Y., Kakihara, Y., and Takahama, K. (1971) Statistical Observations in Kumamoto Prefecture in the Recent Five Years. Acta. Criminol. Med. Leg. Japan. 37, 220-229.

Tuteur, W. (1963) Child Molesters and Men who Expose Themselves - An Anthropological Approach. Journal of Forensic Sciences. 8, 515-525.

Voight, J. (1972) Sexual Offences in Copenhagen: A Medico-Legal Study. Forensic Science. 1, 67-76.

Walters, D. R. (1975) Physical and Sexual Abuse of Children: Causes and Treatment. Bloomington Indiana: University Press.

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Test - Revised (WAIS - R) Manual

Whitman, W. P., and Quinsey, V. L. (1981) Heterosocial Skill Training for Institutionalized Rapists and Child Molesters. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science. 13, 105-114.

Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) Manual.

Wormith, J. S. (1980) A Standard Procedure for the Psychophysiological Assessment of Sexual Offenders. in Proceedings of the Annual Psychiatric Research Meeting. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 19-20.

Zuckerman, M. (1971) Physiological Measures of sexual Arousal. in, The Human Psychology Bullitin. 75, 297-329.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

Age and Sexual Preference of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Sexual Preference	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Heterosexual Pedophile	4 (57.1%)	12 (32.4%)	5 (62.5%)	21 (40.4%)
Homosexual Pedophile	3 (42.9%)	25 (67.6%)	3 (37.5%)	31 (59.6%)
	7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(13.5%)	(71.2%)	(15.3%)	

TABLE 2

Sex of Victim by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Sex of Victim	0–19	20–49	50–75	Total
Male	2 (40.0%)	30 (63.8%)	5 (55.5%)	37 (57.8%)
Female	3 (60.0%)	17 (36.2%)	4 (44.5%)	24 (42.2%)
	5 (100%)	47 (100%)	9 (100%)	61 (100.0%)
Total	(7.8%)	(77.0%)	(15.6%)	

[$X^2(2) = 1.2$, ns.]

TABLE 3

Sex of Victim by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Preference of Offender		
Sex of Victim	Het Ped	Hom Ped	Total
Male	1 (4.4%)	36 (97.3%)	37 (57.8%)
Female	23 (95.8%)	1 (2.7%)	24 (42.2%)
	24 (100%)	37 (100%)	61 (100.0%)
Total	(39.3%)	(60.6%)	

[$X^2(1) = 52.93$, $p < .001$]

TABLE 4

Age of Victim by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Age of Victim	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
0-5	0 (0%)	4 (8.5%)	0 (0%)	4 (6.6%)
6-10	4 (80.0%)	25 (53.2%)	5 (55.6%)	34 (55.7%)
11-15	1 (20.0%)	18 (38.3%)	4 (44.4%)	23 (37.7%)
	5 (100%)	47 (100%)	9 (100%)	61 (100.0%)
Total	(8.2%)	(77.0%)	(14.8%)	

[$X^2(4) = 3.27$, ns.]

TABLE 5

Age of Victim by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Prefrence of Offender		
Age of Victim	Het Ped.	Hom Ped.	Total
0-5	2 (8.3%)	2 (5.4%)	4 (6.6%)
6-10	17 (70.8%)	17 (45.9%)	34 (55.7%)
11-15	5 (20.8%)	18 (48.7%)	23 (37.7%)
	24 (100%)	37 (100%)	61 (100.0%)
Total	(39.3%)	(60.7%)	

[$X^2(2) = 5.06$, ns.]

TABLE 6

Victim-Offender Relationship by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Relationship	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
No Relationship	4 (57.1%)	5 (13.5%)	1 (12.5%)	10 (19.3%)
Casual Acquaintance	3 (42.9%)	27 (69.2%)	6 (75.0%)	36 (69.2%)
Good Friend	0 (0%)	5 (12.8%)	1 (12.5%)	6 (11.5%)
	7 (100%)	37 (1005)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	

[$X^2(4) = 2.14$, ns.]

TABLE 7

Victim-Offender Relationship by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Preference of offender		
Relationship	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
No Relationship	6 (27.3%)	4 (13.3%)	10 (19.2%)
Casual Acquaintance	16 (72.7%)	20 (66.7%)	36 (69.3%)
Good Friend	0 (0%)	6 (20.0%)	6 (11.5%)
	22 (100%)	30 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(42.3%)	(57.7%)	

[$X^2(2) = 5.75$, ns.]

TABLE 8

Violence Against Victim by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Violence Used	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
No Violence	5 (83.3%)	2 (78.4%)	8 (100%)	42 (82.4%)
Some Violence	0 (0%)	4 (10.8%)	0 (0%)	4 (7.8%)
Moderate Violence	1 (16.7%)	2 (5.4%)	0 (0%)	3 (5.9%)
Severe Violence	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Excessive Violence	0 (0%)	2 (5.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.9%)
	6 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	51 (100.0%)
Total	(11.8%)	(72.5%)	(15.7%)	

[$X^2(6) = 4.32$, ns.]

TABLE 9

Violence Against Victim by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Preference of Offender		
Violence Used	Het Ped.	Hom Ped.	Total
No Violene	18 (85.7%)	24 (80.0%)	42 (82.4%)
Some Violence	2 (9.5%)	2 (6.7%)	4 (7.8%)
Moderate Violence	1 (4.8%)	2 (6.7%)	3 (5.9%)
Severe Violence	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Excessive Violence	0 (0%)	2 (6.7%)	2 (3.9%)
	21 (41.2%)	30 (58.8%)	51 (100.0%)
Total	(41.2%)	(58.8%)	

[$X^2(3) = 1.65$, ns.]

TABLE 10

Occupation of Offender by Age of Offender

Occupation	Age of Offender 0-19	30-49	50-75	Total
Nil	0 (0%)	6 (16.2%)	0 (0%)	6 (11.5%)
Major Professional	0 (0%)	2 (5.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.8%)
Minor Professional	0 (0%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.9%)
Administrative Personnel	0 (0%)	3 (8.1%)	4 (50.0%)	7 (13.5%)
Clerical	0 (0%)	5 (13.5%)	1 (12.5%)	6 (11.5%)
Skilled Manual Worker	0 (0%)	4 (10.8%)	1 (12.5%)	5 (9.6%)
Semi-skilled Worker	0 (0%)	7 (18.9%)	1 (12.5%)	8 (15.4%)
Unskilled Worker	2 (28.6%)	7 (18.9%)	0 (0%)	9 (17.3%)
Homemaker	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Student	5 (71.4%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	6 (11.5%)
Other	0 (0%)	1 (2.7%)	1 (12.5%)	2 (3.8%)
	7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	

[$X^2(18) = 45.56$, $p<.001$]

TABLE 11

Occupation of Offender by Sexual Preference

Occupation	Sexual Preference Het Ped	Hom Ped	Total
Nil	1 (4.8%)	5 (16.1%)	6 (11.5%)
Major Professional	1 (4.8%)	1 (3.2%)	2 (3.9%)
Minor Professional	0 (0%)	1 (3.2%)	1 (1.9%)
Administrative Personnel	2 (9.5%)	5 (16.1%)	7 (13.5%)
Clerical Work	2 (9.5%)	4 (12.9%)	6 (11.5%)
Skilled Manual Worker	3 (14.2%)	2 (6.5%)	5 (9.6%)
Semi-skilled Worker	4 (19.1%)	4 (12.9%)	8 15.4%)
Unskilled Worker	4 (19.1%)	5 (16.1%)	9 (17.3%)
Homemaker	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Student	3 (14.1%)	3 (9.7%)	6 (11.5%)
Other	1 (4.8%)	1 (3.2%)	2 (3.9%)
	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100.0%)
Total	(40.4%)	(59.9%)	

[$X^2(9) = 4.16$, ns.]

TABLE 12

Employment Status of Offender by Age of Offender

Status	Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Unemployed	6 (85.7%)	18 (51.4%)	1 (12.5%)	25 (50.0%)
Part-time	1 (14.3%)	1 (2.9%)	1 (12.5%)	3 (6.0%)
Full-time	0 (0%)	16 (45.7%)	4 (50.0%)	20 (40.0%)
Retired	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (25.0%)	2 (4.0%)
	7 (100%)	35 (100%)	8 (100%)	50 (100.0%)
Total	(14%)	(70%)	(16%)	

[$X^2(8) = 19.75$, $p<.05$]

TABLE 13

Employment Status of Offender by Sexual Preference of Offender

Status	Sexual Preference of Offender Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Unemployed	8 (40.0%)	17 (56.7%)	25 (50.0%)
Part-time	2 (10.0%)	1 (3.3%)	3 (6.0%)
Full-time	9 (45.0%)	11 (36.7%)	20 (40.0%)
Retired	1 (5.0%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (4.0%)
	20 (100%)	30 (100%)	50 (100.0%)
Total	(40.0%)	(60.0%)	

[$X^2(4) = 2.13$, ns.]

TABLE 14

Education Level of Offender by Age of Offender

Education	Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Nil	0 (0%)	2 (5.6%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.9%)
Graduate School	0 (0%)	1 (2.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.0%)
College/Univ. graduate	0 (0%)	5 (13.9%)	0 (0%)	5 (9.8%)
Partial University	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (25.0%)	2 (3.9%)
Diploma	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Grade 12	0 (0%)	4 (11.1%)	1 (12.5%)	5 (9.8%)
Grade 11	1 (14.3%)	4 (11.1%)	0 (0%)	5 (9.8%)
Grade 10	3 (42.8%)	9 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)	14 (27.5%)
Grade 9	1 (14.3%)	4 (11.1%)	0 (0%)	5 (9.8%)
Grade 8	1 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (12.5%)	2 (3.9%)
Less than Grade 7	1 (14.3%)	7 (19.4%)	2 (25.0%)	10 (19.6%)
	7 (100%)	36 (100%)	8 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(13.7%)	(70.6%)	(15.7%)	

[$X^2(18) = 22.63$, ns.]

TABLE 15

Education Level of Offender by Sexual Preference of Offender

Education	Sexual Preference of Offender Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Nil	1 (5.0%)	1 (3.2%)	2 (3.9%)
Graduate School	1 (5.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.0%)
College/Univ. Graduate	1 (5.0%)	4 (12.9%)	5 (9.8%)
Partial University	1 (5.0%)	1 (3.2%)	2 (3.9%)
Diploma	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Grade 12	1 (5.0%)	4 (12.9%)	5 (9.8%)
Grade 11	2 (10.0%)	3 (9.7%)	5 (9.8%)
Grade10	7 (35.0%)	7 (22.6%)	14 (27.5%)
Grade 9	2 (10.0%)	3 (9.7%)	5 (9.8%)
Grade 8	1 (5.0%)	1 (3.2%)	2 (3.9%)
Less than Grade 7	3 (15.0%)	7 (22.6%)	10 (19.6%)
	20 (100%)	31 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(39.2%)	(60.8%)	

[$X^2(9) = 4.43$, ns.]

TABLE 16

Marital Status of Offender by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Status	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Single	7 (100.0%)	17 (47.2%)	2 (25.0%)	26 (51.0%)
Married	0 (0%)	8 (22.2%)	5 (62.5%)	13 (25.5%)
Seperated	0 (0%)	3 (8.3%)	0 (0%)	3 (5.9%)
Divorced	0 (0%)	6 (16.7%)	1 (12.5%)	7 (13.7%)
Widowed	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Common Law	0 (0%)	2 (5.6%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.9%)
	7 (100.0%)	36 (100.0%)	8 (100.0%)	51(100.0%)
Total	(13.7%)	(70.6%)	(15.7%)	

[$X^2(8) = 13.97$, ns.]

TABLE 17

Marital Status of Offender by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Preference of Offender		
Status	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Single	9 (45.0%)	17 (54.9%)	26 (51.0%)
Married	6 (30.0%)	7 (22.6%)	13 (25.5%)
Seperated	2 (10.0%)	1 (3.2%)	3 (5.9%)
Divorced	2 (10.0%)	5 (16.1%)	7 (13.7%)
Widowed	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Common Law	1 (5.0%)	1 (3.2%)	2 (3.9%)
	20 (100.0%)	31 (100.0%)	51 (100.0%)
Total	(39.2%)	(60.8%)	

[$X^2(4) = 1.87$, ns.]

TABLE 18

Number of Dependent Children of Offender by Age of Offender

Number of Children	Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
0	6 (100%)	18 (58.0%)	3 (37.5%)	27 (60.0%)
1	0 (0%)	3 (9.7%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (9.0%)
2	0 (0%)	6 (19.4%)	0 (0%)	6 (13.3%)
3	0 (0%)	4 (12.9%)	3 (37.5%)	7 (15.5%)
4	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (2.2%)
	6 (100%)	31 (100%)	8 (100%)	45 (100%)
Total	(13.3%)	(68.9%)	(17.8%)	

[$X^2(8) = 13.85$, ns.]

TABLE 19

Number of Dependent Children of Offender by Sexual Preference of Offender

Number of Children	Sexual Preference Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
0	9 (47.4%)	18 (69.2%)	27 (60.0%)
1	2 (10.5%)	2 (7.7%)	4 (8.9%)
2	4 (21.0%)	2 (7.7%)	6 (13.3%)
3	3 (15.8%)	4 (15.4%)	7 (15.6%)
4	1 (5.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.2%)
	19 (100%)	26 (100%)	45 (100%)
Total	(42.2%)	(57.8%)	

[$X^2(4) = 3.81$, ns.]

TABLE 20

Patient Status of Offender by Age of Offender

Status	Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Inpatient - open	0 (0%)	1 (2.7%)	1 (12.5%)	2 (3.8%)
Inpatient - closed	2 (28.6%)	11 (29.7%)	0 (0%)	13 (25.0%)
Outpatient	5 (71.4%)	25 (67.6%)	7 (87.5%)	37 (71.2%)
	7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(13.5%)	(71.4%)	(15.4%)	

[$X^2(4) = 4.49$, ns.]

TABLE 21

Patient Status of Offender by Sexual Preference of Offender

Status	Sexual Preference of Offender Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Inpatient - open	2 (9.5%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.8%)
Inpatient - closed	5 (23.8%)	8 (25.8%)	13 (25.0%)
Outpatient	14 (66.7%)	23 (74.2%)	37 (71.2%)
	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	

[$X^2(2) = 3.10$, ns.]

TABLE 22

Level of Dangerousness of Offender
by Age of Offender

Dangerousness	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Not Dangerous	4 (57.1%)	25 (67.6%)	8 (100%)	37 (71.2%)
Conditionally Dangerous	2 (28.6%)	11 (29.7%)	0 (0%)	13 (25.0%)
Unconditionally Dangerous	1 (14.3%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.8%)
	7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	

[$X^2(4) = 5.98$, ns.]

TABLE 23

Level of Dangerousness of Offender by
Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Preference of Offender		
Dangerousness	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Not Dangerous	16 (76.2%)	21 (67.8%)	37 (71.2%)
Conditionally Dangerous	4 (19.0%)	9 (29.0%)	13 (25.0%)
Unconditionally Dangerous	1 (4.8%)	1 (3.2%)	2 (3.8%)
	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	

[$X^2(2) = .70$, ns.]

TABLE 24

Mental State at Time of Offence - Alcohol - by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Influence	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
No Alcohol	6 (100.0%)	30 (81.1%)	6 (75.0%)	42 (82.4%)
Alcohol	0 (0%)	7 (18.9%)	2 (25.0%)	9 (17.6%)
	6 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(11.7%)	(72.5%)	(15.7%)	

[$X^2(2) = 1.63$, ns.]

TABLE 25

Mental State at Time of Offence - Drugs - by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Influence	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
No Drugs	6 (100%)	35 (94.6%)	8 (100%)	49 (96.1%)
Drugs	0 (0%)	2 (5.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.9%)
	6 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(11.7%)	(72.5%)	(15.7%)	

[$X^2(2) = .79$, ns.]

TABLE 26

Mental State at Time of Offence - No Influence - by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Influence	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
No Influence	6 (100%)	26 (76.3%)	6 (75.0%)	38 (74.5%)
Influence	0 (0%)	11 (29.7%)	2 (25.0%)	13 (25.5%)
	6 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(11.7%)	(72.5%)	(15.7%)	

[$X^2(2) = 2.40$, ns.]

TABLE 27

Mental State at the Time of Offence - Alcohol - by Sexual Preference

	Sexual Preference		
Influence	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
No Alcohol	16 (76.2%)	26 (86.7%)	42 (82.4%)
Alcohol	5 (23.8%)	4 (13.3%)	9 (17.6%)
	21 (100%)	30 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(41.2%)	(58.8%)	

[$X^2(1) = .93$, ns.]

TABLE 28

Mental State at Time of Offence - drugs - by Sexual Preference

	Sexual Preference		
Influence	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
No Drugs	20 (95.2%)	29 (96.7%)	49 (96.1%)
Drugs	1 (4.8%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (3.9%)
	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(41.2%)	(58.8%)	

[$X^2(1) = .07$, ns.]

TABLE 29

Mental State at Time of Offence - No Influence - by Sexual Preference

	Sexual Preference		
Influence	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped	Total
No Influence	15 (71.4%)	23 (26.7%)	38 (74.5%)
Influence	6 (28.6%)	7 (23.3%)	13 (25.5%)
	21 (100%)	30 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(41.2%)	(58.8%)	

[$X^2(1) = .18$, ns.]

TABLE 30

Mental Illnesses of Offender by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Anxiety Neurosis				
No	7 (100%)	35 (94.6%)	7 (87.5%)	49 (94.2%)
Yes	0 (0%)	2 (5.4%)	1 (5.8%)	3 (5.8%)
Total	7 (100%) (13.5%)	37 (100%) (71.1%)	8 (100%) (15.4%)	52 (100%)
				$[X^2(2) = 1.58, ns.]$
Hysterical Neurosis				
No	7 (100%)	36 (97.3%)	8 (100%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.9%)
Total	7 (100%) (13.5%)	37 (100%) (71.1%)	8 (100%) (15.4%)	52 (100%)
				$[X^2(2) = .39, ns.]$
Obsessive Compulsive Neurosis				
No	7 (100%)	36 (97.3%)	8 (100%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.9%)
Total	7 (100%) (13.5%)	37 (100%) (71.1%)	8 (100%) (15.4%)	52 (100%)
				$[X^2(2) = .39, ns.]$
Depressive Neurosis				
No	6 (85.7%)	33 (89.2%)	8 (100%)	47 (90.4%)
Yes	1 (14.3%)	4 (10.8%)	0 (0%)	5 (9.6%)
Total	7 (100%) (13.5%)	37 (100%) (71.1%)	8 (100%) (15.4%)	52 (100%)
				$[X^2(2) = 1.06, ns.]$
Paranoid Personality Disorder				
No	7 (100%)	36 (97.3%)	8 (100%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.9%)
Total	7 (100%) (13.5%)	37 (100%) (71.1%)	8 (100%) (15.4%)	52 (100%)
				$[X^2(2) = .39, ns.]$

continued on next page

Table 30 con't

	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Explosive Personality Disorder				
No	7 (100%)	36 (97.3%)	8 (100%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.9%)
Total	7 (100%) (13.5%)	37 (100%) (71.1%)	8 (100%) (15.4%)	52 (100%)
				[$X^2(2) = .39$, ns.]
Hysterical Personality Disorder				
No	7 (100%)	36 (97.3%)	8 (100%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.9%)
Total	7 (100%) (13.5%)	37 (100%) (71.1%)	8 (100%) (15.4%)	52 (100%)
				[$X^2(2) = .39$, ns.]
Asthenic Personality Disorder				
No	7 (100%)	36 (97.3%)	8 (100%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.9%)
Total	7 (100%) (13.5%)	37 (100%) (71.1%)	8 (100%) (15.4%)	52 (100%)
				[$X^2(2) = .39$, ns.]
Antisocial Personality Disorder				
No	7 (100%)	36 (97.3%)	8 (100%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.9%)
Total	7 (100%) (13.5%)	37 (100%) (71.1%)	8 (100%) (15.4%)	52 (100%)
				[$X^2(2) = .39$, ns.]
Inadequate Personality Disorder				
No	7 (100%)	34 (91.9%)	8 (100%)	49 (94.2%)
Yes	0 (0%)	3 (8.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (5.8%)
Total	7 (100%) (13.5%)	37 (100%) (71.1%)	8 (100%) (15.4%)	52 (100%)
				[$X^2(2) = 1.28$, ns.]

TABLE 31

Mental Illnesses of Offenders by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Preference		
	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Anxiety Neurosis			
No	18 (85.7%)	31 (100%)	48 (94.2%)
Yes	3 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	3 (5.8%)
	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	—
			[$X^2(1) = 4.68$ $p<.05$]
Hysterical Neurosis			
No	21 (100%)	30 (96.8%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (3.2%)	1 (1.9%)
	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
			[$X^2(1) = .69$, ns.]
Obsessive Compulsive Neurosis			
No	21 (100%)	30 (96.8%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (3.2%)	1 (1.9%)
	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
			[$X^2(1) = .69$, ns.]
Depressive Neurosis			
No	21 (100%)	26 (83.9%)	47 (90.4%)
Yes	0 (0%)	5 (16.1%)	5 (9.6%)
	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
			[$X^2(1) = 3.72$, ns.]
Paranoid Personality Disorder			
No	20 (95.2%)	31 (100%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	1 (4.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.9%)
	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
			[$X^2(1) = 1.51$, ns.]

Continued on next page

Table 31 con't.

	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Explosive Personality Disorder			
No	21 (100%)	30 (96.8%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (3.2%)	1 (1.9%)
Total	21 (100%) (40.4%)	31 (100%) (59.6%)	52 (100%)
			[$X^2(1) = .69$, ns.]
Hysterical Personality Disorder			
No	21 (100%)	30 (96.8%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (3.2%)	1 (1.9%)
Total	21 (100%) (40.4%)	31 (100%) (59.6%)	52 (100%)
			[$X^2(1) = .69$, ns.]
Asthenic Personality Disorder			
No	21 (100%)	30 (96.8%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (3.2%)	1 (1.9%)
Total	21 (100%) (40.4%)	31 (100%) (59.6%)	52 (100%)
			[$X^2(1) = .69$, ns.]
Antisocial Personality Disorder			
No	21 (100%)	30 (96.8%)	51 (98.1%)
Yes	0 (0%)	1 (3.2%)	1 (1.9%)
Total	21 (100%) (40.4%)	31 (100%) (59.6%)	52 (100%)
			[$X^2(1) = .69$, ns.]
Inadequate Personality Disorder			
No	20 (95.2%)	29 (93.5%)	49 (94.2%)
Yes	1 (4.8%)	2 (6.5%)	3 (5.8%)
Total	21 (100%) (40.4%)	31 (100%) (59.6%)	52 (100%)
			[$X^2(1) = .05$, ns.]

TABLE 32

Mental Retardation by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Mental Retardation	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
No	6 (85.7%)	30 (81.1%)	7 (87.5%)	43 (82.7%)
Borderline	1 (14.3%)	4 (10.8%)	1 (12.5%)	6 (11.5%)
Mild	0 (0%)	3 (8.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (5.8%)
Moderate	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Severe	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Profound	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Unspecified	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	

[$X^2(2) = 1.28$, ns.]

TABLE 33

Mental Retardation by Sexual Preference

	Sexual Preference		
Mental Retardation	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped	Total
No	17 (81.0%)	26 (83.9%)	43 (82.8%)
Borderline	3 (14.3%)	3 (9.7%)	6 (11.5%)
Mild	1 (4.7%)	2 (6.4%)	3 (9.7%)
Moderate	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Severe	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Profound	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Unspecified	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	

[$X^2(1) = .23$, ns.]

TABLE 34

Likeliness of Offence to Re-occur by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Likliness	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Not Likely	0 (0%)	6 (16.2%)	2 (25.0%)	8 (15.7%)
Somewhat Likely	3 (50.0%)	12 (32.5%)	5 (62.5%)	20 (39.2%)
Mildly Likely	0 (0%)	2 (5.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.9%)
Fairly Likely	3 (50.0%)	10 (27.0%)	1 (12.5%)	14 (27.5%)
Highly Likely	0 (0%)	7 (18.9%)	0 (0%)	7 (13.7%)
	6 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(11.7%)	(72.6%)	(15.7%)	

[$X^2(8) = 8.32$, ns.]

TABLE 35

Likeliness of Offence to Re-occur
by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Preference		
Likliness	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Not Likley	5 (23.8%)	3 (10.0%)	8 (15.7%)
Somewhat Likely	10 (47.6%)	10 (33.3%)	20 (39.2%)
Mildly Likely	1 (4.8%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (3.9%)
Fairly Likely	4 (19.0%)	10 (33.3%)	14 (27.5%)
Highly Likely	1 (4.8%)	6 (20.0%)	7 (13.7%)
	21 (100%)	30 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(32.2%)	(58.8%)	

[$X^2(4) = 5.17$, ns.]

TABLE 36

Lack of Guilt or Remorse by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Guilt or Remorse	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
No Guilt or Remorse	2 (33.3%)	5 (13.5%)	0 (0%)	7 (13.7%)
Little Degree	2 (33.3%)	7 (18.9%)	4 (50.0%)	13 (25.5%)
Mild Degree	0 (0%)	8 (21.6%)	0 (0%)	8 (15.7%)
Moderate Degree	1 (16.7%)	5 (13.5%)	0 (0%)	6 (11.8%)
High Degree	1 (16.7%)	12 (32.5%)	4 (50.0%)	17 (33.3%)
	6 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(11.9%)	(72.5%)	(15.6%)	

[$X^2(8) = 10.8$; ns.]

TABLE 37

Lack of Guilt or Remorse by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Preference		
Guilt or Remorse	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
No Guilt	2 (9.5%)	5 (16.7%)	7 (13.7%)
Little Degree	4 (19.0%)	9 (30.0%)	13 (25.5%)
Mild Degree	4 (19.0%)	4 (13.3%)	8 (15.7%)
Moderate Degree	2 (9.5%)	4 (13.3%)	6 (11.8%)
High Degree	9 (43.0%)	8 (26.7%)	17 (33.3%)
	21 (100%)	30 (100%)	51 (100%)
Total	(41.2%)	(58.8%)	

[$X^2(4) = 2.41$, ns.]

TABLE 38

Full Scale IQ by Age of Offender

IQ	Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Mental Retardation	0 (0%)	1 (3.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.5%)
Below Average	2 (33.3%)	6 (21.4%)	0 (0%)	8 (20.0%)
Low Average	4 (66.7%)	7 (25.0%)	0 (0%)	11 (27.5%)
Average	0 (0%)	11 (39.3%)	5 (83.3%)	16 (40.0%)
High Average	0 (0%)	2 (7.1%)	1 (16.7%)	3 (7.5%)
Superior	0 (0%)	1 (3.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.5%)
Very Superior	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	6 (100%)	28 (100%)	6 (100%)	40 (100%)
Total	(15.0%)	(70.0%)	(15.0%)	

[$X^2(10) = 14.02$, ns.]

TABLE 39

Full Scale IQ by Sexual Preference of Offender

IQ	Sexual Preference Hom. Ped.	Het. Ped.	Total
Retardation	1 (6.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.5%)
Below Average	3 (18.7%)	5 (20.8%)	8 (20.0%)
Low Average	5 (31.2%)	6 (25.0%)	11 (27.5%)
Average	5 (31.2%)	11 (45.8%)	16 (40.0%)
High Average	1 (6.3%)	2 (8.3%)	3 (7.5%)
Superior	1 (6.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.5%)
Very Superior	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	16 (100%)	24 (100%)	40 (100%)
Total	(40.0%)	(60.0%)	

[$X^2(5) = 3.7$, ns.]

TABLE 40

WRAT: Reading Percentile by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Score	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Below Average	0 (0%)	5 (22.7%)	3 (50.0%)	8 (23.5%)
Average	6 (100%)	12 (54.6%)	3 (50.0%)	21 (61.8%)
Above Average	0 (0%)	5 (22.7%)	0 (0%)	5 (14.7%)
	6 (100%)	22 (100%)	6 (100%)	34 (100%)
Total	(17.6%)	(64.7%)	(17.6%)	

[$X^2(4) = 7.7$, ns.]

TABLE 41

WRAT: Spelling Percentile by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Score	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Below Average	2 (33.3%)	11 (50.0%)	0 (0%)	13 (39.4%)
Average	4 (66.7%)	9 (40.9%)	2 (40.0%)	15 (45.4%)
Above Average	0 (0%)	2 (9.1%)	3 (60.0%)	5 (15.2%)
	6 (100%)	22 (100%)	5 (100%)	33 (100%)
Total	(18.2%)	(66.6%)	(15.2%)	

[$X^2(4) = 11.46$ $p < .05$]

TABLE 42

WRAT: Math Percentile by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Score	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Below Average	5 (83.3%)	10 (37.0%)	1 (14.3%)	16 (40.0%)
Average	1 (16.7%)	15 (55.6%)	6 (85.7%)	22 (55.0%)
Above Average	0 (0%)	2 (7.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (5.0%)
	6 (100%)	27 (100%)	7 (100%)	40 (100%)
Total	(15.0%)	(67.5%)	(17.5%)	

[$X^2(4) = 7.8$, ns.]

TABLE 43

WRAT: Reading Percentile by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Preference		
Score	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Below Average	2 (15.4%)	3 (14.3%)	5 (14.7%)
Average	8 (61.5%)	13 (61.9%)	21 (61.8%)
Above Average	3 (23.1%)	5 (23.8%)	8 (23.5%)
	13 (100%)	21 (100%)	34 (100%)
Total	(38.2%)	(61.8%)	

[$X^2(2) = .01$, ns.]

TABLE 44

WRAT: Spelling Percentile by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Preference		
Score	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Below Average	5 (38.5%)	8 (40.0%)	13 (39.4%)
Average	6 (46.1%)	9 (45.0%)	15 (45.4%)
Above Average	2 (15.4%)	3 (15.0%)	5 (15.2%)
	13 (100%)	20 (100%)	33 (100%)
Total	(39.4%)	(60.6%)	

[$X^2(2) = .01$, ns.]

TABLE 45

WRAT: Math Percentile by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Prefrence		
Score	Het. Ped	Hom. Ped.	Total
Below Average	6 (37.5%)	10 (41.6%)	16 (40.0%)
Average	9 (56.2%)	13 (54.2%)	22 (55.0%)
Above Average	1 (6.3%)	1 (4.2%)	2 (5.0%)
	16 (100%)	24 (100%)	40 (100%)
Total	(40.0%)	(60.0%)	

[$X^2(2) = .13$, ns.]

TABLE 46

MMPI Scales by Age of Offender

		Age of Offender			
		0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Question Scale:	Not Significant	3 (75.0%)	15 (78.9%)	4 (100%)	22 (81.5%)
	Significant	1 (25.0%)	4 (21.1%)	0 (0%)	5 (18.5%)
		4 (100%)	19 (100%)	4 (100%)	27 (100%)
	Total	(14.8%)	(70.4%)	(14.8%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 1.10$, ns.]
Lie Scale:	Not Significant	5 (100%)	28 (96.5%)	6 (85.7%)	39 (95.1%)
	Significant	0 (0%)	1 (3.5%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (4.9%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 1.72$, ns.]
F Scale:	Not Significant	3 (60.0%)	16 (55.2%)	4 (57.1%)	23 (56.1%)
	Significant	2 (40.0%)	13 (44.8%)	3 (42.9%)	18 (43.9%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
					[$X^2(2) = .04$, ns.]
K Scale:	Not Significant	5 (100%)	28 (26.5%)	7 (100%)	40 (97.6%)
	Significant	0 (0%)	1 (3.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.4%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
					[$X^2(2) = .42$, ns.]
Hypochondriasis:	Not Significant	4 (80.0%)	21 (72.4%)	5 (71.4%)	30 (73.2%)
	Significant	1 (20.0%)	8 (27.6%)	2 (28.6%)	11 (26.8%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
					[$X^2(2) = .14$, ns.]
Depression:	Not Significant	3 (60.0%)	14 (48.3%)	5 (71.4%)	22 (53.7%)
	Significant	2 (40.0%)	15 (51.7%)	2 (28.6%)	19 (46.3%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 1.31$, ns.]
Hysteria:	Not Significant	5 (100%)	19 (65.5%)	5 (71.4%)	29 (70.7%)
	Significant	0 (0%)	10 (34.5%)	2 (28.6%)	12 (29.3%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 2.45$, ns.]

Continued on next page

Table 46 con't

		0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Psychopathic Deviance					
	Not Significant	1 (20.0%)	13 (44.8%)	5 (71.4%)	19 (46.3%)
	Significant	4 (80.0%)	16 (55.2%)	2 (28.6%)	22 (53.7%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 3.19$, ns.]	
Masc/Fem:	Not Significant	3 (60.0%)	21 (72.4%)	6 (85.7%)	30 (73.2%)
	Significant	2 (40.0%)	8 (27.6%)	1 (14.3%)	11 (26.8%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 1.01$, ns.]	
Paranoia:	Not Significant	3 (60.0%)	16 (55.2%)	5 (71.4%)	24 (85.5%)
	Significant	2 (40.0%)	13 (44.8%)	2 (28.6%)	17 (41.5%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
				[$X^2(2) = .62$, ns.]	
Psychasthenia:	Not Significant	2 (40.0%)	13 (44.8%)	5 (71.4%)	20 (48.8%)
	Significant	3 (60.0%)	16 (55.2%)	2 (28.6%)	21 (51.2%)
		5 (100%)	21 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 1.77$, ns.]	
Schizophrenia:	Not Significant	2 (40.0%)	11 (37.9%)	3 (42.9%)	16 (39.0%)
	Significant	3 (60.0%)	18 (62.1%)	4 (57.1%)	25 (61.0%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
				[$X^2(2) = .006$, ns.]	
Hypomania:	Not Significant	0 (0%)	22 (75.9%)	4 (57.1%)	26 (63.4%)
	Significant	5 (100%)	7 (24.1%)	3 (42.9%)	15 (36.6%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(12.2%)	(70.7%)	(17.1%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 10.72$, $p<.01$]	
Social Introversion					
	Not Significant	4 (80.0%)	28 (96.5%)	7 (100%)	39 (95.1%)
	Significant	1 (20.0%)	1 (3.5%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.9%)
		5 (100%)	29 (100%)	7 (100%)	41 (100%)
				[$X^2(2) = 2.95$, ns.]	

TABLE 47

MMPI Scales by Sexual Preference of Offender

		Sexual Preference of Offender		
		Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Question Scale:	Not Significant	8 (100%)	14 (73.7%)	22 (81.5%)
	Significant	0 (0%)	5 (26.3%)	5 (18.5%)
		8 (100%)	19 (100%)	27 (100%)
	Total	(29.6%)	(70.4%)	
				[$X^2(1) = 2.58$, ns.]
Lie Scale:	Not Significant	14 (87.5%)	25 (100%)	39 (95.1%)
	Significant	2 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.9%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = 3.28$, ns.]
F Scale:	Not Significant	8 (50.0%)	15 (60.0%)	23 (56.1%)
	Significant	8 (50.0%)	10 (40.0%)	18 (43.9%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .39$, ns.]
K Scale:	Not Significant	16 (100%)	24 (96.0%)	40 (97.6%)
	Significant	0 (0%)	1 (4.0%)	1 (2.4%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .66$, ns.]
Hypochondriasis:	Not Significant	10 (62.5%)	20 (80.0%)	30 (73.2%)
	Significant	6 (37.5%)	5 (20.0%)	11 (26.8%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = 1.52$, ns.]
Depression:	Not Significant	9 (56.3%)	13 (52.0%)	22 (53.7%)
	Significant	7 (43.7%)	12 (48.0%)	19 (46.3%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .07$, ns.]
Hysteria:	Not Significant	10 (62.5%)	19 (76.0%)	29 (70.7%)
	Significant	6 (37.5%)	6 (24.0%)	12 (29.3%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .86$, ns.]

Continued on next page

Table 47 con't.

		Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Psychopathic Deviance:				
	Not Significant	7 (43.7%)	12 (48.0%)	19 (46.3%)
	Significant	9 (56.3%)	13 (52.0%)	22 (53.7%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .07$, ns.]
Masc./Fem.	Not Significant	14 (87.5%)	16 (64.0%)	30 (73.2%)
	Significant	2 (12.5%)	9 (36.0%)	11 (26.8%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = 2.75$, ns.]
Paranoia:	Not Significant	8 (50.0%)	16 (64.0%)	24 (58.5%)
	Significant	8 (50.0%)	9 (36.0%)	17 (41.5%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .79$, ns.]
Psychasthenia:	Not Significant	7 (43.7%)	13 (52.0%)	20 (48.8%)
	Significant	9 (56.3%)	12 (58.0%)	21 (51.2%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .27$, ns.]
Schizophrenia:	Not Significant	7 (43.7%)	9 (36.0%)	16 (39.0%)
	Significant	9 (56.3%)	16 (64.0%)	25 (61.0%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .25$, ns.]
Hypomania:	Not Significant	7 (43.7%)	19 (76.0%)	26 (63.4%)
	Significant	9 (56.3%)	6 (24.0%)	15 (36.6%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = 4.37$ $p<.05$]
Social Introversion:				
	Not Significant	15 (93.7%)	24 (96.0%)	39 (95.1%)
	Significant	1 (6.3%)	1 (4.0%)	2 (4.9%)
		16 (100%)	25 (100%)	41 (100%)
	Total	(39.0%)	(61.0%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .11$, ns.]

TABLE 48

Testosterone Levels by Age of Offender

Level	Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Low	0 (0%)	2 (5.9%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.1%)
Average	7 (100%)	20 (58.8%)	7 (87.5%)	34 (69.4%)
High	0 (0%)	12 (35.3%)	1 (12.5%)	13 (26.5%)
	7 (100%)	34 (100%)	8 (100%)	49 (100%)
Total	(14.3%)	(69.4%)	(16.3%)	

[$X^2(4) = 6.19$, ns.]

TABLE 49

Testosterone Levels by Sexual Preference of Offender

Level	Sexual Preference Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Low	1 (5.0%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (4.1%)
Average	15 (75.0%)	19 (65.6%)	34 (69.4%)
High	4 (20.0%)	9 (31.0%)	13 (26.5%)
	20 (100%)	29 (100%)	49 (100%)
Total	(40.8%)	(59.2%)	

[$X^2(2) = .77$, ns.]

TABLE 50

FSH Levels by Age of Offender

Level	Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Low	1 (14.3%)	7 (21.9%)	1 (12.5%)	9 (19.1%)
Average	6 (85.7%)	23 (71.9%)	7 (87.5%)	36 (76.6%)
High	0 (0%)	2 (6.2%)	0 (0%)	2 (4.3%)
Total	7 (100%) (14.9%)	32 (100%) (68.1%)	8 (100%) (17.0%)	47 (100%)

[$X^2(4) = 1.63$, ns.]

TABLE 51

FSH Levels by Sexual Preference of Offender

Level	Sexual Preference Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Low	1 (5.3%)	8 (28.6%)	9 (19.1%)
Average	18 (94.7%)	18 (64.3%)	36 (76.6%)
High	0 (0%)	2 (7.1%)	2 (4.3%)
Total	19 (100%) (40.4%)	28 (100%) (59.6%)	47 (100%)

[$X^2(2) = 5.94$, ns.]

TABLE 52

LH Levels by Age of Offender

	Age of Offender			
Level	0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Low	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Average	7 (100%)	32 (86.5%)	8 (100%)	47 (90.4%)
High	0 (0%)	5 (13.5%)	0 (0%)	5 (9.6%)
	7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	

[$X^2(2) = 2.24$, ns.]

TABLE 53

LH Levels by Sexual Preference of Offender

	Sexual Preference		
Levels	Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Low	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Average	19 (90.5%)	28 (90.3%)	47 (90.4%)
High	2 (9.5%)	3 (9.7%)	5 (9.6%)
	21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
Total	(40.0%)	(59.6%)	

[$X^2(1) = .00$, ns.]

TABLE 54

Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory
by Age of Offender

		Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Information:	Deficiencies	6 (85.7%)	25 (67.6%)	6 (75.0%)	37 (71.2%)
	Strengths	1 (14.3%)	12 (32.4%)	2 (25.0%)	15 (18.8%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 1.01$, ns.]
Experience:	Deficiencies	6 (85.7%)	29 (78.4%)	8 (100%)	43 (82.7%)
	Strengths	1 (14.3%)	8 (21.6%)	0 (0%)	9 (17.3%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 2.20$, ns.]
Drive:	Deficiencies	5 (71.4%)	13 (35.1%)	7 (87.5%)	25 (48.1%)
	Strengths	2 (28.6%)	24 (64.9%)	1 (12.5%)	27 (51.9%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 8.99$, $p<.05$]
Attitudes:	Deficiencies	6 (85.7%)	31 (83.8%)	8 (100%)	45 (86.5%)
	Strengths	1 (14.3%)	6 (16.2%)	0 (0%)	7 (13.5%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 1.49$, ns.]
Symptoms:	Deficiencies	6 (85.7%)	31 (83.8%)	5 (62.5%)	42 (80.0%)
	Strengths	1 (14.3%)	6 (16.2%)	3 (37.5%)	10 (19.2%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 2.05$, ns.]
Affects:	Deficiencies	7 (100%)	27 (73.0%)	3 (37.5%)	37 (71.2%)
	Strengths	0 (0%)	10 (27.0%)	5 (62.5%)	15 (28.8%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 7.31$, $p<.05$]

Table 54 con't

		0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Gender Role:	Deficiencies	6 (85.7%)	27 (73.0%)	6 (75.0%)	39 (75.0%)
	Strengths	1 (14.3%)	10 (27.0%)	2 (25.0%)	13 (25.0%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(2) = .51$, ns.]	
Fantasy:	Deficiencies	4 (57.1%)	22 (59.5%)	7 (87.5%)	33 (63.5%)
	Strengths	3 (43.9%)	15 (40.5%)	1 (12.5%)	19 (36.5%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 2.37$, ns.]	
Body Image:	Deficiencies	4 (57.1%)	32 (86.5%)	8 (100%)	44 (84.6%)
	Strengths	3 (43.9%)	5 (13.3%)	0 (0%)	8 (15.4%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 5.61$, ns.]	
Satisfaction:	Deficiencies	4 (57.1%)	19 (51.4%)	5 (62.5%)	28 (53.8%)
	Strengths	3 (42.9%)	18 (48.6%)	3 (37.5%)	24 (46.2%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(2) = .36$, ns.]	
SFI:	Deficiencies	6 (85.7%)	34 (91.9%)	7 (87.5%)	47 (90.4%)
	Strengths	1 (14.3%)	3 (8.1%)	1 (12.5%)	5 (9.6%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(2) = .35$, ns.]	
GSSI:	Deficiencies	1 (14.3%)	15 (40.5%)	3 (37.5%)	19 (36.5%)
	Strengths	6 (85.7%)	22 (59.5%)	5 (62.5%)	33 (63.5%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.4%)	(71.2%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 1.75$, ns.]	

TABLE 55

Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory
by Sexual Preference of Offender

		Sexual Preference		
		Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Information:	Deficiencies	16 (76.2%)	21 (67.7%)	37 (71.2%)
	Strengths	5 (23.8%)	10 (32.3%)	15 (28.8%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .12$, ns.]
Experience:	Deficiencies	16 (76.2%)	27 (87.1%)	42 (82.7%)
	Strengths	5 (23.8%)	4 (12.9%)	9 (17.3%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .42$, ns.]
Drive:	Deficiencies	12 (57.1%)	13 (41.9%)	25 (48.1%)
	Strengths	9 (42.9%)	18 (58.1%)	27 (51.9%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .63$, ns.]
Attitudes:	Deficiencies	19 (90.5%)	26 (83.9%)	45 (86.5%)
	Strengths	2 (8.5%)	5 (16.1%)	7 (13.5%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .07$, ns.]
Symptoms:	Deficiencies	16 (76.2%)	26 (83.9%)	42 (80.8%)
	Strengths	5 (23.8%)	5 (12.1%)	10 (19.2%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .11$, ns.]
Affects:	Deficiencies	14 (66.7%)	23 (74.2%)	37 (71.2%)
	Strengths	7 (33.3%)	8 (25.8%)	15 (28.8%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .07$, ns.]

Table 55 con't

		Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Gender Role:	Deficiencies	17 (81.0%)	22 (71.0%)	39 (75.0%)
	Strengths	4 (19.0%)	9 (29.0%)	13 (25.0%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .24$, ns.]
Fantasy:	Deficiencies	13 (61.9%)	20 (64.5%)	33 (63.5%)
	Strengths	8 (38.1%)	11 (35.5%)	19 (36.5%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .00$, ns.]
Body Image:	Deficiencies	18 (85.7%)	26 (83.9%)	44 (84.6%)
	Strengths	3 (14.3%)	5 (16.1%)	8 (15.4%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .00$, ns.]
Satisfaction:	Deficiencies	11 (52.4%)	17 (54.8%)	28 (53.8%)
	Strengths	10 (47.6%)	14 (45.2%)	24 (46.2%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .00$, ns.]
SFI:	Deficiencies	18 (85.7%)	29 (93.5%)	47 (90.4%)
	Strengths	3 (14.3%)	2 (6.5%)	5 (9.6%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .21$, ns.]
GSSI:	Deficiencies	6 (28.6%)	13 (41.9%)	19 (36.5%)
	Strengths	15 (71.4%)	18 (58.1%)	33 (63.5%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .47$, ns.]

TABLE 56

Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory
by Age of Offender

Scale		Age of offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Negativism:	Average	3 (42.9%)	27 (73.0%)	7 (87.5%)	37 (71.2%)
	High	4 (57.1%)	10 (27.0%)	1 (12.5%)	15 (28.8%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 3.83$, ns.]
Resentment:	Average	1 (14.3%)	22 (59.5%)	6 (75.0%)	29 (55.8%)
	High	6 (85.7%)	15 (40.5%)	2 (25.0%)	23 (44.2%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 6.29$; $p<.05$]
Indirect Hostility:	Average	1 (14.3%)	18 (48.6%)	4 (50.0%)	23 (44.2%)
	High	6 (85.7%)	19 (51.4%)	4 (50.0%)	29 (55.8%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 2.95$, ns.]
Assault:	Average	2 (28.6%)	29 (78.4%)	6 (75.0%)	37 (71.2%)
	High	5 (71.4%)	8 (21.6%)	2 (25.0%)	15 (28.8%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
					[$X^2(2) = 7.18$, $p<.05$]

Continued on next page

Table 56 con't.

		0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Suspicion:	Average	3 (42.9%)	12 (32.4%)	5 (62.5%)	20 (38.5%)
	High	4 (57.1%)	25 (67.6%)	3 (37.5%)	32 (61.5%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	

[$X^2(2) = 2.58$, ns.]

Irritability:	Average	4 (57.1%)	29 (78.4%)	8 (100%)	41 (78.8%)
	High	3 (42.9%)	8 (21.6%)	0 (0%)	11 (21.2%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	

[$X^2(2) = 4.13$, ns.]

Verbal Hostility:	Average	2 (28.6%)	25 (67.6%)	7 (87.5%)	34 (65.4%)
	High	5 (71.4%)	12 (32.4%)	1 (12.5%)	18 (34.6%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	

[$X^2(2) = 5.99$, $p < .05$]

Guilt:	Average	0 (0%)	15 (41.7%)	4 (50.0%)	19 (63.5%)
	High	7 (100%)	21 (53.8%)	4 (50.0%)	32 (62.7%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	

[$X^2(2) = 5.01$, ns.]

Total:	Average	2 (28.6%)	25 (67.6%)	6 (75.0%)	33 (63.5%)
	High	5 (71.4%)	12 (32.4%)	2 (25.0%)	19 (36.5%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	

[$X^2(2) = 4.40$, ns.]

TABLE 57

Buss Durkee Hostility Inventory
by Sexual Preference of Offender

Scale		Sexual Preference: Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Negativism:	Average	17 (80.9%)	21 (64.5%)	37 (71.2%)
	High	4 (9.1%)	11 (35.5%)	15 (28.8%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				$[X^2(1) = .94, ns.]$
Resentment	Average	11 (52.4%)	18 (58.1%)	29 (55.8%)
	High	10 (47.6%)	13 (41.9%)	23 (44.2%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				$[X^2(1) = .01, ns.]$
Indirect Hostility:	Average	10 (47.6%)	13 (41.9%)	23 (44.2%)
	High	11 (52.4%)	18 (58.1%)	29 (55.8%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				$[X^2(1) = .01, ns.]$
Assault	Average	11 (52.4%)	26 (83.9%)	37 (71.2%)
	High	10 (47.6%)	5 (16.1%)	15 (28.8%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				$[X^2(1) = 4.61, ns.]$

Continued on next page

Table 57 con't.

		Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Suspicion:	Average	8 (38.1%)	12 (38.7%)	20 (38.5%)
	High	13 (61.9%)	19 (61.3%)	32 (61.5%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				$[X^2(1) = .00, ns.]$
Irritability:	Average	17 (81.0%)	24 (77.4%)	41 (78.8%)
	High	4 (19.0%)	7 (22.0%)	11 (21.2%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				$[X^2(1) = .00, ns.]$
Verbal Hostility:	Average	13 (61.9%)	21 (67.7%)	34 (65.4%)
	High	8 (38.1%)	10 (32.3%)	18 (34.6%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				$[X^2(1) = .02, ns.]$
Guilt:	Average	10 (47.6%)	9 (45.0%)	19 (37.3%)
	High	11 (52.4%)	21 (55.0%)	32 (62.7%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				$[X^2(1) = .97, ns.]$
Total:	Average	13 (61.9%)	20 (64.5%)	33 (63.5%)
	High	8 (38.1%)	11 (35.5%)	19 (36.5%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				$[X^2(1) = .00, ns.]$

TABLE 58

Sexual Attitude Scores by Age of Offender

Test		Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total
Heterosexuality:	Negative	2 (18.6%)	3 (8.1%)	0 (0%)	5 (9.6%)
	Neutral	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Positive	5 (71.4%)	34 (91.9%)	8 (100%)	47 (90.4%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
				$[X^2(2) = 3.48, ns.]$	
Homosexuality:	Negative	3 (42.9%)	23 (62.2%)	8 (100%)	34 (65.4%)
	Neutral	2 (28.6%)	2 (5.4%)	0 (0%)	4 (7.7%)
	Positive	2 (28.6%)	12 (32.4%)	0 (0%)	14 (26.9%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
				$[X^2(4) = 9.48, ns.]$	
Heterosexual Pedophile:					
	Negative	3 (42.9%)	24 (64.9%)	7 (87.5%)	34 (65.4%)
	Neutral	2 (28.6%)	6 (16.2%)	1 (12.5%)	9 (17.3%)
	Positive	2 (28.6%)	7 (18.9%)	0 (0%)	9 (17.3%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
				$[X^2(4) = 3.74, ns.]$	
Homosexual Pedophile:					
	Negative	4 (57.1%)	22 (59.5%)	6 (75.0%)	32 (61.5%)
	Neutral	2 (28.6%)	4 (10.8%)	1 (12.5%)	7 (13.5%)
	Positive	1 (14.3%)	11 (29.7%)	1 (12.5%)	13 (25.0%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
				$[X^2(4) = 2.82, ns.]$	
Fetishisms:	Negative	3 (42.9%)	22 (59.5%)	7 (87.5%)	32 (61.5%)
	Neutral	2 (28.6%)	5 (13.5%)	1 (12.5%)	8 (15.4%)
	Positive	2 (28.6%)	10 (27.0%)	0 (0%)	12 (23.1%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
				$[X^2(4) = 4.41, ns.]$	

Table 58 con't.

Transvestism:	Negative	4 (57.1%)	30 (81.1%)	8 (100%)	42 (80.8%)
	Neutral	2 (28.6%)	6 (16.2%)	0 (0%)	8 (15.4%)
	Positive	1 (14.3%)	1 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (3.8%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(4) = 5.31$, ns.]	
Exhibitionism:	Negative	5 (71.4%)	12 (32.4%)	7 (87.5%)	24 (46.2%)
	Neutral	0 (0%)	7 (18.9%)	0 (0%)	7 (23.1%)
	Positive	2 (28.6%)	18 (48.7%)	1 (12.5%)	21 (40.4%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(4) = 10.69$, $p<.05$]	
Voyeurism:	Negative	3 (42.9%)	15 (40.5%)	5 (62.5%)	23 (44.2%)
	Neutral	4 (57.1%)	6 (16.2%)	0 (0%)	10 (19.2%)
	Positive	0 (0%)	16 (43.2%)	3 (37.5%)	19 (36.5%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(4) = 10.68$, $p<.05$]	
Frotteurism:	Negative	3 (42.9%)	18 (48.7%)	3 (37.5%)	24 (46.2%)
	Neutral	1 (14.2%)	5 (13.5%)	3 (37.5%)	9 (17.3%)
	Positive	3 (42.9%)	14 (37.8%)	2 (25.0%)	19 (36.5%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(4) = 2.81$, ns.]	
Sadism/Masochism:					
	Negative	5 (71.4%)	29 (78.4%)	8 (100%)	42 (80.8%)
	Neutral	1 (14.3%)	4 (10.8%)	0 (0%)	5 (9.6%)
	Positive	1 (14.3%)	4 (10.8%)	0 (0%)	5 (9.6%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(4) = 2.88$, ns.]	
Neutral:	Negative	3 (42.9%)	23 (62.2%)	6 (75.0%)	32 (61.5%)
	Neutral	0 (0%)	5 (13.5%)	0 (0%)	5 (9.6%)
	Positive	4 (57.1%)	9 (24.3%)	2 (25.0%)	15 (28.8%)
		7 (100%)	37 (100%)	8 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(13.5%)	(71.1%)	(15.4%)	
				[$X^2(4) = 6.91$, ns.]	

TABLE 59

Sexual Attitude Scores by Sexual Preference of Offender

Test		Sexual Preference: Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Heterosexuality:	Negative	2 (9.5%)	3 (9.7%)	5 (9.6%)
	Neutral	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Positive	19 (19.5%)	28 (90.3%)	47 (90.4%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(1) = .00$, ns.]
Homosexuality:	Negative	16 (76.2%)	18 (58.1%)	34 (65.4%)
	Neutral	4 (19.0%)	0 (0%)	4 (7.7%)
	Positive	1 (4.8%)	13 (41.9%)	14 (26.9%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 12.96$, $p<.01$]
Heterosexual Pedophile:	Negative	12 (57.1%)	22 (71.0%)	34 (65.4%)
	Neutral	3 (14.3%)	6 (19.6%)	9 (17.3%)
	Positive	6 (28.6%)	3 (9.7%)	9 (17.3%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52. (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 3.13$, ns.]
Homosexual Pedophile:	Negative	17 (81.0%)	15 (48.4%)	32 (61.5%)
	Neutral	2 (9.5%)	5 (16.1%)	7 (13.5%)
	Positive	2 (9.5%)	11 (35.5%)	13 (25.0%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 5.94$, ns.]
Fetishisms:	Negative	11 (5.4%)	21 (67.7%)	32 (61.5%)
	Neutral	4 (19.0%)	4 (7.7%)	8 (15.4%)
	Positive	6 (28.6%)	6 (19.4%)	12 (23.1%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 1.25$, ns.]

Table 59 con't.

		Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total
Transvestism:	Negative	18 (85.7%)	24 (46.2%)	42 (80.8%)
	Neutral	2 (9.5%)	6 (19.4%)	8 (15.4%)
	Positive	1 (4.8%)	1 (3.2%)	2 (3.8%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(2) = .97$, ns.]
Exhibitionism:	Negative	10 (47.6%)	14 (45.2%)	24 (46.2%)
	Neutral	2 (9.5%)	5 (16.1%)	7 (13.5%)
	Positive	9 (42.9%)	12 (38.7%)	21 (40.4%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(2) = .48$, ns.]
Voyeurism:	Negative	11 (5.4%)	12 (38.7%)	23 (44.2%)
	Neutral	4 (19.0%)	6 (19.4%)	10 (19.2%)
	Positive	6 (28.6%)	13 (41.9%)	19 (36.5%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 1.14$, ns.]
Frotteurism:	Negative	8 (38.1%)	16 (51.6%)	24 (46.2%)
	Neutral	5 (23.8%)	4 (12.9%)	9 (17.3%)
	Positive	8 (38.1%)	11 (35.5%)	19 (36.5%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 1.38$, ns.]
Sadism/Masochism:				
	Negative	18 (85.7%)	24 (77.4%)	42 (80.8%)
	Neutral	1 (4.8%)	4 (12.9%)	5 (9.6%)
	Positive	2 (9.5%)	3 (9.7%)	5 (9.6%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 1.80$, ns.]
Neutral	Negative	11 (52.4%)	21 (67.7%)	32 (61.5%)
	Neutral	2 (9.5%)	3 (9.7%)	5 (9.6%)
	Positive	8 (38.1%)	7 (22.6%)	15 (28.8%)
		21 (100%)	31 (100%)	52 (100%)
	Total	(40.4%)	(59.6%)	
				[$X^2(2) = 1.53$, ns.]

TABLE 60

High Levels of Arousal of Penile Tumescence Slides by Age of Offender

Slide	Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total	Chi Square
Adolescent Female:	2 (50.0%)	8 (32.0%)	3 (50.0%)	13 (37.1%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.99$, ns.]
Female Child (10-11)	2 (50.0%)	7 (28.0%)	3 (50.0%)	12 (34.3%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.53$, ns.]
Male Child (11)	2 (50.0%)	12 (52.0%)	3 (50.0%)	17 (48.6%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.01$, ns.]
Adolescent Male	2 (50.0%)	8 (32.0%)	2 (33.3%)	12 (34.2%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.49$, ns.]
Male Child (7-8)	3 (75.0%)	8 (32.0%)	3 (50.0%)	14 (40.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 2.96$, ns.]
Adult Female	2 (50.0%)	7 (28.0%)	3 (50.0%)	12 (34.3%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.53$, ns.]
Adult Male	1 (25.0%)	3 (12.0%)	2 (33.3%)	6 (17.1%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.75$, ns.]
Female Child (4-5)	2 (50.0%)	8 (32.0%)	2 (33.3%)	12 (34.3%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.50$, ns.]

TABLE 61

High Levels of Arousal of Penile Tumescence Slides by Sexual Preference of Offender

Slide	Sexual Preference Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total	Chi Square
Adolescent Female	6 (54.5%)	7 (29.2%)	13 (37.1%)	[$X^2(1) = 1.13$, ns.]
Female Child (10-11)	6 (54.5%)	6 (25.0%)	12 (34.3%)	[$X^2(1) = 1.76$, ns.]
Male Child (11)	4 (36.4%)	13 (54.2%)	17 (48.6%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.38$, ns.]
Adolescent Male	4 (36.4%)	8 (33.3%)	12 (34.3%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Male Child (7-8)	4 (36.4%)	10 (41.7%)	14 (40.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Adult Female	5 (45.5%)	7 (29.2%)	12 (34.3%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.31$, ns.]
Adult Male	2 (19.2%)	4 (16.7%)	6 (17.1%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Female Child (4-5)	5 (45.5%)	7 (29.2%)	12 (34.2%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.31$, ns.]

TABLE 62

High Levels of Arousal of Penile Tumescence
Heterosexual Pedophile Tapes by Age of Offender

Tape		Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total	Chi Square
Child Initiate	- arouse	3 (100%)	13 (76.5%)	1 (20.0%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 7.27$ $p<.05$]
	- supress	3 (100%)	10 (58.8%)	2 (40.0%)	15 (60.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 2.84$, ns.]
Child Mutual	- arouse	3 (100%)	12 (70.6%)	2 (40.0%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 3.26$, ns.]
	- supress	3 (100%)	10 (58.8%)	2 (40.0%)	15 (60.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 2.84$, ns.]
Non-physical coercion						
	- arouse	3 (100%)	13 (76.5%)	3 (60.0%)	19 (76.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.65$, ns.]
	- supress	3 (100%)	12 (70.6%)	2 (40.0%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 3.26$, ns.]
Physical Coercion						
	- arouse	3 (100%)	13 (76.5%)	1 (20.0%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 7.27$ $p<.05$]
	- supress	3 (100%)	12 (70.6%)	2 (40.0%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 3.26$, ns.]
Sadism	- arouse	3 (100%)	13 (76.5%)	1 (20.0%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 7.27$ $p<.05$]
	- supress	4 (100%)	10 (58.8%)	3 (60.0%)	17 (65.4%)	[$X^2(2) = 2.50$, ns.]
Assault	- arouse	3 (100%)	8 (47.1%)	2 (40.0%)	13 (52.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 3.22$, ns.]
	- supress	3 (100%)	10 (58.8%)	3 (60.0%)	16 (64.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.92$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (hetero)						
	- arouse	3 (100%)	11 (54.7%)	2 (40.0%)	16 (64.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 2.94$, ns.]
	- supress	3 (100%)	15 (88.2%)	3 (60.0%)	21 (84.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 2.94$, ns.]
Incest	- arouse	2 (66.7%)	12 (70.6%)	3 (60.0%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.20$, ns.]
	- supress	3 (100%)	13 (76.5%)	3 (60.0%)	19 (76.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.65$, ns.]
Pedophile Index						
	- arouse	1 (33.3%)	6 (35.3%)	0 (0%)	7 (28.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 2.43$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (33.3%)	7 (41.2%)	1 (20.0%)	9 (36.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.76$, ns.]
Assault Index	- arouse	0 (0%)	4 (23.5%)	2 (40.0%)	6 (24.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.65$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (33.3%)	2 (11.8%)	2 (40.0%)	5 (20.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 2.30$, ns.]

TABLE 63

High Levels of Arousal of Penile Tumescence Heterosexual Pedophile Tapes by Sexual Preference of Offender

Tape		Sexual Preference: Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total	Chi Square
Child Initiates	- arouse	12 (70.6%)	5 (62.5%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
	- supress	11 (64.7%)	4 (50.0%)	15 (60.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.07$, ns.]
Child Mutual	- arouse	11 (64.7%)	6 (75.0%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(1) = .003$, ns.]
	- supress	11 (64.7%)	4 (50.0%)	15 (60.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.07$, ns.]
Non-physical Coercion					
	- arouse	12 (70.6%)	7 (87.5%)	19 (76.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.18$, ns.]
	- supress	12 (70.6%)	5 (62.5%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Physical Coercion					
	- arouse	11 (64.7%)	6 (75.0%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(1) = .003$, ns.]
	- supress	12 (70.6%)	5 (62.5%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Sadism	- arouse	11 (64.7%)	6 (75.0%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(1) = .003$, ns.]
	- supress	12 (66.7%)	5 (62.5%)	17 (65.4%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Assault	- arouse	10 (58.8%)	3 (37.5%)	13 (52.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.32$, ns.]
	- supress	11 (64.7%)	5 (62.5%)	16 (64.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (hetero)					
	- arouse	13 (76.5%)	3 (37.5%)	16 (64.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 2.09$, ns.]
	- supress	14 (82.4%)	7 (87.5%)	21 (84.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Incest	- arouse	10 (58.8%)	7 (87.5%)	17 (68.0%)	[$X^2(10 = 0.95$, ns.]
	- supress	11 (64.7%)	8 (100%)	19 (76.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 2.03$, ns.]
Pedophile Index					
	- arouse	5 (29.4%)	2 (25.0%)	7 (28.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
	- supress	7 (41.2%)	2 (25.0%)	9 (36.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.11$, ns.]
Assault Index	- arouse	4 (23.5%)	2 (25.0%)	6 (24.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
	- supress	4 (23.5%)	1 (12.5%)	5 (20.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.01$, ns.]

TABLE 64

High Levels of Arousal of Penile Tumescence
Homosexual Pedophile Tapes by Age of Offender

Tape		Age of Offender 0-19	20-49	50-75	Total	Chi Square
Child Initiates	- arouse	2 (100%)	17 (70.8%)	2 (100%)	21 (75.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.55$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	16 (66.7%)	1 (50.0%)	18 (66.7%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.75$, ns.]
Child Mutual	- arouse	2 (100%)	18 (75.0%)	0 (0%)	20 (71.4%)	[$X^2(2) = 5.95$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	16 (66.7%)	1 (50.0%)	18 (66.7%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.75$, ns.]
Non-physical Coercion						
	- arouse	2 (100%)	13 (54.2%)	0 (0%)	15 (53.6%)	[$X^2(2) = 4.04$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	11 (45.8%)	1 (50.0%)	13 (48.1%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.13$, ns.]
Physical Coercion						
	- arouse	2 (100%)	14 (60.9%)	0 (0%)	16 (59.3%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.89$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	12 (52.2%)	1 (50.0%)	14 (53.8%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.89$, ns.]
Sadism	- arouse	2 (100%)	13 (56.5%)	1 (50.0%)	16 (59.3%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.52$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	12 (52.2%)	1 (50.0%)	14 (53.8%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.89$, ns.]
Assault	- arouse	2 (100%)	10 (43.5%)	0 (0%)	12 (44.4%)	[$X^2(2) = 4.11$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	19 (39.1%)	1 (50.0%)	11 (42.3%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.51$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (hetero)						
	- arouse	2 (100%)	12 (52.2%)	1 (50.0%)	15 (55.6%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.73$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	10 (43.5%)	0 (0%)	11 (42.3%)	[$X^2(2) = 2.84$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (homo)						
	- arouse	2 (100%)	3 (56.5%)	1 (50.0%)	16 (59.3%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.52$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	11 (47.8%)	1 (50.0%)	13 (50.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.04$, ns.]
Incest	- arouse	2 (100%)	17 (73.9%)	1 (50.0%)	20 (74.1%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.30$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	9 (39.1%)	1 (50.0%)	11 (42.3%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.51$, ns.]
Pedophile Index						
	- arouse	1 (50.0%)	15 (65.2%)	1 (50.0%)	10 (37.0%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.33$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	13 (56.5%)	1 (50.0%)	15 (57.7%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.79$, ns.]
Assault Index	- arouse	0 (0%)	6 (26.1%)	0 (0%)	6 (22.2%)	[$X^2(2) = 1.34$, ns.]
	- supress	0 (0%)	5 (21.7%)	0 (0%)	6 (19.2%)	[$X^2(2) = 0.81$, ns.]

TABLE 65

High Levels of Arousal of Penile Tumescence Homosexual Pedophile Tapes by Sexual Preference of Offender

Tape		Sexual Preference: Het. Ped.	Hom. Ped.	Total	Chi Square
Child Initiates	- arouse	1 (100%)	20 (74.1%)	21 (75.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	17 (65.4%)	18 (66.7%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Child Mutual	- arouse	1 (100%)	19 (70.4%)	20 (71.4%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	17 (65.4%)	18 (66.7%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Non-physical Coercion					
	- arouse	1 (100%)	14 (51.9%)	15 (53.6%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	12 (46.2%)	13 (48.1%)	[$X^2(1) = .001$, ns.]
Physical Coercion					
	- arouse	1 (100%)	15 (57.7%)	16 (59.3%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	13 (52.0%)	14 (53.8%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Sadism	- arouse	1 (100%)	15 (57.7%)	16 (59.3%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	13 (52.0%)	14 (53.8%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Assault	- arouse	1 (100%)	11 (42.3%)	12 (44.4%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.01$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	10 (40.0%)	11 (42.3%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.02$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (hetero)					
	- arouse	1 (100%)	13 (53.8%)	15 (55.6%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	10 (40.0%)	11 (42.3%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.02$, ns.]
Adult Mutual (homo)					
	- arouse	1 (100%)	15 (57.7%)	16 (59.3%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	12 (48.0%)	13 (50.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Incest	- arouse	1 (100%)	19 (73.1%)	20 (74.1%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
	- supress	0 (0%)	11 (44.0%)	11 (42.3%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Pedophile Index					
	- arouse	1 (100%)	9 (34.6%)	10 (37.0%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.07$, ns.]
	- supress	1 (100%)	14 (56.0%)	15 (57.7%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]
Assault Index	- arouse	1 (100%)	5 (19.2%)	6 (22.2%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.46$, ns.]
	- supress	0 (0%)	5 (20.0%)	5 (19.2%)	[$X^2(1) = 0.00$, ns.]