

Sex Offenses Against Female Children Perpetrated by Men Who Are Not Pedophiles

KURT FREUND, M.D., D.Sc. and ROBIN WATSON, M.Ed.

Department of Behavioural Sexology

Clarke Institute of Psychiatry

ROBERT DICKEY, M.D.

Gender Identity Clinic

Clarke Institute of Psychiatry

Previous research and clinical impression indicate two possible predictors of gynephilic preference among offenders against female children: (1) the occurrence of the offense within a father-daughter (or stepdaughter) relationship, and (2) victimization of only one child. Validation of these putative predictors was by phallometric test results of a total of 187 male adult subjects: 95 "incest" offenders against female children, 54 such non-incest offenders, and 38 offenders against adult females. Each of these predictors showed to be valid in its own right, and the interaction of the two did not increase prediction potential.

KEY WORDS: Incest, pedophilia, phallometry, penile volume changes.

In his classical textbook on the paraphilias, Krafft-Ebing (1950/1886, pp. 552-557; see also Finkelhor, 1984, pp.34-36) differentiates between two types of sex offenders against children: 1. individuals who use the child as a substitute for a physically mature partner, and 2. pedophiles, whose condition is a disorder. In women, pedophilia is either non-existent or very rare (Gebhard, Gagnon, Pomeroy, & Christenson, 1965, p. 275).

It is likely that the recidivism rates of these two types of offenders against children differ substantially. However, even the most recent scholarly review of studies of recidivism rates (Furby, Weinrott, & Blackshaw, 1989) does not mention this possibility. Also, according to

This research was supported in part by Grant No. MA-9134 from the Medical Research Council of Canada. The authors wish to thank Cathy Spegg, B.S., M.B.A., for statistical advice; Doug Rienzo, B.Sc., for technical assistance; and Michael Kuban for editorial assistance. Requests for reprints should be addressed to Dr. Kurt Freund, Department of Behavioural Sexology, Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, 250 College Street, Toronto, ON, Canada, M5T 1R8.

clinical experience, these two types of offenders require different kinds of treatment in order to prevent further recidives. With true pedophiles or hebephiles, psychological therapies play only an ancillary role, and in the majority of cases, physiological sex drive reduction is necessary (Freund, 1980). With gynephilic offenders against children—such offenders who erotically prefer physically mature females—indictment or incarceration may effect a “cure” for life.

An earlier study has shown that at least some gynephilic males may become aroused by the sight of the nude body of an attractive female child, but that the level of this arousal is far below that elicited by the sight of the nude body of an attractive physically mature female (Freund, Mc Knight, Langevin, & Cibiri, 1972). What then leads an adult (or nearly adult) gynephilic male to involve a child in his sexual activities? There seem to be conditions which are conducive to the occurrence of a sex offense against a female child by some adult gynephilic males. The present study tested the validity of the clinical impression that the father role may be such a condition. (Exhibitionism may be a further such condition [Freund & Watson, 1990].)

The investigators who first addressed the father role in this regard were Quinsey, Chaplin, and Carrigan (1979). For this purpose, they used the phallometric test of erotic partner-gender and age preference, which records penile responses to potentially erotic pictorial or verbal stimuli (Abel, Becker, Murphy, & Flanagan, 1981; Freund & Blanchard, 1989; Freund, Diamant, & Pinkava, 1958; Marshall, Barbaree, & Christophe, 1986; Quinsey, Steinman, Bergersen, & Holmes, 1975). Their study compared phallometric responses of 9 men who had sexually abused their daughters or step-daughters (or the like) with a group of 7 sex offenders against related female children for whom, however, they were not in a father role. They then matched groups of 9 and 7 offenders against unrelated female children. The 9 offenders against daughters or stepdaughters showed significantly less arousal to children than the matched group consisting of sex offenders against unrelated female children. Further investigators who compared incestuous and non-incestuous offender groups on mean phallometric group responses to female children and adults were Marshall, Barbaree, and Christopher, (1986), Marshall, Barbaree, and Butt, (1988), and Frenzel and Lang, (1989).

The intent of the present investigation was to go one step further by: (1) comparing these groups in regard to proportions of *individually diagnosed* pedophiles and gynephiles; (2) differentiating between *offenders against only one child* (hereafter “single case-victimizers”) and

offenders against at least two children (hereafter "multi-case victimizers"). This differentiation was to test the apparently plausible conjecture that a multi-case victimizer is more likely to be a true pedophile than a single-case victimizer; and (3) measuring the interaction of these two conditions. In the course of these comparisons, differences between natural fathers and stepfathers were also explored.

Further, comparisons were made in regard to age bracket of victimized children and to certain (self-reported) retrospective data from the offenders' childhood history and family situation. This included relationship with mother and father and seduction in childhood by a physically mature person.

METHOD

Subjects. Included in the study were 187 male non-psychotic and almost exclusively Caucasian 18- to 55-year-old sex offenders against females selected from the data bank of the sexology department of a psychiatric teaching hospital. They were referred by this institute's forensic department, by psychiatrists from outside the institute who conducted assessments on them for their lawyers or for the courts, by Probation and Parole officers, and by Children's Aid. The latter resource was true mainly of incestuous offenders. Only offenders against children under 12 years of age or against physically mature females (over age 15) were selected. *Not* included in the study were: 1. individuals who offended against children as well as against physically mature females; 2. mentally retarded or borderline offenders (so diagnosed by the institutions in which they resided, or by the professionals who supervised and referred them for assessment); 3. individuals with at least one incest offense and at least one non-incest offense; 4. exhibitionists in whom no additional paraphilic activity preference was present (which could be used to specify age preference); and 5. offenders against children as well as pubescents because in this category the subgroups of incestuous and non-incestuous offenders were too small for any statistical comparison.

The group of incestuous offenders comprised biological fathers and stepfathers of their victims as well as men who at the time of the offense had been living for at least six months with a common-law wife or girlfriend whose daughter(s) became the offender's target. However, only "non-admitters" were selected, i.e., sex offenders against children or pubescents who denied an erotic preference for minors and claimed that children or pubescents were never the subject of their erotic fantasies (see below). The reason for including only these offenders was

that very few sex offenders against minors do admit to such a preference. The reason for the exclusion of mentally handicapped offenders was that few of them were in the father role.

There were 95 incestuous offenders and 54 non-incestuous offenders against female children who had no known offense against pubescents. Each of these two groups was further divided into a subgroup of single-case victimizers and of multi-case victimizers. There were 74 incestuous and 29 non-incestuous single-case victimizers and 21 incestuous and 25 non-incestuous multi-case victimizers. Excluded from the study were 16 incest offenders who also victimized a child outside the family, (43.2 %, if added to all the multi-victim incest offenders, or 14.4 %, if added to all incest offenders in the study).

Verbal Procedures. A seven-level ranking system was used for the assessment of level of education: no formal education; less than eight grades completed; eight grades completed, but not more; more than 8 grades completed, but less than 12; twelve grades completed, but no university studies; university studies without graduation; university graduation. Socio-economic status was characterized by scores on the Hollingshead-Redlich (1958) occupational scale.

Non-admitter status was assigned to offenders against children who endorsed answer (*d*) for item 1. and (*a*) for item 2. in the two questions below—contained in a questionnaire, the “Erotic Preferences Examination Scheme” (hereafter EPES—unpublished).

1. When lying in bed and sexually aroused, do you imagine or fantasize about intimately touching (*a*) boys or girls up to 10 years old, (*b*) boys or girls 12 to 15 years old, (*c*) boys or girls in both age ranges, (*d*) none of the above?

2. When lying in bed and sexually aroused, do you imagine or fantasize about intimately touching females 17 and over more often than touching children or teenagers 15 years or younger? (*a*) yes; (*b*) no.

Four questions used in the current study concerned parental loss:

1. Before you turned 6, did your natural mother die or leave you, without another adult female bringing or helping bring you up? (*a*) yes; (*b*) no.

2. Between the ages of 6 and 12, did your mother die or leave you, without another adult female bringing or helping bring you up? (*a*) yes; (*b*) no; and (*c*) lived mostly in a public institution or boarding school during this period, or your mother died and left you already at an earlier age (without another adult female bringing or helping bring you up).

The two questions concerned with father loss were similar, with the exception that the question about the period up to age 6 contained a third option (c) your father died or left your mother prior to your birth.

Relationship with parents was assessed by two mini-scales, a mother-son and a father-son distance scale, each consisting of 4 items embedded in the EPES (Freund, 1973; Freund & Blanchard, 1983—available on request). For the present study, the alpha reliability index was recalculated for 1,409 individuals for the Mother Distance scale (alpha = .870) and for 1,351 individuals for the Father Distance scale (alpha = .893). The groups and numbers of group members used in the recalculation for the Mother Distance scale/Father Distance scale are as follows: 374/362 gynephilic patients; 129/119 gynephilic volunteers; 116/108 androphilic clients; 13/13 androphilic volunteers; and 446/432 heterosexual, 233/221 homosexual, and 98/96 bisexual offenders against minors.

There were two EPES questions which assessed the individuals' molestation in childhood by physically mature males or females: "Were you ever seduced by a male older than 17 when you were younger than 16? If so, how old were you when this happened?"; (a) younger than 12, (b) between 12 and 16, (c) was never seduced by a male before age 16. The second question asked the same about females over 17. The first and second answers were evaluated as identical.

The Phallometric Test. The differential diagnosis between pedophilia or, in a broader sense, a preference for minors (hereafter equated with pedophilia) and gynephilia was made by means of the most recent version of the phallometric test of erotic gender and age preferences (Freund & Blanchard, 1989). As in our earlier studies, the original volumetric penile sensor was used (Freund, Sedlacek, & Knob, 1965) rather than the circumference sensor (Bancroft, Jones, & Pullan, 1966; Barlow, Becker, Leitenberg, & Agras, 1970), since the volumetric method has been demonstrated to measure penile tumescence more accurately (Earls, Marshall, Marshall, Morales, & Surridge, 1983; Freund, Langevin, & Barlow 1974; McConaghy, 1974).

The test was administered in two separate sessions. Each session included pictures of nude physically mature and physically immature females and males, successively presented one at a time on a screen and accompanied by taped narratives. A break separated the two sessions to minimize fatigue effects (as had also been intended with the variation of types of stimulus presentation—see below). In Session One, 9 categories of stimuli were presented, including four age categories for each of the two genders and also one category of sexually neutral movie

clips. The four age categories were children of ages 5 to 8 and 8 to 11, pubescents of ages 12 to 15, and physically mature persons. Stimuli were presented in fixed random order in 3 successive blocks, each consisting of 9 trials, with one trial for each of the gender-age categories and one for the sexually neutral category (landscapes). In Session Two, four gender-age categories as well as a category of sexually neutral slides (also landscapes) were presented in five successive blocks analogous to those in Session One. The younger category of children and the pubescents were not included in Session Two. Session One was preceded by three habituation trials, Session Two by two such trials.

In Session One, each of 27 trials lasted 28 seconds and consisted of two consecutive movie strips each showing a different person of the same gender-age category walking towards the viewer. In Session Two, each of 25 trials lasted 54 seconds during which slides of three nude persons were shown successively such that three screens simultaneously showed a front view, a rear view and the genital region. In the course of a trial, no one screen showed the same type of view (front, rear, genital region) twice. The narratives accompanying Session One described the persons on the screen engaging in sexually neutral activities, such as swimming. In Session Two, the narratives described imaginary sexual interaction between the testee and the person on the screen. With the exception of those individuals whose first test session was valid and rendered a diagnosis of pedophilia, every testee underwent two test sessions.

As a routine, everybody administered the phallometric test must first sign a consent form explaining that the test measures "blood circulation in the penis for the purpose of assessment of erotic preferences" (this is also explained orally). Each person is also told that he will be seeing film clips (or slides) of nude persons of both genders and of different ages. To ensure that the demand characteristics of the situation (Orne, 1962) of the offenders against physically mature females were as similar as possible to those of the offenders against children, the former were additionally instructed that we were assessing their preferred partner age.

After attachment of the volume sensor at the start of each session of the phallometric test of partner gender-age preference, the examined individual is engaged in conversation of a sexually neutral nature until his penile volume reaches its minimal level. Following each trial, there is a waiting period during which various non-erotic sections of printed text are presented on slides, which the testee is required to read aloud until penile volume returns to the baseline level. The next trial

commences once penile volume oscillates around the baseline level. The examined individuals are monitored with a low light level video camera to ensure that they are attending to the visual stimuli.

Measurement. For each trial, penile volume changes (in mL) were measured in two ways: a *D*-type score, the largest deviation from initial value; and an *A*-type score, the area under the plotted response curve. The raw *D*-type scores for each separate session were converted to standard scores derived from each subject's own *D*-type data only (Freund et al., 1972), and the same operation was carried out with his *A*-type scores. The reason for using *z*-scores was that: 1. It has been shown that they reflect a testee's erotic preference better than raw scores (Earls, Quinsey, & Castonguay, 1987; Freund et al., 1974; Freund, McKnight, Langevin, & Cibiri, 1972; Quinsey et al., 1979; Quinsey & Harris, 1976); 2. These *D*-type and *A*-type standard scores were subsequently combined according to the formula $(zD + zA)/2$. The area under the curve *A* and maximal deviation from baseline *D* are highly correlated (Abel, Blanchard, Murphy, Becker, & Djenderedjian, 1981; Freund, Langevin, Chamberlayne, Deosaran, & Zajac, 1974) and therefore any response with an uncharacteristic relationship between these two measures is likely to reflect an irregularity, such as body movement. The combined score lowers the impact of such irregularities in the evaluation of test results.

To avoid inclusion of test sessions in which there was virtually no response to the stimuli, each subject's overall response level was expressed for each session as an output index (O.I.; Freund, Chan, & Coulthard, 1979). This was the mean of the 3 highest responses in raw *D*-scores (excluding neutrals). In both sessions, O.I. had to be at least 1.0 mL.

More detailed information, in particular about gender and age preference indices, is available on request. Since Freund & Blanchard, 1989, minor changes have been instituted, mainly in regard to cut-off points. The measurements and diagnoses were made by computer program.

Statistical evaluation. Where interval data were concerned, the simultaneous comparison of all groups was by ANOVA, and the subsequent separate comparisons of each of the individual pairs of groups were by the Tukey-HSD test (using harmonic means). Where only ordinal data were available, a one-way Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA (with correction for ties) was used for simultaneous comparison of all groups, and two-tailed Mann-Whitney *U* tests (corrected for ties) were employed for subsequent comparisons of the individual pairs of groups.

Where only nominal data were concerned, the Chi square test was used for simultaneous comparison of more than two groups, and two-tailed *t*-tests of proportions (with correction for small samples) were used for comparing the individual pairs of groups. The relative importance of variables shown to be predictors of gynephilia in offenders against children was assessed by regression analysis. The significance level chosen for all comparisons was $p < .05$.

RESULTS

Phallometric diagnoses of pedophilia vs. gynephilia. Table 1 shows the differential diagnoses between pedophilia and gynephilia by means of the phallometric test.

A summary comparison of the five subject groups as to the numbers of individuals phallometrically diagnosed as pedophilic vs. the number diagnosed as erotically gynephilic indicated the presence of significant differences (Chi square = 32.856, *d.f.* = 4, $p < .001$). According to the results of individual comparisons of the groups by *t*-tests of proportions, the non-incestuous multi-case victimizers were more often diagnosed as pedophilic than any of the remaining groups. Results of these comparisons were as follows: non-incestuous multi-case victimizers vs. incestuous multi-case victimizers, $t = 2.784$, *d.f.* = 28, $p < .01$; vs. incestuous single-case victimizers, $t = 4.312$, *d.f.* = 63, $p < .001$; vs. non-incestuous single-case victimizers, $t = 2.610$, *d.f.* = 38, $p < .02$; and vs. offenders against physically mature females, $t = 5.276$, *d.f.* = 44, $p < .001$.

In contrast, every group contained significantly more individuals diagnosed as pedophilic than the offenders against physically mature females. Results of these comparisons were as follows: offenders against

Table 1

Phallometric Diagnosis

	N	Low OI	Ped/Heb	Gyne	Undet	Effort
Incest						
single	74	10	10	36	6	12
multiple	21	5	3	8	4	1
Non-Incest						
single	29	1	8	13	2	5
multiple	25	2	15	4	2	2
Gyne offenders	38	3	1	26	2	6

Note: Low OI = low output index, Ped/Heb = pedophilia/ hebephilia, Gyne = gynephilia, Undet = undetermined age preference, Effort = documented faking, Incest = offenders against daughters or stepdaughters, Non-incest = offenders against children for whom they are not in the father role, single = victimized single female child, multiple = victimized two or more children (at least one female), Gyne offenders = offenders against adult females with no offenses against minors.

physically mature females vs. incestuous multi-case victimizers, $t = 2.147$, $d.f. = 36$, $p < .05$; vs. incestuous single-case victimizers, $t = 2.079$, $d.f. = 71$, $p < .05$; vs. non-incestuous single-case victimizers, $t = 3.028$, $d.f. = 46$, $p < .01$. There were no other significant differences.

The exploratory comparisons above were followed by a more direct assessment of whether an incestuous offense against a female child is more likely than a non-incestuous offense to have been committed by a gynephile, whether the same is true in regard to single-case as opposed to multi-case victimization, and which of these two predictors of gynephilia is stronger. A stepwise regression model was used: for the first step, multiple $r = .354$; for the second step, multiple $r = .417$; for incestuous vs. non-incestuous offense (ANOVA), $F = 13.567$, $d.f. < 1,95$, $p < .0005$; for single-case vs. multi-case victimizer status (ANOVA), $F = 9.888$, $d.f. = 2,94$, $p < .0002$; and for the increase in prediction potential affected by the second step, $F = 5.558$, $d.f. = 2,94$, $p < .03$. These 2 variables accounted for 17.4% of the variance. Incestuous offense as well as single-case victimizer status showed to be significant predictors of an offender against female children being actually gynephilic. The incestuous vs. non-incestuous situation variable entered the stepwise regression first, which indicates that it is *the stronger of the two predictors*.

The interaction between incest situation and single-case victimizer status did not add a significant degree of change to predicting whether a sex offender against children would actually be gynephilic ($F = 3.007$, $d.f. = 3,93$, $p < .10$). A significantly greater proportion of incestuous than of non-incestuous offenders were single-case victimizers ($t = 3.073$, $d.f. = 147$, $p < .01$). Between incestuous offenders who victimized their natural daughters and those who victimized stepdaughters (and the like), there was no significant difference in regard to proportions of single-case and multi-case victimizers.

The groups did not differ in regard to self-reports on parental loss, Mother and Father Distance scales, self-reports about having been molested in childhood by adult females or males, or in regard to proportions of victimizers of girls under age 6.

There was, however, a significant difference between sex offenders against minors who were phallometrically diagnosed as pedophiles and those diagnosed as gynephiles in regard to self-reports on molestation in childhood by an adult male. (Too few individuals claimed to have been molested by a female for a statistical comparison.) A simultaneous Chi square test indicated the presence of significant differences (Chi square = 10.059, $d.f. = 3$, $p < .02$). According to t -tests of proportions, the incest

offenders phallometrically diagnosed as pedophiles indicated significantly more often having been molested in childhood by a male than the incest and the non-incest offenders diagnosed as gynephiles ($t = 2.390, d.f. = 47, p < .05; t = 2.904, d.f. = 26, p < .01$).

Table 2 demonstrates, for each of the groups in the current study, the number of individuals, mean age, *SD* age, median educational level, median socio-economic status, information about the earlier mentioned retrospective self-reports on certain aspects in the offenders' childhood history, and the numbers of offenders who had involved female children under age 6 in their sexual activities.

Table 2

Subject Group Characteristics

	Sing. Inc.	Mult. Inc.	Sing. Non.	Mult. Non.	Ch. + Pub.	Gyne Off.
N	74	21	29	25	16	38
Mean Age	35.6a	37.0a	32.4a	36.1a	43.9	25.8
S.D. age	7.6	6.5	10.6	10.8	7.6	6.1
Median education	8<Ed<12	8<Ed<12	8<Ed<12	8<Ed<12	8<Ed<12	8<Ed<12
Median occupation	SSL	SL	USL	USL	SSL	USL
Y. V. < 6	21	9	10	9	2	—
Y. V. = 6-11	53	12	19	16	14	—
Mol. in childhood	18	6	3	6	6	4
N for Mol.	65	20	27	22	13	32

Note: Sing. Inc. = offenders against a single female child who is their daughter or stepdaughter; Mult. Inc. = such offenders with 2 or more victims (no pubescents); Sing. Non. = non-incestuous offenders with a single victim; Mult. Non. = non-incestuous offenders with 2 or more victims (no pubescents); Ch. + Pub. = offenders against at least one child *and* at least one pubescent; Gyne off. = offenders against adult females, with no charges or accusations regarding minors; 8<Ed<12 = more than 8 grades completed but less than 12; SSL = semi-skilled labor; SL = skilled labor; USL = unskilled labor; Y.V. < [= 6-11] = number of men whose youngest victim was under 6 years of age [between 6 and 11 years of age]; Mol. in childhood = number of offenders claiming to have been molested prior to their 12th year by someone older than 16; N for Mol. = number of subjects asked whether they had been molested in their childhood. Figures sharing the same subscript are not different at the $p < .05$ level (Tukey HSD).

A comparison of the groups in regard to *age* by one-way ANOVA indicated the presence of significant differences ($F = 11.21, d.f. = 4, 182, p < .001$), and Tukey-HSD tests showed that the offenders against physically mature females were significantly younger than the remaining groups. There were no other significant differences. There were no significant group differences in regard to education. A one-way Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA of occupational status represented by the Hollingshead-Redlich index showed, however, the presence of a significant difference (Chi square = 17.97, $p < .002$). Mann-Whitney *U*-tests indicated that the offenders against physically mature females

tended to have a lower occupational status than the offenders against children. Significant differences were found between the offenders against physically mature females on the one hand and the incestuous single case as well as multi-case victimizers on the other hand ($U = 861.0, p < .001$; $U = 201.0, p < .001$). The differences, however, between the offenders against physically mature females and non-incestuous single-case and multi-case non-incestuous victimizers of children closely approached but did not reach the $p < .05$ significance level ($U = 439.5, p < .08$; $U = 370.5, p < .06$).

A further comparison investigated potential differences between individuals phallometrically diagnosed as pedophilic and individuals phallometrically diagnosed as gynephilic. Four groups were compared: incestuous offenders diagnosed as pedophiles, non-incestuous offenders so diagnosed, incestuous offenders diagnosed as gynephiles, and non-incestuous offenders so diagnosed. There were no significant differences between these four groups in regard to age and the proportion of victimizers of girls under age 6. However, a Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA indicated the presence of significant differences in regard to educational level (Chi square = 10.156, $p < .02$). According to results of a comparison of each pair of groups by Mann-Whitney U tests, the non-incestuous offenders phallometrically diagnosed as pedophiles were better educated than the incestuous and non-incestuous offenders diagnosed as gynephiles ($U = 276.0, p < .005$; $U = 119.0, p < .03$). Occupational status showed the same pattern, but differences did not reach the $p < .05$ significance level (Chi square = 6.681, $p < .09$).

DISCUSSION

The present study primarily tested the validity of three conjectures: 1. that there are certain conditions under which a sizable proportion of gynephilic males may offend sexually against female children; 2. that the father role may be one of these conditions—which would imply that an incest situation could be used as a predictor of gynephilia in a sex offender against a female child; and 3. that victimization of only one female child could be another such predictor.

A direct test of these predictions would likely require assessing the proportion of sex offenders against female children among a large sample of gynephilic males and comparing the proportion of such offenders within an incest situation to those not in an incest situation. This kind of test is, however, presently out of reach. Therefore, these conjectures were tested indirectly first by comparing the proportions of gynephilic males who offended in an incest situation to those who

offended in a non-incest situation, and then by comparing single-case vs. multi-case victimizers.

The results above demonstrate first that there are significantly more gynephiles among incestuous sex offenders against children than among non-incestuous offenders. This validates the father-role as a predictor of gynephilia. Second, victimization of only one child showed to be another such predictor which, however, appeared to be weaker than an incestuous situation. This suggests that an incestuous situation and victimization of only one child are each predictors in their own right; however, they probably do not interact with each other. Therefore, in an incestuous situation, victimization of only one child loses its potential as a predictor of gynephilia. Third, the study demonstrated a difference between the proportions of single-case victimizers in incestuous and non-incestuous offenders. There were more single-case victimizers among the incestuous offenders.

Excluded from the study were 16 incest offenders who also victimized a child outside the family (43.2 %, if added to the multi-victim incest offenders only, or 14.4 %, if added to all incest offenders in the study). This was to maximize the differentiation between incest and non-incest offenders. Abel and his associates(1988), however, found 40 % of such cases among their offenders against children. This discrepancy is most likely due to the fact that in contrast to the situation of our subjects, their clients were guaranteed absolute confidentiality. This makes it likely that we have not been able to separate fully incest and non-incest offender groups. The reason for exclusion of exhibitionists who could not be clearly diagnosed as gynephiles by concomitant paraphilic activities was that some among them are pedophiles (Freund & Watson, 1990).

There was no difference between the five offender groups with regard to retrospective self-reports about their family situation in childhood. Neither was there any difference between offenders against minors diagnosed as pedophiles and those diagnosed as gynephiles. There was also no difference between the five groups with regard to seduction in childhood by an adult. There was, however, such a difference between the offenders phallometrically diagnosed as gynephiles and those diagnosed as pedophiles. The latter group reported seduction more often. This self-reported circumstance, however, if indicated by sex offenders against children, does not have an unequivocal interpretation. This issue has been discussed in some detail in an earlier study (Freund, Watson, & Dickey, 1990). The lower age and occupational status of the offenders against adult females than of the offenders against children

may indicate that the crimes and misdemeanors of the offenders against adults are more often connected with high sex drive states. The finding that education and occupational status of the incest and non-incest gynephilic offenders tended to be lower than that of the non-incest pedophiles may indicate that opportunistic offenses against female children may be connected with low socio-economic status.

Because the study investigated an offender population, one has to take into account that there may be circumstances, connected with policies and practices of the police force and the courts, availability of lawyers and similar factors which influence the data and had to be ignored. Only large-scale sociologically oriented investigations would be able to provide corrective measures.

The few additional aspects investigated by this study did not lead to any finding which would provide a specific lead for research why the father role may have this effect. This goal would have to be pursued by a broadly designed investigation; however, this would be quite difficult as there is no reason to rely too much on these offenders' self-reports. Earlier investigators who focussed mainly on this aspect and used self-reports have not come up with definitive findings (see Langevin, 1985, pp. 162-164).

References

- ABEL, G., BECKER, J., MURPHY, W., & FLANAGAN, B. (1981). Identifying dangerous child molesters. In R. B. Stewart (Ed.), *Violent behavior: Social learning approaches to prediction, management, and treatment* (pp. 116-137). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- ABEL, G., BECKER, J., CUNNINGHAM-RATHNER, J., MITTELMAN, M., & ROULEAU, J. (1988). Multiple paraphilic diagnoses among sex offenders. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 16, 153-168.
- ABEL, G., BLANCHARD, E., MURPHY, W., BECKER, J., & DJENDEREDJIAN, A. (1981). Two methods of measuring penile response. *Behavior Therapy*, 12, 320-328.
- BANCROFT, J., JONES, H., & PULLEN, B. (1966). A simple transducer for measuring penile erection, with comments on its use in the treatment of sexual disorders. *Behaviour Research & Therapy*, 4, 239-241.
- BARLOW, D., BECKER, R., LEITENBERG, H., & AGRAS, W. (1970). Technical note: A mechanical strain gauge for recording penile circumference change. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 3, 73-76.
- EARLS, C., MARSHALL, W., MARSHALL, P., MORALES, A., & SURRIDGE, D. (1983). Penile elongation: A method for the screening of impotence. *The Journal of Urology*, 130, 90-92.
- EARLS, C., QUINSEY, V., & CASTONGUAY, L. (1987). A comparison of three methods of scoring penile circumference changes. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 16, 493-500.

- FINKELHOR, D. (1984). *Child sexual abuse: New theory and research*. New York: New York Free Press.
- FRENZEL, R., & LANG, R. (1989). Identifying sexual preferences in intrafamilial and extrafamilial child sexual abusers. *Annals of Sex Research*, 2, 255-275.
- FREUND, K. (1973). A comparison of transsexuals and non-transsexual homosexual males In: D. R. Laub & P. Gandy (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd interdisciplinary symposium on gender dysphoria syndrome*, Stanford, CA, pp. 28-30.
- FREUND, K. (1980). Therapeutic sex drive reduction. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 62, Supplement 287.
- FREUND, K., & BLANCHARD, R. (1983). Is the distant relationship of fathers and homosexual sons related to the sons' erotic preference for male partners, or to the sons' atypical gender identity, or to both? *Journal of Homosexuality*, 9, 7-25.
- FREUND, K., & BLANCHARD, R. (1989). Phallometric diagnosis of pedophilia. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57, 1-6.
- FREUND, K., CHAN, S., & COULTHARD, R. (1979). Phallometric diagnosis with "Nonadmitters." *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 17, 451-457.
- FREUND, K., DIAMANT, J., & PINKAVA, V. (1958). On the validity and reliability of the phalloglethysmographic diagnosis of some sexual deviations. *Review of Czechoslovak Medicine*, 4, 145-151.
- FREUND, K., LANGEVIN, R., & BARLOW, D. (1974). Comparison of two penile measures of erotic arousal. *Behavior Research & Therapy*, 12, 355-359.
- FREUND, K., LANGEVIN, R., CHAMBERLAYNE, R., DEOSARAN, A., & ZAJAC, Y. (1974). The phobic theory of male homosexuality. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 32, 495-499.
- FREUND, K., MCKNIGHT, C. K., LANGEVIN, R., & CIBIRI, S. (1972). The female child as a surrogate object. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 2, 119-133.
- FREUND, K., SEDLACEK, F., & KNOB, K. (1965). A simple transducer for mechanical plethysmography of the male genital. *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 8, 169-170.
- FREUND, K., & WATSON, R. (1990). Mapping the boundaries of courtship disorder. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 27, 599-606.
- FREUND, K., WATSON, R., & DICKEY, R. (1990). Is there support for the notion that sexual abuse in childhood causes pedophilia?—An exploratory study. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 19, 557-568.
- FURBY, L., WEINROTT, M., & BLACKSHAW, L. (1989). Sex offender recidivism: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 105, 3-30.
- GEBHARD, P., GAGNON, J., POMEROY, W., & CHRISTENSON, C. (1965). *Sex offenders*. New York: Harper & Row.
- HOLLINGSHEAD, A., & REDLICH, F. (1958). *Social class and mental illness: A community study*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- KRAFFT-EBING, R. VON (1950/orig.1886). *Psychopathia sexualis: a medico-forensic study*. New York: Pioneer Publications Inc.
- LANGEVIN, R. (1985). *Erotic preference, gender identity, and aggression in men: New research studies*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- MARSHALL, W., BARBARIE, H., & BUTT, J. (1988). Sexual offenders against male children: Sexual preferences for age of victims and type of behaviour. *Behavior Research & Therapy*, 26, 383-391.
- MARSHALL, W., BARBARIE, H., & CHRISTOPHE, D. (1986). Sexual offenders against female children: Sexual preferences for age of victims and type of behaviour. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 18, 424-439.
- MCCONAGHY, N. (1974). Measurement of change in penile dimensions. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 3, 381-388.

- ORNE, M. (1962). On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications. *American Psychologist*, 17, 776-783.
- QUINSEY, V., CHAPLIN, T., & CARRIGAN, W. (1979). Sexual preferences among incestuous and nonincestuous child molesters. *Behavior Therapy*, 10, 562-565.
- QUINSEY, V., & HARRIS, G. (1976). A comparison of two methods of scoring the penile circumference response: Magnitude and area. *Behavior Therapy*, 7, 702-704.
- QUINSEY, V., STEINMAN, C., BERGERSEN, S., & HOLMES, T. (1975). Penile circumference, skin conductance, and ranking responses of child molesters and "normals" to sexual and nonsexual visual stimuli. *Behavior Therapy*, 6, 213-219.

