INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

The Association Between the
Neutralization of Self-Punishment, Guilt, and Psychopathy
Among Extrafamilial Child Molesters

by

Janice E. Cripps, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

(Master of Arts)

Department of Psychology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
September 4, 1997

© copyright
1997, Janice E. Cripps

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-26908-6

The undersigned recommend to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research acceptance of this thesis

**“The Association Between the
Neutralization of Self-Punishment, Guilt, and Psychopathy
Among Extrafamilial Child Molesters”**

submitted by Janice Elizabeth Cripps, B.A.
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Psychology

Carleton University

September, 1997

Abstract

The sexual victimization of children has been a persistent problem in society throughout history, as well as in the present. The present study focused on the association between the mechanisms used to disengage self-punishment following sexual offending, guilt, and psychopathy among 48 incarcerated extrafamilial child molesters. The relation between psychopathy and offense history, and the frequency of disengagement mechanisms used were also explored. Several methods of data collection were utilized: semi-structured interview, questionnaire, and institutional file review. The Hare Revised Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R; Hare, 1991) was used to assess psychopathy. The results revealed negative associations between 1) retrospective guilt and disengagement variables, 2) retrospective guilt and the antisocial component of psychopathy, and 3) psychopathy and disengagement variables. Furthermore, psychopathy was positively related to number of previous nonsexual offenses and inversely related to age of onset of sexual offending. In general, internal factors were blamed for the assault, particularly among participants who had received sex offender treatment. Explanations for the offense were more likely to be excuses than justifications. The results of this study have implications for both the forensic and general communities. It will aid the development of maintenance theories, treatment planning, risk assessments, and early identification of and intervention with at-risk individuals.

Acknowledgments

Although I would like to take all the credit for this research project, its completion would not have been possible without the help of many people.

I am grateful and thankful to Mr. Bruce Malcolm at the Millhaven Assessment Unit, for without his valuable assistance, this project would not have got off the ground, let alone completed. I am also thankful to Ms. Kim Herrington at the Millhaven Assessment Unit for her persistence and for making me feel welcome. I would also like to thank the Psychology Department at Bath Institution (Ms. Lize Puro, Dr. Tony Glover, Dr. Gary Bernfeld, Ms. Lana Di Fazio, Mr. Jordan Liberman), and the Visitation and Communications department at Warkworth Institution (Mr. Dave Phair, Jennifer, Lori, Brent, and Joanne), Ms. Franca Cortoni and Mr. Bill Bailey from the Sex Offender Treatment Program at Kingston Penitentiary, and to Ms. Harriet D'Melo, Ms. Amy Hogg, Mr. Pieter Looyenga, Mr. Paul Chen, Ms. Jo Anne Miller-Reid, and Mr. Roddy Brazzier at the Ontario Correctional Institute (O.C.I.) for helping me recruit participants and allowing me to disrupt their already very busy lives.

I would also like to thank O.C.I.'s research committee (Dr. Ken Scapinello, Dr. Eugene Stasiak and Mr. David Maben), and Ms. Shelley Brown for all their helpful comments at the prospectus phase of this thesis, to Mr. Jeremy Mills, Mr. Jim Hemphill and Mr. Tom Martin for their helpful statistical advice, to Ken, Pat, Barry, Megan, and Regina for lending their equipment and lab space, and to Dr. John Logan for allowing me consistently disrupt his vacation plans.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Adelle Forth, Dr. Philip Firestone, Dr. Karl Hanson, Dr. Bob Hoge for their helpful comments at the prospectus and final stages of this thesis

I would like to thank the Graduate department at Carleton University and Dr. Adelle Forth for their financial assistance, to the Correctional Services of Canada and the Minister of the Solicitor General for their support of this project, and to the many federal and provincial inmates who took the time to participate in this study, to open up the doors to their lives that many wish would remain closed.

I am extremely grateful to Dr. Adelle Forth, for her endless hours of consultation and for being, not only my academic supervisor, but also my friend.

My family and friends have also played a crucial role, not only in terms of the present thesis, but also in terms of my experience as a graduate student. I would like to express my gratitude to Jennifer for helping with data coding, Ami for listening to my crises, and to Heather and Neil for providing me with a home away from home. Lastly, in the deepest sense, I would like to thank my family and Luciano for their never-ending support, encouragement and complete and unconditional love.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xi
List of Appendices	xii
Introduction	1
Literature Review	2
Social Cognitive Theory	3
Self-Regulation of Behaviour	4
Justification.....	7
Avoiding Responsibility	7
Minimizing Consequences.....	8
Dehumanizing and Attribution of Blame.....	8
Disengagement of Self-Reaction and Child Sexual Assault.....	9
Cognitive Distortions Among Child Molesters	10
Summary	14
Explanation for Offense(s).....	14
Summary	19
Summary of Disengagement in Child Sexual Assault Literature	19

Disengagement and Guilt.....	20
Guilt-Proneness.....	22
Guilt in Offenders	24
Summary of Guilt Literature.....	27
Psychopathy	27
The Concept of Psychopathy	28
Hare Revised Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R)	31
PCL-R and Criminal Behaviour.....	32
Psychopathy and Child Molesters.....	34
Summary	36
Psychopathy and Disengagement of Self-Punishment	36
Psychopathy and Explanations for Offense(s)	37
Summary	39
Disengagement, Guilt, and Psychopathy: Putting It All Together.....	39
Rationale of Present Study.....	40
Purpose and Hypotheses	41
Method	42
Participants.....	42
Selection Criteria	43
Recruitment Process.....	43
Federal Participants.....	43
Provincial Participants	44

Response Rates	44
Federal Sample.....	44
Provincial Sample	46
Total Sample	46
General Demographics.....	47
Offense Characteristics	47
Design	48
Measures	48
Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR)	48
The Hare Revised Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R)	49
Disengagement of Self-Reaction: Semi-Structured Interview.....	50
Disengagement of Self-Reaction: Self-Report Questionnaires.....	52
Attribution for Criminal Events (ACE)	52
Cognition Scale (CS)	53
Guilt-Proneness.....	54
Test of Self Conscious Affect--Social Deviant Version (TOSCA-SD)	55
Questionnaire Booklet	55
Institutional File Review.....	56
Procedure	56
Confidentiality	58
Debriefing	59
Results.....	59

Data Screening	59
Missing Data	60
Outliers.....	60
Normality	61
Data Analysis: Overview	61
Reliability of Measures	63
Internal Consistency of the PCL-R and Self-Report Questionnaires.....	63
Inter-Rater Reliability of Interview Variables	63
Comparable Attribution of Blame Variables	63
Social Desirability.....	65
Sex Offender Treatment.....	66
Psychopathy Scores	68
Psychopathy and Guilt Variables.....	69
Psychopathy and Disengagement Variables	69
Guilt-Proneness and Disengagement Variables.....	71
Retrospective Guilt and Disengagement Variables	71
Controlling for Sex Offender Treatment.....	73
Psychopathy and Retrospective Guilt	75
Psychopathy and Disengagement Variables	75
Guilt-Proneness and Disengagement Variables.....	75
Retrospective Guilt and Disengagement Variables	75
Psychopathy and Previous Offense Characteristics	75

Frequency of Disengagement Mechanisms Used	80
Total Sample	80
Untreated Participants	82
Treated Participants	82
Group Comparisons	84
Discussion	84
Distribution of PCL-R Scores	85
BIDR Score Distribution and Associations with Study Variables	86
Relation Between Psychopathy and Guilt Variables	88
Relation Between Psychopathy and Disengagement Variables	90
Relation Between Guilt-Proneness and Disengagement Variables	93
Relation Between Retrospective Guilt and Disengagement Variables	94
Relation Between Psychopathy and Offense Characteristics	95
The Effects of Participation in Sex Offender Treatment	98
Examination of the Frequency of Disengagement Mechanisms Used	99
Limitations/Weaknesses	102
Directions for Future Research	103
Conclusions and Implications	104
References	106
Appendices	124

List of Tables

Table 1: Response Rates for Federal, Provincial, and Total Samples.....	45
Table 2: Cronbach Alpha for PCL-R and Self-Report Questionnaires	64
Table 3: Tests of Means (two-tailed) Between Untreated and Treated Participants ...	67
Table 4: Pearson r Correlations (one-tailed) Between PCL-R Total/Factor Scores and Disengagement Variables.....	70
Table 5: Pearson r Correlations (one-tailed) Between Guilt-Proneness and Disengagement Variables.....	72
Table 6: Pearson r Correlations (one-tailed) Between Retrospective Guilt and Disengagement Variables.....	74
Table 7: Part Correlations (one-tailed) Between PCL-R Total/Factor Scores and Disengagement Variables.....	76
Table 8: Part Correlations (one-tailed) Between Guilt-Proneness and Disengagement Variables.....	77
Table 9: Partial Correlations (one-tailed) Between Retrospective Guilt and Disengagement Variables.....	78
Table 10: Pearson r Correlations (two-tailed) Between PCL-R Total/Factor Scores and Previous Offense Characteristics.....	79
Table 11: Frequency of Disengagement Mechanisms Used by the Total Sample	81
Table 12: Frequency of Disengagement Mechanisms Used by Untreated and Treated Participants.....	83

List of Figures

Figure 1: Mechanisms through which internal control is selectively activated or disengaged from conduct at different points in the self-regulation of behaviour.....	6
--	---

List of Appendices

A:	Items Comprising the PCL-R.....	125
B:	Items Loading on Factor 1 and Factor 2 of the PCL-R.....	126
C:	Balanced Inventory for Desirable Responding (BIDR) Version 6--Form 40	127
D:	Disengagement Interview.....	129
E:	Disengagement Interview Coding Scheme	132
F:	Attribution for Criminal Events (ACE).....	136
G:	Cognition Scale (CS).....	138
H:	Cognition Scale Filler Items.....	141
I:	Test of Self-Conscious Affect - Social Deviant Version (TOSCA-SD)	134
J:	Questionnaire Instructions.....	149
K:	File Review Coding Manual	150
L:	Information Form (Federal/Sexual Offender)	156
M:	Information Form (Federal/Nonsexual Offender)	157
N:	Information Form (Provincial)	158
O:	Consent Form #1 (Federal).....	159
P:	Consent Form (Provincial)	160
Q:	Consent Form #2 (Federal).....	161
R:	Participant Form.....	162
S:	Feedback Form	163
T:	Inter-Correlations Between Disengagement Variables	164
U:	Partial Inter-Correlations Between Disengagement Variables.....	165

While child sexual abuse is only one of many problems facing Canadians, it cuts across many facets of the nation's legal framework and the public and private services. There are no simple or instant solutions (Badgley, 1984, p. 29).

The sexual victimization of children has been a persistent problem throughout history (Overholser & Beck, 1989) and continues to be a major problem in society today. A recently published survey of 9953 randomly sampled Ontarians 15 years of age and older revealed that between 2% and 7% of males and between 8% and 15% of females experienced sexual contact with an adult while they were growing up. When the researchers examined the responses to whether physical and/or sexual abuse occurred, the numbers drastically increased. Between 25% and 40% of the males and between 23% and 30% of the females responded that they had suffered physical and/or sexual abuse from an adult while they were growing up (Gadd, 1997). A review of several earlier large scale surveys conducted in the United States and Canada reveals that between 19% and 63% of women and between 9% and 65% of men surveyed reported that, as children and/or adolescents, they experienced sexual victimization by the hands of a family member, acquaintance and/or stranger (Badgley, 1984; Finkelhor, 1979; Russell, 1986). Unfortunately, of these victims, only 24% to 37% of the girls and 11% to 27% of the boys told someone of the assault. For the majority of the victims their experience of sexual assault had "been kept as closely guarded personal secrets" (Badgley, 1984, p. 187; Finkelhor, 1979).

In terms of convicted perpetrators, the numbers are rather high. According to the end-of-year review in 1996 (Motiuk & Belcourt, 1997), there were 4041 sex offenders under federal jurisdiction, 18% of the total federal offender population. Of these sex offenders, 2974 (73.6%) were incarcerated and 1067 (26.4%) were under community supervision. Comparing these figures to those reported at the end of 1994, there is a 7.8% increase in the total federal sex offender population, a 10% increase in incarcerated sex offenders and a 2.1% increase in sex offenders on conditional release (Motiuk & Belcourt, 1997). According to an examination of 808 offenders admitted into federal institutions in 1995 (Motiuk & Belcourt, 1996), approximately 23% had been previously convicted of sexually assaulting a child. Of these child molesters, 15% assaulted a non-related child, and 8% committed incest. In terms of present sex offense, approximately 75% involved a child or an adolescent (Motiuk & Belcourt, 1996). It is important to note that the above figures underrepresent the number of sex offenders in Canada; sex offenders who are under provincial jurisdiction are not considered and those who have not been apprehended cannot be tabulated (Motiuk & Belcourt, 1997).

Literature Review

There are a plethora of studies investigating the various characteristics of child molesters, attempting to explain and understand the various 'whys' of child molesting (Finkelhor, 1984; Nexhipi, 1993): why a person finds relating sexually to a child emotionally gratifying and congruent; why a person is capable of being sexually aroused

by a child: why a person is unable to obtain sexual and emotional gratification from more appropriate sources, and why a person is not deterred by conventional social inhibitions from having sexual relationships with a child (Finkelhor, 1984). These explanations have come from a variety of theoretical backgrounds, such as psychodynamic, physiological and social learning. Aspects of this latter approach, the Social Learning Theory, have also been applied to understand the maintenance of child molesting.

The following section will outline the general theory of social learning, concentrating on the disengagement of self-punishment through cognitive modification. Its applicability to child molesters will then be considered by reviewing the literature concerning child molesters' relevant cognitive distortions and offenders' explanation(s) for their offense(s). This is followed by a discussion of guilt-proneness in relation to disengagement. Following this will be a survey of the psychopathy literature in general, and that specifically pertaining to child molesters and the explanations they provide for their offense(s).

Social Cognitive Theory

The social cognitive theory (a.k.a. social learning theory) describes human functioning as being a function of the reciprocity between behaviour, cognitive and other personal factors, and environmental events. Behaviour is described in relation to its development, provocation, and regulation. In particular, behaviour is (1) acquired through biological factors, observational learning, and reinforced performance; (2)

provoked by stimuli, such as aversive treatment and incentives, and (3) maintained via external, vicarious and self-regulation (Bandura, 1976, 1979). This latter aspect of behaviour, self-regulation, and how it relates to the commission of detrimental conduct, is the focus of the present study.

Self-regulation of behaviour.

Although behaviour is influenced by the observation and/or experience of external consequences, Bandura (1977, 1979) asserted that behaviour is not entirely controlled by these results; otherwise “people would behave like weathervanes, constantly shifting direction to conform to whatever momentary influence happened to impinge upon them” (Bandura, 1986, p. 335). Rather, through self-produced reward and punishment, people are capable of regulating their behaviour.

According to social cognitive theory, the self-regulation of behaviour operates through three subfunctions: a) self-observation; b) judging the relationship between action, internal standards and external circumstances, and c) self-reaction. In terms of the first subfunction, Bandura (1986) noted that in order to control behaviour, one must first be aware of it, he/she must observe what he/she is doing. For instance, in social situations, actions are evaluated with respect to dimensions, such as sociability and morality. Although self-observation is the first step in regulating conduct, in order for self-evaluation to occur, the individual must judge their conduct in relation to social and moral standards of conduct, internalized during socialization (Bandura, 1986, 1991). If

their behaviour violates these standards, the person evaluates it negatively. If it is in accord with these standards, it will then be positively evaluated. The person's perception of the determinants of their behaviour also influence how it is judged. In terms of negative behaviours, people may experience negative self-evaluation if they see themselves as blameworthy; however, if they see their behaviour as a result of external factors, they will not experience the same self-criticism (Bandura, 1986).

Although the former two subfunctions of self-regulation, self-observation and judgment, are important influences, Bandura (1986, 1991) noted that self-reaction is the primary control concerning whether an individual will act in accordance with or contrary to personal standards of conduct. Essentially, people behave in ways that produce feelings of satisfaction and worth, while they avoid behaviour that produce negative feelings, such as disapproval, remorse, and self-criticism (Bandura, 1973, 1977, 1986); one's anticipated consequences of reward and punishment have at least some control over behaviour.

Bandura and his colleagues (Bandura, 1973; Bandura et al., 1996) noted that the experience of self-regulation, however, is not always cut and dry; if self-reaction is not activated, it will not have an influence over behaviour. By selectively activating or by disengaging self-reaction, an individual is capable of detrimental behaviour without the negative self-evaluation that would otherwise result (Bandura, 1976; Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996). As depicted in Figure 1, disengagement can

Figure 1. Mechanisms through which internal control is selectively activated or disengaged from conduct at different points in the self-regulation of behaviour. Taken from Social Foundation of Thought and Action (p. 376), by A. Bandura, 1986, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc..

occur through several mechanisms: “reconstructing conduct, obscuring causal agency, disregarding or misrepresenting injurious consequences, and blaming and devaluing the victim” (Bandura 1991, p. 72).

Justification. The commission of reprehensible conduct is made socially and personally acceptable through moral justification, palliative comparison and euphemistic labeling. By explaining one’s behaviour by attributing it to some noble aim and by contrasting the behaviour with a more heinous action, this makes the behaviour appear more honorable. Euphemistic labeling is the simple use of semantics to mask the reprehensible conduct: “through convoluted verbiage, pernicious conduct is made benign and those who engage in it are relieved of a sense of personal agency” (Bandura 1977, p. 156; Bandura et al., 1996).

Avoiding responsibility. A second set of neutralizing mechanisms occurs when one’s behaviour negatively affects another. By displacing the responsibility for the behaviour onto another person, or by diffusing the responsibility onto other people, the relationship between the behaviour and its consequences becomes blurred, therefore, relieving the actor of any personal responsibility (Bandura 1973, 1977, 1979; Bandura et al., 1996).

Minimizing consequences. Self-punishment may also be neutralized by avoiding the harm or ignoring, minimizing, or distorting the consequences. Bandura (1986) noted that when the behaviour is physically and/or temporally distant from its effects, and when the consequences are not visible to the offender, it becomes easier for a person to behave in a way that is harmful to another.

Dehumanizing and attribution of blame. By perceiving the recipient of one's conduct as an object, rather than a human being, this enables the actor to avoid self-detering consequences for his/her actions. In addition, blame may be attributed to circumstances surrounding the behavior, such as alcohol or stress. By shifting the blame from the self to the victim or circumstance, the actor disengages him/herself from the behaviour, thus reducing any emotional discomfort that would otherwise resulted (Bandura 1973, 1979, 1986).

In summary, the aforementioned mechanisms work to disengage the self-reactive subfunction of self-regulation. This, in turn, enables the individual to participate in transgressive and detrimental behaviour without the resulting self-censure. It is important to note, however, that this neutralization does not instantly enable a person to commit heinous actions; it begins with an individual performing minor tolerable violations, and, through repeated performance, self-reproof is diminished and detrimental conduct can occur without self-punishment (Bandura 1986).

Bandura has applied the social cognitive theory to explain the acquisition, provocation and the maintenance of aggressive behaviour. The disengagement of self-reaction has typically been utilized to explain institutional violence (Bandura, 1979); however, it has also been employed to understand interpersonal violence, such as wife assault (for example, Dutton, 1995) and sexual assault against female adults (for example, Lottes, 1988). It can also be used to help explain the sexual molestation of children (Abel, Becker, & Cunningham-Rathner, 1984; Johnston & Ward, 1996; Murphy, 1990; Murphy & Stalgaitis, 1987).

Disengagement of Self-Reaction and Child Sexual Assault

According to social cognitive theory, a person can behave in ways that would normally violate personal sanctions by experiencing a variety of cognitive mechanisms that will neutralize negative self-reaction (Bandura, 1977, 1986). In regards to child molesting behaviour, it is often asserted that since adult-child sexual contact runs counter to social norms, this behaviour will likely result in emotional discomfort. Considering the rewards the perpetrator receives from this behaviour, such as sexual pleasure, his cognitions concerning the act will likely be restructured, thus reducing any negative self-reaction (Abel, Gore, Holland, Camp, Becker, & Rathner 1989; Abel et al., 1984; Conte 1985; Gizzarelli 1993; Howells, 1981; Johnston & Ward 1996; Stermac & Segal 1989; Ward, Hudson, & Marshall, 1995).

Disengagement of self-regulation has been indirectly examined by focusing on the influence of cognitive distortions in the regulation of child molesting behaviour (for example, Abel, Mittleman, & Becker, 1985; Johnston & Ward, 1996; Marshall & Barbaree, 1990; Murphy & Stalgaitis, 1987). The following literature review will highlight several areas of research. First, it will review studies that have examined the general cognitive distortions of child molesters, as measured by self-report questionnaire. This will be followed by a review of investigations that focus more specifically on offenders' explanations for their crime(s).

Cognitive distortions among child molesters.

It has only been within the past decade that empirical research on offenders' attitudes regarding adult-child sex has increased. The term "cognitive distortions" has been used in the literature to refer to the "self-statements molesters use to deny, minimize, justify and rationalize their behaviour" (Hayashino, Wurtele, & Klebe, 1995, p. 106); thus indicating permissive attitudes toward adult-child sex. Research has typically examined cognitive distortions as part of a self-report questionnaire that surveys various self-statements used by these offenders, such as justifying and minimizing the behaviour.

One of the first published investigations into the cognitive distortions of child molesters was conducted by Abel et al. (1989). Based on their clinical experience, these researchers developed a self-report measure intended to assess the degree to which a child molester endorses adult-child sex. This "Cognition Scale" consists of 29 items, covering

a variety of areas, such as perceived beneficial and detrimental effects, child versus adult initiation, and social acceptance. To examine whether child molesters and non-child molesters differed in their cognitive distortions, these researchers administered their scale to three samples, 86 community controls, 240 child molesters and 48 non-child molester paraphiliacs. The latter two groups were receiving treatment at the time. These researchers found that, compared to laypersons, child molesters held more deviant attitudes. Thus, the child molesters were more likely to believe that a child would benefit from adult-child sexual contact, that children have motivations for the contact, that adults are able to know when the sexual contact will harm the child, and that adult-child sex should not be legally sanctioned. There were no significant differences between the child molesters and the non-child molester paraphiliacs. Analyses also revealed that the number of cognitive distortions increased with both an increase in the duration of molesting behaviour and an increase in the number of types of molesting behaviours.

Stermac and Segal (1989) also examined child molesters' cognitive distortions. In addition to using the previously mentioned Cognition Scale, these researchers developed a series of vignettes describing a situation in which an adult had sexual contact with a child. These scenarios were identical except for the degree of sexual contact and the child's response to the experience, which were varied. In contrast to Abel et al. (1989), Stermac and Segal used a broader sample of sex offenders and community control groups. Specifically, they recruited six samples: 20 male heterosexual and homosexual

child molesters and 17 male rapists, all undergoing assessment or receiving treatment, 35 male and female mental health clinicians, 53 male and female community laypersons of high socioeconomic status, 20 male and female community laypersons of low socioeconomic status, 20 male and female criminal lawyers, and 21 male and female police officers. Once the participants read a vignette, they were asked to respond, using 5-point rating scales, to six questions. These questions addressed the possible benefits of sexual contact for the child, victim complicity, potential harm, and adult responsibility. Analyses revealed that, compared to the control groups, child molesters (heterosexual and homosexual combined) were more likely to say that children benefit from sexual contact with adults, that the child had greater complicity in the initiation of sexual contact, and that the adult was less responsible for the sexual contact. Similar to Abel et al. (1989), it was found that child molesters endorsed more permissive attitudes regarding adult-child sex, than the non-child molester sex offenders and the control groups.

To identify the relationship between child molesting and the particular attitudes held by incest offenders, Hanson, Gizzarelli, and Scott (1994) had 50 adult male incest offenders (referred for treatment through a child welfare agency), 25 male batterers (referred for treatment) and 25 male community volunteers (not undergoing any treatment) complete the Hanson Sex Attitude Questionnaire. This self-report instrument is comprised of six attitude scales (Frustration, Affairs, Sexual Entitlement, Sex/Affection Confusion, Sexy Children, and Sexual Harm). Analyses revealed that the incest group

scored significantly higher on the Sexual Entitlement, Sexy Children and Sexual Harm scales, than the comparison groups (separately and as a composite group). The authors concluded that, in comparison to the other groups, the incest offenders had more deviant attitudes. They were the most likely to perceive children as sexually attractive and as sexually motivated. In addition, these incest offenders minimized the harm experienced by the children as a result of the sexual contact, and typically held attitudes advocating male sexual entitlement.

A more recent investigation (Hayashino et al., 1995) compared 22 incarcerated incest and 33 extrafamilial child molesters, in addition to 33 rapists, 27 non-sex offenders and 26 laypersons, in terms of their attitudes toward adult-child sex. Using Abel and Becker's Cognition Scale, these authors confirmed previous conclusions that child molesters hold more cognitive distortions than non-child molesters. Incest offenders did not differ from the rapists, non-sex offenders or laypersons. That is, extrafamilial child molesters held more cognitive distortions, than did all the other groups.

Lastly, Bumby (1996) investigated the cognitive distortions of child molesters by having 44 incarcerated child molesters, 20 rapists and 20 non sex offenders complete a measure of cognitive distortions developed by the author. This scale is comprised of 44 items derived from the Abel and Becker Cognition Scale and clinical and research experiences. The participants were required to respond to each item on a 4-point scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The scores on each item were then

summed to reveal the degree of cognitive distortions regarding adult-child sex held by the respondent. Analyses revealed that child molesters held more deviant attitudes than both the rapist and non-sex offender groups. It was also found that, for the child molester group, both the duration of molesting behavior and number of victims, were positively related to the score on the cognitive distortion scale.

Summary. The previous research on cognitive distortions of child molesters indicates that these offenders endorse more permissive attitudes than non-child molester sex offenders, non-sex offenders, and laypersons. It is important to note, however, that these studies typically used self-report questionnaires comprised of general items concerning sexual contact with children. The following discussion will review the literature on more specific disengagement mechanisms revealed in the offenders' explanations for their offense(s).

Explanations for offense(s).

Interest in how people attempt to explain their own behaviour has been apparent in the literature since the 1940s (for example, Mills, 1940). For instance, Sykes and Matza (1957) suggested "the individual can avoid moral culpability for his criminal action and thus avoid the negative sanctions of society--if he can prove that criminal intent was lacking" (p. 666). They proposed several "techniques of neutralization": denial of responsibility, denial of injury, denial of victim, condemnation of the condemners and appeal to higher loyalties. Scott and Lyman (1968) refer to "accounts",

excuses and justifications used when an individual is faced with the accusation of transgression. They further proposed four types of excuses: accidents, defeasibility, biological drives, and scapegoating. Justifications were classified as the “techniques of neutralization” reported above by Sykes and Matza (1957).

Investigations have focused on exploring the explanations provided by men who batter (Bograd, 1988, as cited in Holtzworth-Munroe, 1992; Dutton, 1985; Holtzworth-Munroe, 1988) and by men who have been convicted of violent and/or sexual crimes (Gudjonsson, 1984; Harry, 1992a; McCaghy, 1966; Pollock & Hashmall, 1991). The following discussion will focus on the explanations provided by this latter group.

An early investigation by Taylor (1972) explored the justifications provided by “sexual deviants”, via court transcripts, case reports, published interviews, biographies and autobiographies. Ninety-four accounts were collected and collapsed into several categories. The majority of the justifications concerned factors considered involuntary on behalf of the offender: breakdown in mental function, inner impulse and defective social skills. The justifications that were seen as voluntary factors were: the desire for special experiences, a wish to frighten or hurt, and the refusal to accept normal restraints. Implication of the victim was considered to be both involuntary and voluntary.

In a more current study, Scully and Marolla (1984) investigated the use of excuses and justifications in 67 incarcerated rapists who either admitted the rape or who denied the sexual contact was rape. Their examination revealed that admitters tended to excuse

their actions by appealing to forces surrounding three themes: substance use, emotional problems, and “nice guy” portrayal. On the other hand, deniers tended to justify their actions by attributing the blame to the victims. The justifications comprised four themes: women as seductress, “yes” means “no”, “nice girls don’t get raped”, and admission of a lesser charge (i.e., using poor judgment).

To examine whether incarcerated rapists and alcohol abusers differed from other offenders in their attribution of blame for their offenses, Loza and Clements (1991) studied 197 federally incarcerated men. These participants, who comprised four groups of offenders: rapist/alcohol abusers ($n=44$), rapists/non-alcohol abusers ($n=21$), non rapists/alcohol abusers ($n=96$), and non rapists/non-alcohol abusers ($n=36$), responded to a 24 item Attribution of Blame Scale especially designed for this study. This scale tapped four areas of blame: victim, offender, alcohol, and societal.

Analyses revealed that, relative to their counterparts, rapists were significantly more likely to blame the victim and alcohol abusers were significantly more likely to blame the alcohol. In addition, the rapist/non-alcohol abuser group were more likely to attribute blame to the victim, than were the other three groups.

An early investigation of the explanations provided by sex offenders, McCaghy (1966) examined the official records (prepared by prison staff) of 181 male child molesters, either on probation or incarcerated. Significant relationships were found between “motives of denial” (either denying the sexual contact occurred or denying

responsibility for the contact) and both the sex of the victim(s) and the amount of coercion used: that is, when the victim was a female and as the amount of coercion increased, the offender's likelihood of expressing denial also increased.

Pollock and Hashmall (1991) explored the excuses of 43 incest offenders and 43 extrafamilial child molesters referred for psychiatric assessment. From a review of 250 explanations, 21 different excuses were identified. The top five excuses were: victim consented (29%); deprived of conventional sex (24%); intoxication (23%); victim initiated (22%), and don't know what's wrong with me (20%). It is important to note that more than one excuse was often provided by an offender. These researchers found several themes overriding these excuses. The most dominant theme was that of situational mitigating factors (48%), followed by sex with children is not wrong (36%), incident was nonsexual (35%), and psychological mitigating factors (35%). The least frequent themes were blaming the victim (22%) and denial (21%). Unfortunately, between group differences were not examined.

Lastly, through the use of an interview concerning the offenders' current offense and his developmental, social and sexual history, Kennedy and Grubin (1992) explored the denial patterns of 102 convicted sex offenders. Included in this sample were 36 men convicted of sexually assaulting an adult and 66 child molesters. Attitudes regarding the offense were rated on several 'denial scales' (Offense, Responsibility, Internal

Attribution, External Attribution, Preference, Effect, and Social Sanction) developed by the authors.

Analyses revealed that of those who admitted to the offense (about two thirds of the sample), approximately 50% felt the victim was at least partially responsible for the behaviour, and about one third attributed their behaviour to an external factor, such as alcohol or stress. In addition, one third acknowledged that their conduct harmed the victim, and approximately one quarter felt the victim had actually benefited from the experience. Twenty-five percent felt their behaviour should not be considered illegal.

Although the authors fail to examine differences in denial among and within the different groups of offenders, cluster analysis exposed three types of offenders based on the elements of the denial used. The "Rationalizers" were composed mostly of child molesters whose victims were male. These offenders typically felt that, rather than harming the victim, their offense had some beneficial value. The "Externalizers" were composed mostly of child molesters whose victims were female. These offenders tended to blame the victim, as well as another third "party" or circumstance, for their offense. The "Internalizers" were predominately heterosexual child molesters, blamed themselves and believed they harmed the victim; however, they also believed their behaviour was due to a temporary aberration of behaviour or mental state. Those offenders who denied any involvement in the offense were predominately those who sexually assaulted an adult.

Summary. The literature on the explanations for sexual offense(s) indicate that these offenders tend to explain their behaviour in terms of external factors, such as the victim and substance abuse. These results need to be considered in light of the offense characteristics; explanations appear to be influenced by the nature of the offense, the use of alcohol, victim sex, and the amount of coercion used. These previous studies, however, typically examined explanations of mixed groups of sex offenders; they lack between and/or within group analyses.

Summary of disengagement in child sexual assault literature.

Investigations into the utilization of neutralization mechanisms by sex offenders in general, and child molesters in particular, has typically examined the attitudes toward adult-child sex via self-statements, the use of justifications and excuses, and the attribution of blame. This, however, does not mean that all child molesters experience the same degree of disengagement. Hayashino and his colleagues (1995) noted extreme variance in extrafamilial child molesters' scores on the Cognition Scale. They are unsure whether those offenders with more extreme scores were atypical or whether they actually belong to a more unique subgroup of extrafamilial child molesters. Although investigators have acknowledged that child molesters do not comprise a homogeneous group (for example, Knight, 1992), the question as to whether all child molesters modify their cognitions in the same degree or manner, has not yet been addressed. In addition, it is typically asserted that child molesters will modify their cognitions regarding their

offense in order to reduce resulting emotional disturbance; however, the possibility of personal factors influencing this cognitive modification has not yet, to the author's knowledge, been explored. The following two sections review the literature concerning two personal factors that may influence the neutralization of self-punishment in child molesters.

Disengagement and Guilt

Recently, Bandura et al. (1996) investigated the link between a set of disengagement mechanisms (i.e., justifications and attribution of blame) and detrimental conduct. Using elementary and high school students, disengagement was found to directly influence the likelihood of transgressions in aggressive children. It also revealed that it had an indirect influence over behaviour in delinquent children by mediating the effect of anticipated guilt (as measured by a 15 item self report scale). As the amount of disengagement increased, the child was less likely to experience guilt. This, therefore, increased the likelihood of transgressive behaviour.

To examine the relationship between attribution of blame and guilt in a sample of 176 criminal offenders, Gudjonsson and Singh (1989) had them complete a battery of questionnaires, including the revised Gudjonsson Blame Attribution Inventory. This measure consisted of an external blame subscale, a denial of responsibility subscale and a guilt feelings subscale, each related to their present convicted offense. A significant

negative relationship was found between external blame and guilt feelings; the more blame attributed to external factors, the less guilt the offender experienced.

This relationship between detrimental behaviour and the experience of guilt is not new to the psychological literature; it has been an area of interest for several decades. Typically, the focus has been on the experience of guilt as a response to the violation of one's moral standards and/or on the anticipation of guilt in preventing moral transgressions (Jones, Kugler, & Adams, 1996). When asked to recount three of the most guilt inducing situations, Tangney (1992) found that behaviours that result in harm to another person(s), such as lying, cheating, stealing and infidelity, were likely to arouse guilty feelings. It is suggested that one's guilt response is not only dependent on the situation, but also on how the individual perceives the situation (Ferguson & Stegge, 1996; Tangney, 1990; Tangney, Wager, Hill-Barlow, Marschall, & Gramzow, 1996); that is, if the situation is perceived as being harmful to another and being controllable or avoidable in nature, then it will likely arouse a guilt reaction.

Studies concerning the motivational function of guilt reveal that the experience of guilt motivates the individual toward reparative action (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994; Ferguson & Stegge, 1996; Lewis, 1971; Lindsay-Hartz, De Rivera, & Mascolo, 1996; Tangney, 1990, 1991, 1992), and its anticipation may inhibit the commission of harmful conduct (Mosher, 1979). Lindsay-Hartz et al. (1996) suggest that in order for guilt to work as an inhibitor, the individual must take responsibility for and

believe they have control over his/her actions, they must be able to feel empathy and to want to live by their own internal standards, in order to inhibit inappropriate behaviour.

Guilt-proneness.

As previously mentioned, the experience of guilt appears to be influenced by not only the situation, but also by the individual's perception of the situation; consequently, the experience of guilt has been conceptualized as being a personality disposition; some people may have a propensity to feeling more guilt than others. For instance, Mosher (1966, 1968, 1979) conceptualizes guilt according to the social learning theory (Jones et al., 1996): seeing guilt as self-punishment following the violation of or in anticipation of violating one's moral standard (Mosher, 1979).

In order to investigate this conceptualization of guilt, Mosher developed a self-report measure that assesses the proneness of individuals to feeling three areas of guilt: sex guilt, hostility guilt, morality-conscience guilt, and guilt overall (Mosher, 1979). There are a plethora of studies investigating the relationship between Mosher's forced-choice guilt inventory and the inhibition of behaviour and moral judgment (see Mosher, 1979, for a review). Mosher (1979) notes, however, that there are several limitations to his scale, particularly that guilt was not always distinguished from other constructs, such as shame. In addition, guilt proneness was measured according to traditional moral standards, rather than including existential guilt, pathological guilt, positive conscience,

and principled morality. In fact, Jones et al. (1996) suggest this inventory is more a measure of moral standards than the disposition to feeling guilt.

In more recent investigations of the proneness to experiencing guilt, Tangney and her colleagues (Tangney, 1990) developed a self-report measure that differentiates the disposition to guilt from that of shame. This measure, the Self-conscious Affect and Attribution Inventory (SCAAI), assesses the affective, cognitive and behavioural responses to guilt and shame, among others. This measure is comprised of 10 negatively valenced and three positively valenced every-day scenarios. Since the former scenarios are used to assess proneness to guilt and shame, only the results related to those scenarios will be discussed. Following each scenario, the respondent is required to rate, on a 5-point scale, the likelihood that they would respond in that particular manner (i.e., guilt, shame). The ratings on each related response are summed across scenarios to create indices of guilt and shame proneness (Tangney, Wager, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992). In assessing the psychometric properties of the guilt and shame proneness subscale, its relationship with the hostility guilt and morality-conscience guilt subscales of Mosher's forced-choice guilt inventory (among others) was examined. Using undergraduate students as respondents, Tangney (1990) found that both the SCAAI guilt and shame subscales were positively related to both of Mosher's guilt subscales; this is consistent with the suggestion that Mosher's inventory of guilt contains shame as well (Mosher 1979; Tangney, 1990).

Tangney et al. (1992) revised the SCAAI by replacing the scenarios with those drawn from actual written accounts from both undergraduate students and non-student adults. New responses, also derived from non-student adults, were also included. This new version, the Test of Self Conscious Affect (TOSCA), is reported as being “equivalent to and in some respects more psychometrically sound than the SCAAI” (Tangney et al., 1992, p. 671).

In several subsequent investigations on guilt prone responding, in using undergraduate and non-student adult samples and both the SCAAI and the TOSCA, Tangney and her colleagues (Tangney, 1991; Tangney et al., 1992; Tangney et al., 1996) have found that some people are more prone to feeling guilt, than are others. They, like Bandura et al. (1996), also found an association between guilt and disengagement of negative self-reaction: the more likely one is to feel guilt, the less likely they are to detach themselves from the negative effects of the situation. Guilt-prone individuals are also more likely to experience empathy for the recipients of their actions.

Guilt in offenders.

The experience of guilt following detrimental behaviour may be best investigated in people who have actually committed wrongdoings. For instance, Scully (1988) investigated convicted rapists’ retrospective accounts of their feelings following their sexual attack. Forty-seven “admitters” (those who acknowledged the rape), and 32 “deniers” (those who admitted to the sexual contact, but denied it was rape) were

interviewed and asked to describe how they felt immediately following the contact. Only 27% of the “admitters” reported that they felt guilt (or shame).

A review of the literature reveals a lack of recent investigations into the predisposition of offenders in general and child molesters in particular, to feeling guilt. There have however, been several early studies, that have explored this area. For instance, Mosher and Mosher (1967) used a sentence completion test to assess guilt proneness (sex guilt, hostility guilt, morality-conscience guilt, and total guilt; the precursor to Mosher’s Forced-Choice guilt inventory) in 55 incarcerated first time offenders and 101 incarcerated recidivists. Analyses revealed significant differences between these groups on all three types of guilt. However, the authors do not indicate which group scored higher than the other. In terms of total guilt, the first time offenders were more guilt prone than the recidivists. When each group was divided according to whether or not their index offense was hostile (e.g., sexual assault, murder), hostile first time offenders scored lower on total guilt than their non-hostile counterparts. The authors also found a positive correlation between age of first time offenders and total guilt, the older the offender, the more guilt prone he was.

In 1970, Persons conducted a study investigating the relationship between guilt proneness (as measured by Mosher’s forced-choice guilt inventory) and the number of criminal offenses committed by 75 juvenile offenders. Correlational analyses revealed a significant negative relationship between number of crimes committed and total guilt. In

particular, the strongest relationship was with hostility guilt, followed by total guilt, then morality-conscience guilt and lastly, sex guilt. In terms of sexual crimes in particular, there was a significant negative relationship between number of offenses and sex guilt, hostile guilt, morality-conscience guilt and total guilt. The strongest relationship between number of sex crimes and guilt, was with sex guilt, followed by total guilt, morality-conscience guilt and then hostility guilt.

Using a different guilt proneness measure, the Buss-Durkee Inventory, Brown (1970) investigated the differences between incarcerated first time offenders and recidivists who were incarcerated for either less than a week (40 first time and 40 repeat) or between 11 and 18 months (46 first time and 47 repeat). The results indicate that, overall, the recidivists had lower total guilt scores than first time offenders. In particular, recently incarcerated offenders had greater total guilt scores than those who had been in prison for 11 to 18 months.

In a more recent study, Mosher's forced-choice guilt inventory was used by Simkins (1993) to investigate guilt proneness in three groups of incarcerated child molesters: repressed (exhibited both delayed psychosexual development and sexual conservatism; $n = 15$), nonrepressed (exhibited no evidence of either delayed psychosexual development or sexual conservatism; $n = 25$) and exploitive (nonrepressed child molesters who have had at least one extramarital affair with an age appropriate partner; $n = 15$). Significant group differences were found across the guilt subscales.

Specifically, the repressed child molesters had the greatest level of sex, hostility and total guilt, and the exploitive group had the highest level of morality-conscience guilt than the other two groups. The lowest level of sex guilt and morality-conscience guilt was found in the nonrepressed group.

Summary of guilt literature.

Previous research on the experience of guilt suggests that guilt is an uncomfortable experience that serves as an inhibitor to moral transgressions or as a motivator toward reparative action following the commission of hurtful behaviour. The early research on guilt reactions and proneness in offenders reveal that offenders do not typically feel or are not likely prone to guilt. One problem with these studies is in the measures used to assess guilt; the assessment of guilt may, in fact, include the experience of another self-conscious emotion, shame. Taking into consideration the implications of the guilt experience (i.e., reparative action) criminal offenders proneness to guilt may have an influence over recidivism and/or treatment efficacy, and should be further investigated.

Psychopathy

As previously mentioned, social cognitive theory posits that an individual is capable of detrimental behaviour by disengaging self-punishment. Several mechanisms allow this to happen, such as, justification, displacement of responsibility, minimizing consequences and attributing the blame to someone or something outside the self. The

previous section described how the anticipation of feeling guilt may play a role in the neutralization of negative self-reaction. This next section discusses another personal characteristic that may be involved in this process, psychopathy.

An individual's propensity toward a psychopathic lifestyle may have an impact on the types of mechanisms used. For the purpose of the present research, psychopathy is described as a "socially devastating disorder defined by a constellation of affective, interpersonal and behavioural characteristics, including egocentricity; impulsivity; irresponsibility; shallow emotions; lack of empathy, guilt, or remorse; pathological lying; manipulateness; and the persistent violation of social norms and expectations" (Hare, 1996, p. 25). Before discussing the relevant literature, it is first beneficial to provide an overview of the concept of psychopathy and its assessment.

The concept of psychopathy.

The notion of psychopathy is not a new one to society; however, its history is marked by confusion (Brown, 1994; Hare, 1991). Pinel (early 1800's) has been credited with the first attempt at diagnosing someone as a psychopath. Using the term "manie sans delire" (mania without delirium), this French psychiatrist referred to people who were behaving anti-socially, but who were not psychotic (Doren, 1987; Spielberger, Kling, & O'Hagan, 1978).

Many clinicians and researchers have attempted to provide definitions of psychopathy. For instance, McCord and McCord (1969) describe a psychopath as "an

asocial, aggressive, highly impulsive person, who feels little or no guilt and is unable to form lasting bonds of affection with other human beings” (p. 3). Robins (1966) noted that psychopaths are people “who chronically fail to conform with social norms, do not maintain close personal relationships, have a poor work record, engage in illegal activities, have problems maintaining support, will suddenly change plans, and have a lot frustration tolerance” (as cited in Hare & Cox, 1978, p. 2)

One of the more comprehensive and influential descriptions of psychopathy is that formulated by Hervey Cleckley, initially presented in the first edition of his book The Mask of Insanity in 1941. Based on his clinical research, Cleckley presents the psychopath as an individual who, although often seen by others as a well-adjusted, intelligent individual, is inconsistently unreliable, untruthful, remorseless, egocentric, flat in affect, lacks insight and fails to develop and follow life goals. The psychopath also tends to be unresponsive to people he interacts with and to behave in an antisocial manner. Cleckley emphasizes affective and interpersonal factors more so than antisocial behaviours. He, thus, put forth the notion that a person does not necessarily have to behave in a socially deviant manner in order to be psychopathic (Smith, 1978).

Presently, there appears to be a consensus among the clinical and forensic communities concerning the central affective, interpersonal and behavioural features of psychopathy (Hare, 1996). At the same time, however, there is a discrepancy as to its assessment (Lilienfeld, 1994). Some people concentrate on personality traits (e.g.,

Cleckley, 1976), while others focus on antisocial behaviours (e.g., Robins, 1978). In fact, the diagnosis of Antisocial Personality Disorder (APD; American Psychiatric Association, 1994) has often been confused with the construct of psychopathy (Hare, 1991, 1996; see also Stevens, 1994, Zinger & Forth, in press). Although the DSM-III and DSM-III-R have defined APD solely by socially deviant behaviour, the fourth version of the manual makes reference to the forensic population in its “Associated Features” section. However, since 50% to 75% of this population are diagnosed as APD, but only 15% to 25% are considered to be psychopathic (defined by the Hare Revised Psychopathy Checklist; Hare, 1996), this simply adds to the confusion; clinicians may be inclined to diagnose someone as psychopathic if they demonstrate characteristics of APD. This becomes problematic, as most offenders diagnosed as APD are not psychopathic, even though most psychopaths are also diagnosed as APD (Hare, 1996).

Several self-report measures intended to assess psychopathy have also been used: for instance, the Psychopathic Deviate (Pd) and Hypomania (Ma) scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), the Disinhibition subscale of the Sensation Seeking Scale, and the Socialization (So) scale of the California Psychological Inventory (Hare, 1985; Hare & Cox, 1978; Hare, Harpur, Hakstian, Forth, Hart & Newman, 1990). There are, however, several problems with the use of self-report measures to assess psychopathy: they require cooperation from the respondents, they do not adequately assess the affective and interpersonal characteristics of psychopathy, and they are not

highly or even moderately correlated with each other and with clinical diagnoses of psychopathy (Hart, Forth, & Hare, 1991). Essentially, these measures do not show reliability and validity in terms of assessing psychopathy (Hare, 1985).

This lack of appropriate assessment instrument has motivated the research efforts of Hare and his colleagues (Harpur, Hare, & Hakstian, 1989). Over approximately the past two decades, they have been developing and refining methods for the assessment of psychopathy for the male criminal population. The result of these efforts is the Hare Revised Psychopathy Checklist, a reliable and valid measure of psychopathy (Hare, 1996).

Hare Revised Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R).

Based on Cleckley's conception of psychopathy, the PCL-R is a 20 item symptom checklist measuring the interpersonal, affective and behavioural characteristics of psychopathy. To score the PCL-R, information pertaining to these characteristics is collected via semi-structured interview and collateral material. The items are rated on a 3-point scale according to the applicability to the individual (0= does not apply, 1= somewhat applies, 2 = definitely applies). The ratings are summed across all 20 items to reveal a total score out of 40. Typically, a score equal to or greater than 30 is used as a diagnostic cut off, indicating the presence of psychopathy (Hare, 1991, 1996). For a list of the PCL-R items, see Appendix A.

Analysis of the structure of the PCL-R revealed that this instrument measures two facets of psychopathy: (1) Interpersonal/affective characteristics, such as superficial charm, shallow affect, lack of empathy and guilt and (2) Behavioural/anti-social characteristics, such as impulsivity, irresponsibility, and proneness to boredom (see Appendix B for a list of items loading on each factor; Hare et al., 1990; Harpur, Hakstian, & Hare, 1988). It has been shown that these two factors of the PCL-R are moderately correlated ($r = .50$; Hare et al., 1990; Harpur et al., 1988, 1989).

PCL-R and criminal behaviour.

Considering the characteristics that define psychopathy, it is not surprising that there is a strong association between psychopathy and criminal behaviour. It has been found that psychopathic offenders are first charged with a criminal offense at a younger age than nonpsychopathic offenders (Hart & Hare, in press). Using an index of psychopathy that is highly correlated with the PCL-R, Hare (1981, Study 1) found that, in a sample of 200 male incarcerates, psychopaths had their first adult charge at the age of 18.1 years, whereas nonpsychopaths were first arrested at 20.0 years. Wong (1984) also found that in a sample of 315 male offenders, those who were psychopathic (PCL Total scores greater than or equal to 30) began their criminal careers at an earlier age (17.8 years) than the nonpsychopathic offenders (PCL Total scores less than or equal to 20; 24.1 years).

The number of crimes committed by offenders has also been found to be related to psychopathy. In a study of 300 adult male offenders, Kosson, Smith, and Newman (1990, Study 3) found that psychopaths committed about twice as many offenses (violent and nonviolent) than nonpsychopathic offenders. Hart and Hare (1989) also found that the PCL-R Total score and number of violent and nonviolent offenses were positively related.

Brown (1994) examined these two criminal history variables, using a sample of 60 incarcerated rapists. Analyses revealed similar results to those of previous studies. PCL-R Total and both Factor 1 and Factor 2 were positively related to nonsexual criminal offense history, and that Factor 2 was also negatively related to age of onset for nonsexual criminal offense. That is, the more psychopathic the offender was, the more likely he was to have a history of nonsexual offense charges beginning at a young age. Similar results were not found in relation to sexual offense history. Prior sexual offense charges and age of onset were found to be unrelated to PCL-R Total and Factor scores.

Although the PCL-R was developed as a research tool, its usage has gone beyond simple investigative purposes. It also has utility in treatment decisions (Serin, 1992; for example, Gerstley, Alterman, McLellan & Wood, 1990; Rice, Harris, & Cormier, 1992), in the taxonomy of offenders (Serin, 1992; for example, Serin, 1991) and in the prediction of both violent and nonviolent recidivism among sexual and nonsexual

offenders (Serin, 1992; for example, Hart, Kropp, & Hare, 1988; Rice, Quinsey, & Harris, 1991; Serin, 1996; Serin & Amos, 1995; Serin, Peters, & Barbaree, 1990).

Psychopathy and child molesters.

As previously mentioned, there has been plenty of studies investigating the characteristics of child molesters. One area which has received only minimal attention is that of the occurrence of psychopathy. Given that psychopaths are individuals who are egocentric, lacking in guilt, and who readily violate social norms in order to meet their own desires, it not surprising that they are involved in deviant sexual behaviour. According to Quinsey, Rice, and Harris (1995), “whereas some nonpsychopathic men may have deviant sexual interests but inhibit their expression for a variety of reasons, psychopathic men may obtain sexual gratification opportunistically regardless of whether it involves their preferred mode of sexual activity or whether it is legal” (p. 87).

Scattered studies using the MMPI (for example, Langevin, Paitich, Mann & Handy, 1978; Panton, 1978) have reported that child molesters tend to score high on the Psychopathic Deviate (Pd) scale. Since psychopathy, as measured by the PCL-R, is the assessment tool to be used in the proposed study, only those studies using the PCL-R (or PCL) will be reviewed.

In a study of 211 rapists, 163 mixed sex offenders (including child molesters), and 82 incest offenders incarcerated in a federal prison, Forth and Kroner (1994; as cited in Hare, 1996) found that, using a cut off score of 30, 26.1% of the rapists, 18.3% of the

mixed sex offenders, and 5.4% of the incest offenders were considered to be psychopaths. Using the PCL (an earlier, highly correlated, version of the PCL-R), Prentky and Knight (1991, as cited in Hare, 1996) found that 45.3% of the 95 rapists and 30.5% of the 59 child molesters from the Massachusetts Treatment Center for Dangerous Sex offenders, were diagnosed as psychopaths. This high rate, however, may be due to the extreme nature of the sample used.

In Serin, Malcolm, Khanna, and Barbaree (1994), 32 extra- and intra-familial child molesters and 33 rapists incarcerated in a federal institution underwent phallometric testing and were assessed by the PCL-R. In terms of psychopathy, there was a marginally significant difference in overall psychopathy, but not in terms of the personality or behavioural component, for the child molesters and the rapists. Using a PCL-R Total score of 29 as a cut off, 7.5% of the child molesters and 12.2% of the rapists were considered to be psychopathic. In addition, these researchers found that the PCL-R Total score was significantly related to deviant sexual arousal for the child molesters. The greater the degree of psychopathy, the greater the deviant sexual arousal. There was a marginally significant positive relationship between behavioural factor of the PCL-R and deviant sexual arousal.

When the researchers differentiated between types of child molesters, this relationship became much stronger for extrafamilial offenders ($r(13) = .42$), than for incest offenders ($r(12) = -.18$). An increase in overall psychopathy reflected greater

deviant sexual arousal in the extrafamilial child molesters, while for the incest offenders it indicated a decrease in deviant sexual arousal. In both instances, however, the relationship did not reach significance. These authors suggested that the non-significant findings for the extrafamilial child molester group may be due to the small sample size used.

Summary. The research on psychopathy in sex offenders generally reveals that rapists are more psychopathic than child molesters; however, this does not mean that the presence of psychopathic traits in child molesters is neither non-existent nor unimportant in understanding the dynamics of child sexual assault, including the disengagement of self-punishment regarding their adult sexual contact with children.

Psychopathy and Disengagement of Self-Punishment

According to social cognitive theory, self-punishment occurs when one behaves in a way that violates personal standards; however, how this relates to individuals with a propensity toward a psychopathic lifestyle has not yet been investigated. Considering the description of psychopathy includes such features as a failure to take responsibility for actions and the persistent violation of social norms (Hare, 1996), one has to wonder how this relates to mechanisms of disengagement in child molesters. Unfortunately, only three studies have, to the present author's knowledge, been conducted exploring the relationship between explanations and psychopathy; however, neither focused on the

responses of child molesters specifically. These three studies are reviewed in the following section.

Psychopathy and explanations for offense(s).

Harry (1992b) examined the relationship between explanations for offending and various characteristics of psychopathy in 100 adult male offenders. The investigator rated the offenders on selected items of the PCL. The results indicate a negative association between expressing internal control for the offense, and each of the following: pathological lying, lack of remorse or guilt, callousness and lack of empathy, and failure to accept responsibility for own actions. Attributing blame to the breakdown in the legal system and pathological lying were also related; the greater the likelihood of the offender attributing the blame to a breakdown in the legal system, the greater the pathological lying score. A positive relationship was also found between attributing the blame to some external control and the likelihood of failing to accept responsibility for his own actions. The results of this study, however, need to be considered with caution; Harry's use of PCL items as subscales, rather than using the PCL total and factor scores, renders the results questionable.

In an unpublished study conducted by Hemphill, Hemphill, and Hare (1993), attribution of blame was studied in 102 incarcerated federal offenders who were assessed for psychopathy with the PCL-R. Participants were required to complete a 29 item Attributions for Criminal Events questionnaire developed by the authors. Each of the

items were rated, on an 8-point scale, according to their importance in contributing to their overall criminal activities (1 = not at all important, 8 = very important). The items comprised of nine different categories: distress/emotional factors; familial discord; persuasibility; substance abuse; upholding integrity/self defense; victim blame; control problems; environmental stressors, and personal defects. After conducting internal consistency analyses on each category, the latter three scales were dropped from further analyses, as they failed to meet the acceptance criteria.

These researchers found a significant positive relationship between psychopathy and blame attributed to familial discord, upholding integrity/self defense and the victim. A significant negative relationship was also obtained between psychopathy and attributing blame to persuasibility (being manipulated by others). Unfortunately, the authors did not investigate the relationship between attribution of blame and both the personality and behavioural components of psychopathy. It is important to note, however, that these researchers did not group offenders according to the crime committed. This may have confounded the pattern of results of the study; for instance, if this study was conducted with a specific group of offenders, such as sex offenders in general, or child molesters in particular, there may be a different pattern of results.

A recently published study by Di Fazio, Kroner, and Forth (1997) examined the relationship between psychopathy (as assessed by the PCL-R) and attribution of blame concerning crime in general in 63 male incarcerated violent offenders. The majority of

these offenders were convicted of a sexual offense. Attribution of blame was assessed via self-report questionnaire where the respondent was required to rate their level of agreement, on 6-point scale, to 24 statements concerning external and internal blame for crime. These items tapped victim, offender, alcohol, and societal blame. Correlations between PCL-R (Total, Factor 1, Factor 2) and both external and internal attribution of blame reveal that PCL-R Total and Factor 1 were positively related to external attribution of blame: that is, as the degree of psychopathy (the personality component in particular) increased, the offender became more likely to attribute crime in general to external factors.

Summary. Research investigating the relationships between explanations for offense and psychopathy reveal that the more psychopathic an offender is the more likely he is to blame external factors for crime in general, and to blame familial discord, upholding integrity/self defense and the victim for his overall criminal activities.

Disengagement, Guilt, and Psychopathy: Putting It All Together

The previous literature review summarized a considerable amount of research related to the disengagement of self-punishment in child sex offenders. Essentially, the research shows that people may sustain self-regulation in the commission of detrimental behaviours. According to the social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) this occurs through several mechanisms, such as justification, minimizing/misconstruing consequences, attribution of blame, and displacement of responsibility. Considering the neutralization of

self-punishment is the motivation surrounding disengagement, emotional states, such as the proneness to or the experience of guilt, may be influenced by or have an influence on the mechanisms used. In this matter, other personal characteristics, such as psychopathy, may also be related to disengagement, as well as guilt reactions.

Rationale of Present Study

The research investigating the cognitive mechanisms used by child molesters to absolve themselves from their offense(s), generally lack a theoretical framework; consequently, the examinations occurred in an unsystematic fashion (Johnston & Ward, 1996; Segal & Stermac, 1990; Ward et al., 1995). By applying the social cognitive model of disengagement to the maintenance of child molesting, this will facilitate a systematic investigation of the mechanisms child molesters use to disengage themselves from their conduct.

In addition to being unsystematic in nature, investigations of within group differences have not been conducted. The examination of the various mechanisms used by child molesters to exonerate themselves and of the influence of personal characteristics, has yet to be considered. Perceiving child molesters as a homogeneous group in terms of the disengagement of self-reaction may be as erroneous as seeing all child molesters as having the same intentions and sexual preferences. Thus, the investigation of within group differences is necessary. In light of the recent research on the motivations of guilt-prone individuals, and in consideration of the characteristics that

define psychopathy, it is not unreasonable to speculate that these personal characteristics may play a role in modifying thoughts regarding a molester's offense(s). In addition, as psychopathy is becoming a factor of crucial importance in terms of treatment and risk assessments (Hare, 1996), it therefore, warrants further examination with child molesters.

Purpose and Hypotheses

The purpose of this study, therefore, was to examine the relationship between psychopathy, guilt, and neutralization of self-reaction in extrafamilial child molesters. The neutralization of self-reaction was examined through the offenders' level of disengagement in general and, in particular, through his attributions of blame for the crime (external versus internal), minimization of the consequences, utilization of justifications and excuses, and endorsement of permissive attitudes regarding adult-child sex.

The present study has tested the following hypotheses:

- 1) Psychopathy should be positively related to disengagement in general, attributing the blame to external factors (such as, victim and substance use), minimizing the consequences, and both excusing and justifying the sexual contact.
- 2) Psychopathy should be inversely related to attributing blame to internal factors (such as, emotional distress, lack of control, childhood experiences and personal deficiencies), guilt-proneness and retrospective guilt.

- 3) These relationships should be stronger for the personality component of psychopathy (Factor 1). than for the behavioural component (Factor 2).
- 4) Guilt-proneness should be inversely related to moral disengagement in general, and attributing the blame to external factors, minimizing the consequences, and justifying the assault.
- 5) Guilt-proneness should be positively related to attributing the blame to internal factors and excusing the assault.
- 6) Retrospective accounts of guilt were also expected to be negatively related to disengagement, external attribution of blame, minimizing consequences and the use of justifications.
- 7) Retrospective accounts of guilt should be positively associated with internal attribution of blame and the use of excuses.
- 8) The relationship between psychopathy and criminal history variables was also explored. It was predicted that psychopathy should be related to previous number of nonsexual offenses and age of onset of criminal behaviour.

Method

Participants

Since the base rate of psychopathy is higher in extrafamilial child molesters as compared to incest offenders (for example, Serin et al., 1994), the present study only sought the participation of extrafamilial child molesters. The participants were currently

incarcerated in several provincial and federal prisons and treatment centers in the province of Ontario.

Selection criteria.

Only those offenders who met the following selection criteria (adapted from Knight, Carter, & Prentky, 1989 and Nexhipi, 1993) were asked to participate in the present study:

- 1) institutional files were available;
- 2) federal inmates had passed through the Millhaven Assessment Unit (MAU) where the PCL-R was completed and the scores were available;
- 3) currently convicted of a sexual offense involving a child with whom the offender did not play a parental role; the relationship between the offender and the child is one of "significant other" (close friends, neighbors, teachers etc.), casual acquaintance, or stranger;
- 4) the victim must be under the age of 16 years, and the offender must have been at least 5 years older than the victim, and
- 5) the offender acknowledges the sexual contact.

Recruitment process.

Federal participants. Participants at the federal level were recruited in two stages.

First, a list of participants, who met the above selection criteria and who had gone through the MAU between January 1994 and January 1997, was generated from the

computerized offender tracking system used by Correctional Services Canada. Potential participants from Warkworth Institution, Bath Institution, Millhaven Institution, and Kingston Penitentiary were visited by the present author and invited to participate. With the assistance of several staff members at these institutions, as well as the Regional Treatment Center (Ontario), several more names were added to the list of potential participants. The former two prisons are medium security and the latter three are maximum security institutions located in central Ontario.

Provincial participants. Provincial participants were recruited from the Ontario Correctional Institute in Brampton Ontario. Potential participants were first approached by a unit social worker, who outlined the purpose of the present study and asked them if they would be willing to participate. A list of interested offenders was provided to the present investigator, who then personally invited them to participate. Only those offenders who met the selection criteria (excluding number two) were asked to participate.

Response rates.

Table 1 reviews the response rates for both the federal and provincial samples.

Federal sample. Sixty-eight federally incarcerated extrafamilial child molesters were independently asked (by staff or “call down” list) to meet with the investigator. Approximately one fifth of the inmates failed to attend the meeting, and therefore, were not given the opportunity to participate in the study. Of the remaining 55 inmates, 78%

Table 1.

Response Rates for Federal, Provincial and Total Samples

	Federal Sample				Provincial Sample				Total Sample			
	n	% ^a	% ^b	% ^{c*}	n	% ^a	% ^b	% ^c	n	% ^{a*}	% ^b	% ^c
Approached	68	100	--	--	15	100	--	--	83	100	--	--
No shows	13	19	--	--	0	0	--	--	13	16	--	--
Invited to participate	55	81	100	--	15	100	100	--	70	84	100	--
Declined	12	18	22	--	6	40	40	--	18	22	26	--
Agreed	43	63	78	100	9	60	60	100	52	63	74	100
Questionnaire, interview, file review	32	47	58	74	8	53	53	89	40	48	57	77
Questionnaire only	4	6	7	9	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	8
Questionnaire and file review	6	9	11	14	1	7	7	11	7	8	10	13
Interview and file review	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2

Note. ^a Response rates include "no shows". ^b Response rates exclude "no shows". ^c Specific response rates for those who agreed to participate. ^{*} Percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding.

gave their consent for at least one of the three parts (questionnaire, interview, file review) of the study. Of these 43 inmates, approximately three quarters consented all three parts. 7% consented to the questionnaire only, 14% refused the interview, and one person did not complete the questionnaire.

Provincial sample. Fifteen provincial inmates were approached to participate in this study: nine inmates agreed to participate. Of these inmates, all but one consented to all three parts of the study.

Total sample. Overall, 70 inmates were asked to participate in the study. Approximately three quarters agreed to at least one of the three parts of the study. Of the participants who agreed, just over three quarters consented to all three parts, 8% agreed to complete only the questionnaire, 13% consented to the interview and one person refused to complete the questionnaire. Four subjects were dropped from the sample due to the complete denial of their offense. Therefore, a total of 48 inmates participated in the present study.

The reasons provided by offenders who refused to participate in the entire study were quite varied: for instance, several (21%) indicated their case was under appeal and/or would not talk about their “offense” unless their lawyer was present. One offender actually refused participation simply because he was “picked” from a list, rather than entirely at random. The majority (58%) refused without giving a reason, or simply stating that they didn’t want to talk about it.

General demographics.

The total sample consisted of 48 participants with an average age at the time of the study of 37.60 ($SD = 10.47$) years; the youngest participant was 22 years of age and the oldest was 67 years. The average number of years of education was 10.66 ($SD = 2.12$); the fewest number of years was 8 and the greatest was 18. Almost the entire sample were Caucasian, 62% were single/never married and 64% were employed at the time of conviction.

Offense characteristics.

Excluding the five offenders with indeterminate sentences, the average sentence length was 3.80 ($SD = 1.84$) years. The mean number of victims was 2.83, with an average age of 11.10 ($SD = 3.33$) years. Almost half (48%) of the sample were heterosexual, 37% were homosexual, and the remaining 15% were bisexual offenders. According to the classification system used by MAU, there were approximately equal numbers of victims who were "significant others" (40%) or "casual acquaintances" (47%) to the offender. Thirteen percent of the victims had no prior contact with the offender.

The participants were convicted of a variety of sexual offenses, such as sexual/indecent assault, sexual exploitation/interference/touch, and sexual/anal intercourse. Sexual/indecent assault charges were the most frequent, with 83% of the

sample being convicted of this offense. The least frequent offense was shared between pornography and sexual services, with only 9% of the sample being convicted.

Design

The variables examined in this correlational study are guilt (proneness and retrospective accounts), psychopathy, attribution of blame (internal/self and external/other), excuse, justification, minimization of consequences, general disengagement, cognitive distortions concerning adult-child sex, and offense history.

Measures

Information needed to assess the above variables were collected via self report questionnaires, a semi-structured interview, and an institutional file review.

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR; Paulhus, 1984).

The present study used the BIDR (Paulhus, 1984) to assess the level of socially desirable responding of the participants. The BIDR is a 40 item self-report instrument intended to assess social desirable responding. This measure has two factors, impression management (IM) and self-deception (SD), both comprised of 20 items. Each statement in the scale is rated, on a 7-point scale, according to the extent to which the participant agrees with the it (1 = not true, 4 = somewhat true, 7 = very true). Items that receive a rating of 6 or 7 are given one point, and the remaining ratings are recoded as "0". The items belonging to each factor are separately summed to reveal a factor score (out of 20).

and all 40 items are summed to reveal a total score (out of 40). The greater the score (total/ factor), the greater the socially desirable responding.

In terms of reliability, Paulhus (1988, as cited in Paulhus, 1992) reports a coefficient alpha of .83 for the entire scale. For the impression management factor and for the self-deception factor, coefficient alphas range from .68 to .80 and .75 to .86 respectively (Paulhus, 1992). Paulhus (1988, as cited in Paulhus, 1992) found test-retest correlation for the impression management factor equal to .65 and for the self-deception factor to be equal to .69.

This scale has also been shown to have validity. The entire scale correlates highly with the Marlowe-Crowne Scale and the Multidimensional Social Desirability Inventory. The self-deception factor is positively correlated with other traditional measures of defense and coping, and the impression management factor is positively correlated with traditional "lie scales" and role playing measures (Paulhus, 1992). See Appendix C for a copy of the BIDR.

The Hare Revised Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R; Hare, 1991).

The extent to which participants have psychopathic traits was measured by the Hare Revised Psychopathy Checklist (PCL-R), an instrument designed to assess interpersonal, affective and behavioural characteristics of psychopathy in male criminal populations. Although the PCL-R is unidimensional, it has been shown that it consists of two factors that are moderately correlated at ($r = .50$; see Appendix B). Information

needed to score the checklist is collected via file review and semi-structured interview. Each item of the checklist is then rated on a 3-point scale: 0 = not present, 1 = somewhat present, 2 = completely present. The scores across all items are then summed to a total score out of 40, a Factor 1 score out of 16, and a Factor 2 score out of 18. A total score of 30 and above is traditionally used as an indicator of psychopathy. A copy of the checklist items is in Appendix A.

The PCL-R has been shown to be a reliable and valid measure of psychopathy in the male criminal population (Hare, 1991; Hart et al., 1991; Hart & Hare, 1989). For instance, in a recent study, the inter-rater reliability for the PCL-R assessments made by the staff at the MAU were examined by Brown (1994). On a sample of 17 rapists, single and averaged intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC's) revealed a high inter-rater reliability for PCL-R Total scores (single ICC = .91, averaged ICC = .94), Factor 1 scores (single ICC = .87, averaged ICC = .93), and Factor 2 scores (single ICC = .82, averaged ICC = .92).

Disengagement of self-reaction: Semi-structured interview.

To assess offenders' retrospective accounts of their feelings following the contact, disengagement of self-reaction in general and in terms of the specific mechanisms of attribution of blame, excuse, justification, excuse, and minimizing the consequences, a semi-structured interview was conducted. Participants were asked several questions (adapted from Brown, 1994, Henderson & Hewstone, 1984, and Hemphill et al., 1993)

regarding the circumstances surrounding the offense (see Appendix D). Many of the questions overlap with those asked in the PCL-R interview; therefore, for the provincial participants, only those unique to the present interview were additionally asked. Since the federal participants had already been assessed for psychopathy, and the scores on the PCL-R were available, only the present interview questions were asked.

The information obtained in this interview was coded according to a manual adapted from Henderson and Hewstone (1984) and Kennedy and Grubin (1992) (see Appendix E): specifically, each variable was rated on a 4 point scale (0 = none, 3 = entirely/completely), as to the degree in which the offender uses each mechanism. A random sample of 10 participants were coded by a graduate student in order for inter-rater reliability to be assessed.

The use of excuses, justifications, and minimizing the consequences were coded from the information provided by the entire interview. There were several specific attributions of blame coded, which were used to comprise two general categories: self and other. Based on Hemphill et al. (1993), the self blame variable is a composite score of blame attributed to the following internal factors: emotional distress, childhood experiences, lack of control and personal defects. Other blame is a composite score of the blame attributed to external factors: the victim and substance abuse. In each case, the offender was asked to rate, on a 4 point scale (0 = none, 3 = entirely) how much he thinks each variable influenced the sexual contact.

A “general disengagement” variable was computed by summing the scores of the justification, minimization of consequences and other blame variables. Offenders’ retrospective accounts of guilt was also coded from the interview. As with the other variables, guilt was coded on the 4-point scale according its intensity reported by the participant (0 = none, 3 = high)

Disengagement of self-reaction: Self-report questionnaires.

Attribution for Criminal Events (ACE: Hemphill et al., 1993). The attribution of blame to external and internal factors was also assessed through the use of the ACE. This unpublished questionnaire was used by Hemphill et al.(1993) to assess offenders’ attribution of blame for their offense(s). It is comprised of 29 statements, in which the respondents independently rate, on an 8-point scale, the importance of each item in the commission of their overall criminal activities (1 = not at all important, 8 = very important). For the purpose of the present study, the participants responded to this questionnaire with reference to their current sex offense. Although Hemphill and his colleagues report several subscales in this inventory, the present study used this scale to measure only external and internal attribution of blame. Internal blame is comprised of items assessing blame attributed to emotional distress, familial factors, lack of control, and personal defects. External blame is comprised of items assessing victim and substance abuse blame. See Appendix F for a copy of this measure.

Cognition Scale (CS; Abel et al., 1989). A combination of the minimization of consequences and justifications for the sexual contact were examined through the use of the CS (Abel et al., 1989; see Appendix G). This scale was developed by Abel and his colleagues (1989) to assess the level of endorsement of adult-child sexual contact in male child molesters. The scale is comprised of 28 statements regarding adult-child sex, and respondents are required to indicate, on a 5-point scale, the extent to which they agree with the statement (1 = strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree). The items are then summed to reveal a total score; the lower the score, the greater the cognitive distortion. The test-retest reliability of the scale was also assessed by having the participants complete the scale one to three weeks after initially completing the scale as part of a larger assessment process. The obtained Pearson product moment correlations for the overall score ranged from .64 to .77. Therefore, this scale also has an acceptable level of test-retest reliability. Hayashino and his colleagues (1994) calculated a Cronbach Coefficient Alpha of .91, indicating that the scale has internal consistency. This scale has also demonstrated discriminant validity; child molesters score significantly lower than normal controls (Abel et al., 1989; Stermac & Segal, 1989). For the purpose of the present study, item 28 was removed from analysis, as this is relevant to treatment, not endorsement of adult-child sex.

The developers note that the scale needs to be modified slightly, in order for it to be more powerful in assessing cognitive distortions. They note that since the items are all

worded in the same direction, this makes the scale too transparent, especially those items concerning the beneficial aspects of adult-child sex. Following the suggestions of the authors, the entire scale was made less transparent to the respondents by randomly mixing all of the items with those from other attitude measures, such as the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980). These items are considered only as filler items (see Appendix H).

Guilt-proneness.

Test of Self Conscious Affect--Social Deviant Version (TOSCA-SD; Hanson & Tangney, 1996). This unpublished questionnaire (see Appendix I) was derived from the TOSCA developed and previously used by Tangney and her colleagues (for example, Tangney et al. 1992). Whereas the original version consisted of 10 negatively valenced and 5 positively valenced scenarios, this social deviant version consists of 13 negative scenarios only. As this version has yet to be assessed in regards to reliability and validity, the following discussion will focus on the original TOSCA and its predecessor, the SCAAI.

As mentioned in the discussion on guilt-proneness, SCAAI was developed to assess a variety of responses (affective, cognitive and behavioural) that are associated with shame/avoidance, guilt/constructive, externalization, minimization/detached, and pride. As the present study examined guilt reactions, this discussion will focus only on the guilt subscale. This measure is comprised of 10 negatively valenced scenarios, each

with four different personal responses. The participant is to rate, on a 5-point scale, the likelihood that they experience each reaction. The items relating to each type of response are summed across all 10 scenarios to provide an index of guilt-proneness.

The reliability of this subscale has been reported as being good: internal consistency having Cronbach alphas between .60 and .70, and test-retest reliability of .73 (Tangney, 1990, 1991; Tangney et al., 1992). In terms of validity, the guilt-proneness subscale is positively related to previous measures of guilt, such as the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory, and Mosher's Forced-Choice guilt inventory, in addition to the experience of empathy and negatively related to a detached attitude regarding participation in transgressive activities (Tangney, 1990, 1992; Tangney et al., 1992).

Taking into consideration that the scenarios and associated responses comprising this measure were developed by Tangney and several of her students (Tangney, 1990), the SCAAI was revised by replacing them with scenarios and responses reported by undergraduate and non-student adults (Tangney et al., 1992). As previously mentioned, the TOSCA has been shown to be as reliable and valid, if not more so, than its predecessor (Tangney et al., 1992, 1996).

Questionnaire booklet.

The four self-report measures (BIDR, ACE, CS, and TOSCA-SD) were presented to the participants in booklet form. To prevent the possibility of biasing responses, there were four booklets, each with a different order (derived via balanced latin square) of the

measures. Participants randomly received one of the four booklets. See Appendix J for a copy of the written instructions located at the front of the booklet.

Institutional File Review.

The following demographic variables were coded from the institutional files:

Offender current age, education/employment background, marital status, substance abuse, victim characteristics and criminal history record. The coding manual used by Brown (1994) was adapted and used in the present study (see Appendix K).

Procedure

In all cases each selected inmate was individually invited to a designated room in the institution. There he was informed, both verbally and in writing, of the purpose and procedure of the study, that participation is voluntary and confidential. Three alternative written versions of this information were used (adapted from Brown, 1994). The two forms used with federal participants contained the same information, however, the first one made specific reference to "sex offender/offense", and the second one did not. This latter version was intended for those inmates who feared the general population of inmates finding out that he is a sex offender (particularly a child molester) (see Appendix L for the "sex offender" information form, Appendix M for the "offender" information form). The third form was used with provincial participants; it contained additional information concerning the PCL-R interview (see Appendix N for the "provincial" information form). All potential participants were allowed to take the form back to their

cell/unit if they so desired. Once the inmate read the information form and agreed to participate, he was given a consent form (adapted from Brown, 1994; see Appendix O for the “federal” form, Appendix P for the “provincial” form) to read, sign and date. If the inmate was illiterate (as was the case for one participant), the consent form was read to him by the investigator.

Once this consent form was signed, the study commenced (questionnaire or interview) or the participant made an appointment to begin the study at another time. In the latter situation, upon arrival at the designated place and time, the participant was reminded of the purpose of the study. He was also given the opportunity to read the information form once again. Depending on the institution, the investigator either stayed in the same room as the participant while he completed the questionnaire, or the participant was brought to another room where he completed the questionnaire alone. In either case, the investigator made herself available to answer any questions. The questionnaire booklet took approximately 45 to 60 minutes to complete. The institutional files were not reviewed until consent was obtained.

Before the interview commenced, the participant was required to sign another consent form outlining the details of the interview (see Appendix Q). Following this, the investigator turned on the audio-recorder and began the interview. For federal participants, this took between 10 and 45 minutes, and for the provincial participants, the interview took approximately 90 to 260 minutes.

Once the participant finished (the questionnaire and/or interview), he was thanked and ensured that his responses would be kept strictly confidential. Although participants did not receive material compensation for their participation, they were reminded that their participation may help the future allocation of resources to and the development of appropriate treatment programs for child sex offenders. They were also provided with the opportunity to request a copy of a summary of the results of the study.

The information provided by the interview and the file review, was used by the present author to rate the utilized disengagement mechanisms and (for provincial participants) to score the PCL-R.

Confidentiality.

Before any information was collected from the participant, he was asked to formulate an identification code. This code consisted of letters and/or numbers, up to eight units long. For those participants who had difficulties with this, the investigator suggested they use the last two letters of their last name plus their birth-date. This code was placed on the participant's questionnaire booklet, interview tape(s) and file review. A record of each participant's identification code, along with a log of the date and time each part of the study was completed, was stored in a locked filing cabinet (see Appendix R). The questionnaire booklets, interview tape(s), and file reviews were also kept in separate compartments of the locked filing cabinet.

Debriefing.

There were no participants who appeared to be, in anyway, disturbed by the questions asked in the interview and/or questionnaire booklet; in fact, many related they were relieved by the experience of discussing their offense(s) with someone. Regardless, they were encouraged to discuss any discomfort they may be feeling with a friend and/or staff member. In order to keep the purpose of the study as private as possible, the participants were not debriefed right away, rather, they were told they would be receiving a letter in the mail describing the study in more detail. All but one of the participants was satisfied with this (this participant did not want to be associated with any psychological study). Due to the negative, and sometime dangerous, stigma attached to child sex offenders, the debriefing form mailed to participants did not refer to the present study as one focusing on sex offenders, rather, type of crime was kept ambiguous (see Appendix S). The participants were also provided with the university address of the investigator if they had any questions or comments about the present study.

Results

Data Screening

Prior to analyses, the data were screened for input accuracy, missing values, outliers, normality and homoscedastisity.

Missing data.

For cases with fewer than 30% of the items missing on a particular scale/subscale, the missing value was replaced with the mean for that item across the entire sample. Where greater than 30% of the items were missing on a scale/subscale, the relevant case was omitted from further analyses involving that particular scale/subscale. Consequently, two cases were excluded from the internal and external blame subscales of the ACE and the guilt-proneness subscale of the TOSCA-SD. There were several cases with missing items on the internal and external blame subscales of the ACE, the self deception and impression management subscales of the BIDR, and on the CS.

Outliers.

To avoid biasing the results, the data were examined for univariate outliers via stem and leaf plot. Scores greater than three standard deviations from the mean were considered to be outliers and were modified. There were two outliers on the guilt-proneness subscale of the TOSCA-SD; these were modified by bringing them closer to the mean of the subscale by adding one standard deviation unit to each of them. The number of previous sex offense charges had 3 outliers. These were modified by being reduced to the next extreme value (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). That is, participants who had 18 or more previous sex related charges were reduced to 17 charges.

The data were examined for multivariate outliers through the standardized residual casewise plot between: a) PCL-R Total, Factor 1 and Factor 2 scores and the

study variables. b) guilt-proneness subscale of the TOSCA-SD and the study variables, and c) retrospective guilt variable coded from the interview and the study variables.

Scores that were greater than three standard deviations from the mean were considered to be outliers. There were no multivariate outliers.

Normality.

The normality of the distribution for the PCL-R, the self-deception and impression management subscales of the BIDR, the internal and external attribution of blame subscales of the ACE, the guilt-proneness subscale of the TOSCA-SD, and the CS total score were examined through investigation of the Shapiro-Wilks test. The normality assumption was violated for internal and external blame, and the CS total score. For those variables that did not violate the normality assumption, the assumption of homoscedasticity is likely not violated. On the other hand, for those variables that violated the normality assumption, the distribution is likely heteroscedastic (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Considering the nature of the population sampled from, it is not surprising that there were violations of these two assumptions; therefore, no attempts were made to transform the distributions to make them more normally distributed.

Data Analyses: Overview

The present study analyzed psychopathy as a continuous variable; rather than dichotomously. The PCL-R Total score will be indicative of the extent to which an individual possesses psychopathic traits. To determine whether participants' responses

were associated with social desirability. Pearson r correlations were calculated between the BIDR and psychopathy, guilt and disengagement variables. Where there were significant correlations ($p \leq .05$), social desirability was partialled out of any further correlations involving that particular study variable.

A series of Pearson r correlations were calculated to examine the relationships between psychopathy and the following: individual disengagement variables (internal blame, external blame, self blame, other blame, excuse, justification, minimize consequences, general disengagement, and cognitive distortions), guilt (proneness and retrospective accounts), previous offense characteristics (age of first sexual and nonsexual offense charge, and number of previous sexual and nonsexual offense charges). The relationships between guilt and individual disengagement variables were also examined with Pearson r correlations. The significance of the relationships will be tested at an alpha level of .05, unless otherwise indicated. Relationships that approach significance at the .10 alpha level will be reported in text.

Due to the variables being measured on several different scales, all variable scores were converted into Z -scores prior to analyses. A full matrix of the inter-correlations between disengagement variables can be found in Appendix T

The frequency of responses to the guilt and disengagement variables coded from the semi-structured interview were also explored.

Due to selective responding on behalf of the participants, sample sizes differ depending on the particular analysis conducted.

Reliability of Measures

Internal consistency of the PCL-R and self-report questionnaires.

The internal consistency of the PCL-R and its two factors, the internal and external blame subscales of the ACE, the guilt-proneness subscale of the TOSCA-SD and the cognitive distortion score of the CS were assessed through the calculation of Cronbach alpha (see Table 2). With the exception of external blame, which had poor internal consistency, and cognitive distortions, which was excellent, each scale/subscale were considered to have good internal consistency.

Inter-rater reliability of interview variables.

Using a subsample of 10 federal participants, Pearson r correlations were calculated to assess the inter-rater reliability on the following variables coded from the interview: self and other blame, excuse, justification, minimize consequences, general disengagement and retrospective guilt. These correlations ranged from .89 to 1.00, indicating excellent inter-rater reliability across all the variables.

Comparable Attribution of Blame Variables

As previously mentioned, the present study employed two measures of attributing blame to internal (childhood experiences, emotional distress, lack of control, and personal deficiencies) and external (victim and substance use) factors. The variables

Table 2.

Cronbach Alpha for PCL-R and Self-Report Questionnaires

Variable	Cronbach Alpha ^a
PCL-R Total	.83
PCL-R Factor 1	.77
PCL-R Factor 2	.83
TOSCA-SD: Guilt-proneness	.82
ACE: Internal blame	.84
ACE: External blame	.51
CS: Cognitive distortions	.92

Note. ^aN ranges from 42 to 47. PCL-R = Psychopathy Checklist-Revised; TOSCA-SD = Test of Self Conscious Affect-Social Deviancy; ACE = Attribution of Criminal Events questionnaire; CS = Cognition Scale.

assessed by self-report questionnaire are referred to as “internal” and “external”, the comparable variables coded from the interview are referred to as “self” and “other”.

Pearson r correlations were calculated between corresponding variables reveal significant positive relations between internal and self blame, $r(34) = .51, p < .005$. External and other blame were also significantly related, in the positive direction, $r(34) = .58, p < .001$.

Social Desirability

The mean total score on the BIDR was 13.94 ($SD = 5.92$), the mean self deception score was 6.57 ($SD = 3.31$) and the mean impression management score 7.36 ($SD = 3.58$). Social desirability in general, and self deception and impression management in particular, were not significantly related to psychopathy or guilt-proneness. Internal blame ($M = 35.53, SD = 16.81$) was the only variable that was significantly related to social desirability: it was negatively related to the BIDR Total score $r(43) = -.54, p < .005$, as well as self deception $r(43) = -.48, p < .005$ and impression management $r(43) = -.46, p < .005$ subscales. The greater the attribution of blame to internal factors, the less likely the participant was to respond in a socially desirable manner. To avoid confounding the associations involving this variable, the BIDR total score was partialled out of internal blame for all of the correlational analyses.

Sex Offender Treatment

At the time of the present study, 23 participants had completed and/or were involved in a sex offender treatment program and 25 had not yet started treatment for their index sex offense(s).

Efforts were not taken a priori to match “untreated” and “treated” participants on potentially confounding variables, such as demographic and offense characteristics; however, several independent groups *t*-tests were performed to examine whether the means on the study variables differed as a function of participation in treatment (see Table 3). There were significant differences in the means on internal, external, and other blame. Compared to participants who had experienced at least some treatment, those who had not received treatment for their index offense were more likely to blame external factors, while being less likely to blame internal factors than their counterparts. There were no significant differences between Untreated and Treated groups in terms of psychopathy, guilt or the remaining disengagement variables.

Considering the possibility of participation in sex offender treatment influencing the relationships involving retrospective guilt and the disengagement variables, two sets of correlational analyses were conducted: first without controlling for the effects of treatment participation, then holding treatment constant by partialling it out of the correlations. A matrix of the partial correlations between disengagement variables can be found in Appendix U.

Table 3.

Tests of Means (two-tailed) Between Untreated and Treated Participants

Variable	Untreated group ^a		Treated group ^b		t ^c
	<u>M</u>	(<u>SD</u>)	<u>M</u>	(<u>SD</u>)	
PCL-R Total	19.08	(7.56)	19.16	(7.21)	-.03
PCL-R Factor 1	8.43	(3.65)	8.71	(3.58)	-.26
PCL-R Factor 2	7.29	(4.95)	7.62	(3.93)	-.25
Internal blame	29.67	(15.42)	42.23	(16.11)	-2.66*
External blame	18.75	(9.25)	13.76	(6.10)	2.16*
Self blame	5.41	(3.35)	6.80	(3.58)	-1.22
Other blame	2.59	(1.62)	1.45	(1.39)	2.27*
Excuse	2.12	(1.22)	2.40	(1.09)	-.74
Justification	1.29	(1.31)	.90	(1.29)	.92
Minimize consequences	1.76	(1.15)	1.30	(1.22)	1.19
General disengagement	5.65	(3.18)	3.65	(3.08)	1.93
Cognitive distortions	114.52	(13.83)	119.47	(13.90)	-1.22
Retrospective guilt	.94	(1.14)	1.45	(1.23)	-1.30
Guilt-proneness	55.87	(6.74)	57.99	(6.10)	-1.11
Previous sexual offense(s)	4.84	(7.31)	6.17	(8.34)	-.59
Previous nonsexual offense(s) ⁺	3.28	(3.61)	3.75	(3.98)	-.43
Age of first sexual offense charge	29.82	(14.58)	35.50	(6.87)	-1.16
Age of first nonsexual offense charge	21.00	(3.41)	25.25	(8.11)	-1.70

Note. ⁺Composite of violent and nonviolent offense charges. ^an ranges from 17 to 25. ^bn ranges from 20 to 23. ^cdf ranges from 15 to 44. *p < .05.

Psychopathy Scores

The mean PCL-R Total score was 19.12 (SD = 7.30), with a minimum score of 5.00 and a maximum score of 32.00. The mean Factor 1 score was 8.57 (SD = 3.58), the lowest score was 2.00, and the greatest was 14.00. Lastly, the mean Factor 2 score was 7.45 (SD = 4.42), scores ranged from 0.00 to 16.00.

There are several items that comprise the PCL-R which have scoring criteria that appear to be directly associated with many of the variables in the present study: item 6 “Lack of remorse or guilt”, appears to be related to the guilt variables; item 16, “Failure to accept responsibility for one’s actions”, appears to be associated with the disengagement variables; items 19 and 20, “Revocation of conditional release” and “Criminal versatility”, both appear to be related to number of previous nonsexual offense charges, and item 20 appears to be related to number of previous sexual offense charges. However, with the exception of one variable, this speculation was not supported by correlational analyses: only the number of previous nonsexual offense charges was significantly related to both item 19, $r(42) = .33$, $p < .05$, and item 20, $r(42) = .80$, $p < .0001$. Consequently, to prevent confounding the correlations by providing redundant information, these two items were removed from PCL-R Total and Factor 2 scores.

Psychopathy and Guilt Variables

The relationships between psychopathy and the two guilt variables, guilt proneness and retrospective guilt, were examined. Familywise alpha level ($.05 / 2 = .025$) was used to control for Type One error; however, relationships that are marginally significant at the .05 alpha levels are also reported. There was only one marginally significant relationship between psychopathy and guilt, Factor 2 was negatively related to guilt-proneness, $r(37) = -.30$, $p < .05$; the greater the behavioural component of psychopathy, the less likely the offender was to anticipate feeling guilt.

Psychopathy and Disengagement Variables

The relations between psychopathy and the following disengagement variables were also examined: internal blame, external blame, self blame, other blame, excuse, justification, minimize consequences, general disengagement, and cognitive distortions (see Table 4). The increased likelihood of committing a Type One error was addressed by adjusting the significance level for pairs of associated variables ($.05 / 2 = .025$): internal and external blame, self and other blame, and excuse and justification; however, relations that were marginally significant at the .05 alpha levels are reported. The PCL-R Total score was significantly related, in the negative direction, to only one of the variables: minimizing consequences; however, it was marginally related, in the positive direction, to self blame and it approached significance, also in the positive direction, with cognitive distortions ($p < .10$). As the Total score increased, the degree of minimization

Table 4.

Pearson r Correlations (one-tailed) Between PCL-R Total/Factor Scores and
Disengagement Variables

Variable	PCL-R Score ^a		
	Total	Factor 1	Factor 2
Internal blame ^b	-.05	.18	.00
External blame	-.17	-.11	-.14
Self blame	.29*	.23	.21
Other blame	-.09	.11	-.25
Excuse	.16	-.02	-.17
Justification	-.13	.12	-.24
Minimize consequences	-.29*	-.19	-.28*
General disengagement	-.20	.04	-.33*
Cognitive distortions	.24	.19	.17

Note. ^adf ranges between 35 and 40. ^bPart correlation (controlling for BIDR Total). * $p < .05$.

and endorsement of cognitive distortions (a higher score indicates fewer cognitive distortions) decreased, while the amount of self blame increased.

There were also significant negative relations between Factor 2 and both minimization of the consequences and general disengagement. The greater the behavioural component of psychopathy, the less likely the offender was to minimize the consequences and use disengagement in general.

Guilt-proneness and Disengagement Variables

The next set of analyses examined the relationship between guilt-proneness and the following variables: internal blame, external blame, self blame, other blame, excuse, justification, minimize consequences, general disengagement, and cognitive distortions. As with the previous analyses involving disengagement variables, a Familywise alpha ($.05 / 2 = .025$) was used in correlations involving internal and external blame, self and other blame, and excuse and justification, to control for Type One error. Relationships that were marginally significant at the .05 alpha level are reported as well. There were no correlations that were significant, marginally significant, or that approached significance (see Table 5).

Retrospective Guilt and Disengagement Variables

The relationship between retrospective guilt and the following disengagement variables were examined: internal blame, external blame, self blame, other blame, excuse, justification, minimize consequences, general disengagement, and cognitive distortions.

Table 5.

Pearson r Correlations (one-tailed) Between Guilt-proneness and DisengagementVariables

Variables	r^a
Internal blame ^b	.04
External blame	-.16
Self blame	.06
Other blame	-.10
Excuse	.10
Justification	-.01
Minimize consequences	-.12
Disengagement	-.10
Cognitive distortions	.13

Note. ^adf ranges from 32 to 42. ^bPart correlation (controlling for BIDR Total).

The Familywise alpha ($.05 / 2 = .025$) was used in analyses involving internal and external blame, self and other blame, and excuse and justification; however, relationships that were marginally significant at the .05 alpha level are reported as well. There were several marginally significant relationships between retrospective guilt and these variables (see Table 6). Specifically, there was a positive relation with excuse and a negative relation with justification. The positive relation with cognitive distortions and the negative relation with general disengagement only approached significance ($p < .10$). These correlations reveal that the more intense the guilt feelings experienced following the sexual contact, the more likely the offender was to excuse the contact and the less likely he was to justify it, have cognitive distortions, and use disengagement in general.

Controlling for Sex Offender Treatment

To control for the possibility of sex offender treatment influencing participants' responses to the measures, the previously examined relationships were re-analyzed with treatment participation partialled out of the correlations involving retrospective guilt and the disengagement variables. The alpha level was adjusted ($.05 / 2 = .025$) to control for Type One error in the following pairs of variables: internal blame and external blame, self blame and other blame, excuse and justification, and guilt-proneness and retrospective guilt. However, relationships that were marginally significant at the .05 alpha level are also reported. Part correlations were calculated between psychopathy and both retrospective guilt and the disengagement variables, and between guilt-proneness and the

Table 6.

Pearson r Correlations (one-tailed) Between Retrospective Guilt and DisengagementVariables

Variable	r^a
Internal blame ^b	.22
External blame	-.25
Self blame	.08
Other blame	-.16
Excuse	.32*
Justification	-.30*
Minimize consequences	-.21
General disengagement	-.27
Cognitive distortions	.25

Note. ^adf ranges from 33 to 35. ^bPart correlation (controlling for BIDR). * $p < .05$.

disengagement variable. Partial correlations were calculated to examine the relationship between retrospective guilt and the disengagement variables.

Psychopathy and retrospective guilt.

The relationship between PCL-R Total, Factor 1 and Factor 2 with retrospective guilt did not change when the effects of treatment were removed.

Psychopathy and disengagement variables.

As depicted in Table 7, there were no substantial differences in the significance of the relationships when the effects of treatment were removed from the variables.

Guilt-proneness and disengagement variables.

When the effect of sex offender treatment was partialled out, there were no significant relationships between guilt-proneness and individual disengagement variables (see Table 8).

Retrospective guilt and disengagement variables.

There were no substantial changes in relations when controlling for treatment (see Table 9).

Psychopathy and Previous Offense Characteristics

Table 10 displays the Pearson correlation coefficients associated with the relationships between psychopathy and the following variables: age of first sexual and nonsexual offense charge, and number of previous sexual and nonsexual offense charges.

Table 7.

Part Correlations (one-tailed) Between PCL-R and Factor Scores with DisengagementVariables

Variables	PCL-R Score ^a		
	Total	Factor 1	Factor 2
Internal blame ^b	-.06	.16	-.04
External blame	-.17	-.07	-.13
Self blame	.28*	.23	.20
Other blame	-.07	.13	-.25
Excuse	.16	-.02	.17
Justification	-.12	.13	-.23
Minimize consequences	-.28*	-.19	-.28*
General disengagement	-.19	.05	-.32*
Cognitive distortions	.24	.18	.17

Note. ^adf between 34 and 39. ^bResidual (controlling for BIDR Total). * p < .05.

Table 8.

Part Correlations (one-tailed) Between Guilt-Proneness and Disengagement Variables

Variables	r^a
Internal blame ^b	.10
External blame	-.17
Self blame	.06
Other blame	-.10
Excuse	.10
Justification	-.01
Minimize consequences	-.13
Disengagement	-.10
Cognitive distortions	.13

Note. ^adf ranges from 32 to 42. ^bResidual (controlling for BIDR Total).

Table 9.

Partial Correlations (one-tailed) Between Retrospective Guilt and DisengagementVariables

Variables	r^a
Internal blame	.14
External blame	-.17
Self blame	.04
Other blame	-.09
Excuse	.30*
Justification	-.27*
Minimize consequences	-.18
General disengagement	-.22
Cognitive distortions	.23

Note. ^adf ranges from 33 to 34. ^bResidual (controlling for BIDR Total). * $p < .05$.

Table 10.

Pearson r Correlations (two-tailed) Between PCL-R Total/Factor Scores and
Previous Offense Characteristics

Variable	PCL-R Score ^a		
	Total	Factor 1	Factor 2
Previous sexual offense(s)	.08	.28	-.05
Previous nonsexual offense(s) [†]	.53 ^{**}	.27	.49 [*]
Age of first sexual offense(s)	-.70 ^{**}	-.43	-.59 [*]
Age of first nonsexual offense(s)	-.13	.06	-.27

Note. ^adf ranges from 19 to 41. [†]Composite of both nonviolent and violent history.
^{*}p < .01. ^{**}p < .001.

Familywise alpha ($.05 / 2 = .025$) was used in tests involving all these variables. Relationships that were marginally significant at the .05 alpha levels are also reported. PCL-R Total and Factor 2 were significantly negatively related with the age of offenders' first sex related charge. The more psychopathic the offender is (particularly in terms of antisocial behaviour), the younger he was when he was first charged with a sexual offense.

The adjusted PCL-R Total and adjusted Factor 2 scores were both significant, in the positive direction, with the number of previous nonsexual offenses. These analyses reveal that the more psychopathic the offender is, the greater the number of previous nonsexual offenses.

Frequency of Disengagement Mechanisms Used

The individual disengagement and retrospective guilt variables coded from the semi-structured interview were further divided into two categories by collapsing the "none" and "little" ratings and the "some" and "completely" ratings. The frequency of responses for each variable were examined, not only for the sample as a whole, but also for the Untreated and Treated participants.

Total sample.

As displayed in Table 11, over half of the total sample felt the sexual contact was somewhat influenced by their own lack of control. On the other hand, the majority felt

Table 11.

Frequency of Disengagement Mechanisms used by the Total Sample

Variable	Frequency of response (%) ^a	
	“None/Little”	“Some/Completely”
Attributing blame to:		
Victim	62.2	29.2
Emotional distress	51.4	48.2
Childhood experiences	43.2	56.8
Substance use	81.1	18.9
Lack of control	37.8	62.2
Personal deficiencies	59.5	40.5
Minimizing consequences	51.4	48.6
Excuse	21.6	78.4
Justification	62.2	37.8
Retrospective guilt	64.9	35.1

Note. ^aN = 37.

the victim and/or substance abuse had little to do with it. About 50% of the sample attributed blame to childhood experiences and/or emotional distress. The participants tended to excuse the contact, rather than justify it. Almost two-thirds of the sample reported that they felt little guilt following the sexual contact.

Untreated participants.

As displayed in Table 12, over half of the untreated participants felt the contact was somewhat influenced by their own lack of control and/or childhood experiences. Approximately three quarters felt emotional distress and about two thirds felt personal deficiencies. victim characteristics and substance abuse had little to do with the sexual contact. Almost 60% of the sample minimized the consequences to some degree. Excuses were used more frequently than justifications, and about 75% did not report feeling guilt following the offense(s).

Treated participants.

For the participants who had at least started treatment, Table 12 indicates that more than two thirds felt their own emotional distress had some influence over the contact. Sixty percent felt their childhood experiences and/or lack of control were at least partially to blame for the offense(s). The same percentage felt the victims' characteristics had little to do with the offense. Over half of the sample minimized the consequences to some degree. As with the untreated participants, these offenders were more likely to

Table 12.
Frequency of Disengagement Mechanisms Used by Untreated and Treated Participants

Frequency of responses (%)					
Variable	Untreated group ^a		Treated group ^b		χ^2
	"None/Little "	"Some/Completely"	"None/Little"	"Some/Completely"	
	Attributing blame to:				
Victim	64.7	35.3	60.0	40.0	.09
Emotional distress	76.5	23.5	30.0	70.0	6.19*
Childhood experiences	47.1	52.9	40.0	60.0	.19
Substance use	64.7	35.3	95.0	5.0	--
Lack of control	35.3	64.7	40.0	60.0	.09
Personal deficiencies	70.6	29.4	50.0	50.0	1.62
Minimizing consequences	41.2	58.8	60.0	40.0	1.30
Excuse	29.4	70.6	15.0	85.0	1.12
Justification	59.8	41.2	65.0	35.0	.15
Retrospective guilt	76.5	23.5	55.0	45.0	1.86

Note. ^a $\bar{n} = 17$. ^b $\bar{n} = 20$. * $p < .013$ (Familywise). "--" indicates the chi square analysis could not be conducted due to low cell frequency counts.

excuse than to justify the contact. Slightly more than 50% of these participants reported little or no guilt feelings following the offense(s).

Group comparisons.

Chi-squared analyses were conducted to examine whether there were group differences in ratings when “none” and “little” were collapsed and “some” and “completely” were collapsed. A Familywise alpha level of $.05 / 4 = .013$ was used for the internal attribution of blame variables: emotional distress, childhood experiences, lack of control and personal deficits. For the following two pairs of variables, victim blame and substance abuse blame, and excuse and justification, a Familywise alpha of $.05 / 2 = .025$ was used. In either case, relationships that were marginally significant at the .05 alpha level will also be reported. There was only one significant difference between groups. The untreated participants were likely to say that emotional distress had little influence over their offense(s), while the treated participants were likely to say that it had some impact.

Discussion

The focus of the present study was three-fold: 1) to examine the relationship between psychopathy, guilt and disengagement, 2) to explore the relationship between psychopathy and offense characteristics, and 3) to explore the particular disengagement mechanisms used by extrafamilial child molesters. First the results of the PCL-R and the BIDR are reviewed. The analyses concerning the relationships between psychopathy,

guilt, disengagement and offense characteristics are then discussed. This is followed by an examination of the effect of controlling for treatment, including group differences on each of the psychopathy, guilt, and disengagement variables. The frequency of disengagement mechanisms used by the offenders are also examined. Finally, possible limitations/weaknesses, directions for future research, and implications of the present study are considered.

Distribution of PCL-R Scores

The mean PCL-R score in the present sample ($\underline{M} = 19.1$) was somewhat lower than to what has been reported in the general prison population ($\underline{M} = 23.6$; Hare, 1991). Previous investigations that have used child molesters in their sample have typically neglected to provide the mean PCL-R scores for extrafamilial child molesters independent of incest offenders and/or rapists. This, unfortunately, prevents direct comparison with the present sample of extrafamilial child molesters. Comparing the mean PCL-R Total ($\underline{M} = 13.2$), Factor 1 ($\underline{M} = 4.7$) and Factor 2 ($\underline{M} = 7.0$) scores of the mixed child molester sample used by Serin et al. (1994) reveals greater PCL-R Total ($\underline{M} = 19.1$) and Factor 1 ($\underline{M} = 8.6$) scores in the present sample. However, similar scores on Factor 2 were obtained ($\underline{M} = 7.5$). The lower scores found in the Serin et al. (1994) study may be due to the inclusion of incest offenders in their sample. Yet, when a cut off score of 29 (in the case of Serin et al.) is used to distinguish psychopaths from non-psychopaths, the present sample has fewer psychopathic child molesters than Serin et al.

(1994; 6.3% and 7.5% respectively). Both these percentages are quite low if they are compared with Prentky and Knight's (1991, as cited in Hare, 1996) mixed child molester sample, where, using a cut off score of 30, 30.5% were considered psychopathic. This is not surprising, however, considering the latter sample was rather extreme in nature, composed of child molesters deemed "dangerous sex offenders".

Comparing the present sample to a sample of rapists reveals that extrafamilial child molesters have lower scores on the PCL-R and are less likely to be considered psychopathic than are sex offenders who have adult victims. For instance, Brown and Forth (in press) found a mean total PCL-R score of 24.9, a mean Factor 1 score of 8.6 and a mean Factor 2 score of 12.1; 35% received a PCL-R total score of 30 or higher. The major difference here is between scores on Factor 2; the rapists are more likely to behave antisocially than the extrafamilial child molesters. This supports the results of Henn, Herjanic, and Vanderpearl (1976) who, after comparing demographics, concurrent charges, and psychiatric illness of a sample of 69 suspected rapists and 116 accused child molesters referred for psychiatric evaluation, concluded that the rapists were more antisocial than child molesters. Baxter, Marshall, Barbaree, Davidson, and Malcolm (1984) also found that rapists had a more extreme nonsexual offense history than child molesters.

BIDR Score Distribution and Associations with Study Variables

The BIDR results revealed that PCL-R Total, Factor 1 and Factor 2 were

unrelated to social desirability in general, and self-deception and impression management, in particular. Compared to the mean score Paulhus (1988, as cited in Paulhus, 1991) found in a sample of male college students (total $N = 433$; $M = 7.5$, for self-deception and $M = 4.3$, for impression management) the present self-deception score ($M = 6.6$) was similar, while the impression management ($M = 7.4$) score was somewhat higher. Therefore, compared to college students, the participants in the present sample were not as likely to engage in self-deception, but they were more likely to engage in impression management. This discrepancy is not surprising considering many of the offenders who refused to participate in the present study indicated they did not trust the investigator's motives; it is possible that those who did participate shared this suspicion, therefore attempting to present themselves in a positive light.

A significant negative relation was found between both self-deception and impression management (and therefore BIDR Total) and the self-report measure of internal attribution of blame. The greater the socially desirable responding, the less likely the offender was to blame internal factors for the sexual offense. This can be explained by the attribution theory of causality (e.g., Kelley, 1973). People tend to be biased in the way they explain their behaviour; successful events are explained in terms of internal factors, while failures are explained in terms of external factors. In other words, people engage in a "self-serving bias" (Arkin & Baumgardner, 1985; Kelley & Michela, 1980; Miller & Ross, 1975). This serves to preserve, if not enhance, one's self-esteem (Arkin

& Baumgardner, 1985; Bradley, 1978; Kelley & Michela, 1980). In the present study, the participants may not have wanted to attribute the blame to internal factors in order to appear less responsible for their actions. These results, however, are not consistent with Di Fazio et al. (1997) who did not find a relation between the social desirability (assessed by the impression management factor of the BIDR) and attribution of internal blame.

Relation Between Psychopathy and Guilt Variables

Prior to analyses, the two guilt variables, guilt-proneness and retrospective guilt, were correlated with item 6 ("Lack of remorse or guilt") of the PCL-R, however, it was revealed that neither variable was related to this item. This was quite unexpected, considering all three variables were designed to assess guilt. A possible explanation for this is that criteria used to rate item 6 is based on the participants' responses to both criminal and noncriminal activities, not simply the current offense. In addition, this item is based, not only on interview material, but also on collateral information; as a result, this may be more reliable than the information obtained from the self-report questionnaire. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the inclusion of item 6 ratings in the PCL-R Total and Factor 1 scores did not provide redundant information when correlated with the guilt variables.

The hypothesis that psychopathy and guilt would be negatively related was partially supported by the results. The PCL-R Total and Factor 1 scores were unrelated to both guilt variables. In fact, the only relationship that even approached significance was

between Factor 2 and guilt-proneness; the greater the antisocial lifestyle of the offender, the less likely he is prone to feeling guilt. This can be explained in terms of the motivational function of guilt. The anticipation of guilt works as a deterrent, motivating people to avoid behaving in ways that will result in guilt (Bandura et al., 1996; Mosher, 1979); consequently, without this foresight there may be little to discourage an individual from behaving in an antisocial manner.

The lack of a relationship with retrospective guilt may be due to the possible shortcomings of the guilt measure. Retrospective guilt was based on the response to the question "How did you feel immediately after the contact? Not only is this a single item measure, it is also based on the recollection of past events. By being a single item measure, this reduces the reliability of the variable. The response to this question may be influenced by distractions, motivation and comprehensive ability (Heiman, 1995). In addition, there are problems inherent in asking participants to report how they felt in the past. While some of the participants were interviewed early in their sentence, others had been incarcerated for several months or years. Regardless, there were many cases where the sexual offense occurred many years ago, so even if the interview was early, the participant may still be recalling emotions experienced some time ago. Naturally, recollection is likely to be distorted in some way (Mitchell & Jolley, 1996).

Relation Between Psychopathy and Disengagement Variables

As with the guilt variables, the disengagement variables were initially correlated with item 16 ("Failure to accept responsibility for one's actions") of the PCL-R. However, unlike Harry (1992b), who found this item to be positively associated with offenders' external blame for their offense(s), none of the relations were significant or approached significance. This could be due to two reasons: first, the scoring criteria includes brief descriptions of these variables, such as "he usually has some excuse for his behavior, including rationalization and placing the blame on others" (Hare, 1991, p. 26). Secondly, this item is scored with respect to the offenders' overall life functioning, not just in relation to the present offense. Taking this into account, it is not surprising that the relationships did not reach significance. The inclusion of item 16 in the correlations between the PCL-R (Total and Factor 1) and the disengagement variables, therefore, did not provide redundant information.

There were nine disengagement variables correlated with the PCL-R Total, Factor 1 and Factor 2 scores, of which only four of the relationships were significant or marginally significant. These results are opposite to the hypothesis that there would be an inverse relation between psychopathy and internal attribution of blame, and a positive relation with minimizing consequences and cognitive distortions. In actuality, the PCL-R Total score was positively related to attributing the blame to internal factors, and negatively associated with minimizing consequences and cognitive distortions. Thus, the

more psychopathic the offender is, the more inclined he was to blame internal factors for the contact, and the less likely he was to minimize the negative consequences and endorse permissive attitudes regarding adult-child sex. In terms of factor scores, the results revealed that Factor 2 was inversely related to minimizing consequences and general disengagement. So, the more antisocial the offenders' lifestyle, the less likely he was to minimize and restructure his thoughts about his sexual behaviour. It is interesting to note that, as with the guilt variables, the personality component of psychopathy, was not related to neutralizing self-punishment. Unlike Hemphill et al. (1993), who found a positive relationship between psychopathy and victim blame, and Di Fazio et al. (1997) who found a positive relation between psychopathy and external blame, the present study found that psychopathy and external blame were unrelated. This discrepancy may be due to differences in the type of offenders comprising the samples. Neither Hemphill et al. nor Di Fazio et al. specified the offender distribution of their sample.

One reason for the present findings could be due to the manipulative nature of the psychopath. In this manner, it is possible that the more psychopathic the offender is, the more likely he is to attempt to impress upon institutional staff that he is the model "convicted sex offender", blaming internal, rather than external factors, and acknowledging the negative effects of his behaviour. Similarly, rather than removing the onus from himself, the offender will "accept" the responsibility for the sexual contact. Considering offenders' explanations are often taken as indicators of treatment motivation

and recidivism risk (Bumby, 1996; Kennedy & Grubin, 1992; Pollock & Hashmall, 1991), which may therefore influence decisions regarding parole and early release, the psychopathic offender may endorse a position in an attempt to use the system to his own advantage (Hare, Forth, & Hart, 1989). Unfortunately, it is likely the present study was not immune to this manipulation. Hare et al. (1989) noted that the “psychopath enters into [social] interactions as though they are confrontations of opposing wills” (p. 35). Taking this into consideration, it is somewhat understandable that, the more psychopathic an offender is, the more likely he responded in the “correct” manner, his objective being to out-manuever the interviewer’s presumed motives.

In addition, as noted by Hare et al. (1989; Hare, 1996), psychopaths are able to “see through” the questions asked in self-report measures. This, in conjunction with the already transparent nature of the CS, may be why the endorsement of permissive attitudes regarding adult-child sex decreased as psychopathy increased. In fact, Hare et al. (1989) suggested that incarcerated samples (particularly those who are psychopathic) are test-wise and that results of self report inventories should be examined with caution.

Another reason for these unexpected results may simply be that the psychopath is not concerned with how others think and feel. This is not to say that psychopathy and honesty are related, they are not (Hare, 1991); rather psychopaths are egocentric, self-centered individuals who are motivated by personal gain, regardless of the cost to others who stand in their way (Hare, 1996). In the present case, although they know their

actions have negatively affected another person, they still may not experience self-punishment, and therefore, do not need to restructure their thoughts regarding their sexual behaviour.

In regards to the present study, there were negative associations found between Factor 2 and the disengagement variables. The more antisocial the offenders' lifestyle, the more sensitized he may be to the harmful effects of his behaviour, the possibility of self-punishment and disengagement becoming more and more remote.

Relation Between Guilt-Proneness and Disengagement Variables

The hypothesized negative association between guilt-proneness and general disengagement, external attribution of blame, minimizing consequences and justification, and the hypothesized positive association between internal attribution of blame and excuse, were not supported by the results. In fact, there were no significant relationships between guilt-proneness and the disengagement variables.

These results do not replicate those found by Bandura et al. (1996), who found that anticipated guilt decreased the likelihood of overall disengagement. This discrepancy, however, may be due to the differences in populations examined (incarcerated child molesters versus children) and/or differences in the measures used to assess guilt-proneness and disengagement.

Another possible explanation for the lack of relation can be seen in the context of the Principle of Compatibility as postulated by Ajzen (1988; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977).

According to this principle, for a measured attitude to be related to a particular behaviour, the indices must first have comparable specificity; that is, the relationship between attitude and a particular behaviour is strengthened if the attitude is specific to the relevant behaviour rather than being more global. In terms of the relation between guilt-proneness and disengagement variables, it is apparent that these two sets of variables lack correspondence; guilt-proneness is a general disposition, assessed via reactions to everyday events, whereas the disengagement variables are specifically assessed in terms of the present sexual offense. Whether or not an individual anticipates feeling guilt to everyday situations may not be related to the neutralization of self-punishment following the molestation of a child. Perhaps there would be an association if guilt-proneness was measured more specifically in terms of the offense in question.

Relation Between Retrospective Guilt and Disengagement Variables

There is evidence to support the hypothesized relationships between retrospective guilt and the disengagement variables. There were marginally significant relations between retrospective guilt and excuse and justification, and the relations with general disengagement and cognitive distortions approached significance; the more guilt experienced following the sexual contact, the less likely the offender was to endorse permissive attitudes regarding adult-child sex and to use disengagement in general. Furthermore, the more guilt experienced, the more likely the offender was to excuse the behaviour, than to justify it.

These findings can be explained in terms of the typical reaction to the guilt experience. In order for an individual to feel guilt, Ferguson and Stegge (1996) suggest the individual must first perceive the act as transgressive, acknowledge that the consequence is due to his own actions, and take responsibility for it. This is counter to the neutralization of self-punishment, where the person avoids the negative experience by restructuring the event. Thus, if one experiences guilt, he/she will likely turn to reparative action, (Baumeister et al., 1994; Ferguson & Stegge, 1996; Lindsay-Hartz et al., 1996; Tangney, 1992) rather than disengagement, as a way to reduce the discomfort.

Relation Between Psychopathy and Offense Characteristics

As with the guilt and disengagement variables, prior to analyses, two items from the PCL-R, "Revocation of conditional release" (item 19) and "Criminal versatility" (item 20) were both correlated with number of previous nonsexual offense charges. Item 20 was also correlated with the number of previous sexual offense charges. These two items were related to nonsexual offense history; therefore, to avoid redundancy, items 19 and 20 were removed from PCL-R Total and Factor 2 for the analyses involving number of previous nonsexual offense charges. On the other hand, item 20 was unrelated to sexual offense history. This non-significant relationship may be due to the scoring criteria for this item, which is based on the number of different types of previous criminal charges/convictions. An examination of the criteria reveals that, of the 15 different types of offenses, only one is related to sexual crimes. So, regardless of the number of prior

sex related charges the offender has, he will receive the lowest score possible (0) on this item, unless he has been previously charged/convicted of a number of different types of offenses.

Using the modified PCL-R scores, the analyses revealed that the hypothesis that psychopathy and number of previous nonsexual offenses should be related was supported; the more psychopathic the offender was, the greater number of previous nonsexual offenses. In terms of factor scores, this association was stronger with the antisocial component than with the personality component. This is not unexpected considering the results of previous studies. For instance, Brown (1994) found a similar relation using a sample of incarcerated rapists. When she divided the sample into two groups, psychopaths and non-psychopaths, the first group had a more extensive criminal history than the second. Similarly, in a five year follow-up study, Serin (1996) reported the associations between factor scores and general recidivism to be stronger for Factor 2 than Factor 1. The relation between psychopathy and nonsexual criminal history has also been reported by researchers, such as Hare and McPherson (1984), Hart, Kropp, and Hare (1988) and Williamson, Hare, and Wong (1987).

Surprisingly, the results reveal that age of onset of nonsexual offending and psychopathy were unrelated. This is inconsistent with previous research using nonsexual offenders which has found that psychopaths are younger than nonpsychopaths in terms of their first adult nonsexual offense (Hart & Hare, in press; see also, Williamson et al.,

1987). However, Brown and Forth (in press) also found no relation between psychopathy and age of onset for nonsexual offending in incarcerated rapists. Considering research in the area of psychopathy in the sex offender population is relatively novel, more empirical investigations are needed before any speculations can be made.

In terms of sexual offending, the presence of a history of sexual crime was unrelated to psychopathy. This is in accord with Brown (1994) who examined a sample of incarcerated rapists and Hare and McPherson (1984) who did not discriminate sex offenders in their sample. According to Brown (1994), one reason for this finding may be that for the psychopath sexual assault is simply one of a variety of different crimes committed. In terms of age of first adult sex offense, however, it was revealed that the more psychopathic the offender is, particularly in terms of antisocial lifestyle, the younger he was when he was first charged with a sex related offense. However, this result may not imply that psychopaths are younger when they first start molesting children, but rather that they are younger when they were first charged. Taking into consideration the characteristics of psychopathy, it is likely that this type of sex offender does not take time to "groom" the victim prior to assaulting him/her. As a result, the child may be less confused about the assault, which in turn, may lead to more immediate reporting and apprehension. Another reason may be that psychopaths tend to inflict more injury on their victims than nonpsychopaths (Hart & Hare, in press). In this manner, the

child may be more likely to report the experience, than if the sexual contact is less physically injurious.

The Effects of Participation in Sex Offender Treatment

Ideally, the present sample would have consisted entirely of child molesters who had not yet started or completed treatment for their index offense(s); lack of availability, however, prevented this from happening. Coincidentally, the present sample consisted of approximately equal numbers of untreated and treated offenders. To explore whether there were any significant differences in mean scores across the variables, several analyses were conducted. The results indicate significant group differences in mean scores on internal, external and other blame: untreated participants were less willing to blame internal factors and more willing to blame external factors, than the treated participants. Bearing in mind sex offender treatment typically addresses issues such as attribution of blame at the onset of the program, it is likely that treated offenders would be less inclined to blame external factors and more inclined to blame internal factors than untreated offenders.

On the other hand, both the untreated and the treated offenders responded in a similar manner to the remaining variables, such as minimizing consequences and cognitive distortions. Furthermore, when the effects of treatment were removed from the correlations involving psychopathy, retrospective guilt, and disengagement variables, there were no substantial changes in the aforementioned relationships. A possible

explanation for this may be due to possible apprehension of the untreated offender to actually admit to these disengagement mechanisms, even if he is experiencing them. By the time an untreated offender participated in this study, he had already experienced the public's reaction to his offense(s), he now knows what to and what not to say in order to make himself appear in a more favorable light. Similarly, those who are/have been in treatment may now be more willing to admit previous disengagement, saying "I used to think this way [disengagement], but now I think like this..."; in fact, several of the present participants asked the investigator "how do you want me to respond [to the questions]-- what I thought then or what I think now (i.e., since I've been in treatment)?"

Consequently, both groups of participants responded in the same manner.

Examination of the Frequency of Disengagement Mechanisms Used

Recall that several attribution of blame variables, such as blame attributed to victim characteristics, emotional distress, and substance abuse were coded and combined to form the self and other blame variables used in the correlational analyses. The excuse, justification, minimizing consequences and retrospective guilt variables were directly coded from this interview. Although these variables were rated on a 4-point scale (0 = none, 1 = little, 2 = some, 3 = completely), based on the degree of influence/endorsement, the "none" and "little" ratings, and the "some" and "completely" ratings were collapsed and the frequency of each response examined. The majority of the sample felt the sexual contact was influenced by their own lack of control, followed by their childhood

experiences. Considering there were few participants who blamed the victim, it makes sense that the offender would excuse, rather than justify, the contact. They were also not likely to report feeling guilt following the contact.

These results are consistent with the present finding that, essentially, these child molesters blamed internal factors for the offense. What is interesting here is that the blame was typically attributed to personal factors that were beyond the offenders' control. This can be explained in the context of attribution theory. According to Weiner (1995), the perception of personal control over behaviour will influence whether or not responsibility is attributed to the actor (for example, Snyder, 1976). That is, if the behaviour is perceived as being influenced by internal factors which are uncontrollable, there will be less culpability placed on the actor, than if influence is perceived as originating from internal factors which are more controllable. In regards to the present findings, the offender may feel less responsible or may feel he is portraying himself as less responsible for the sexual contact if he blames uncontrollable circumstances such as childhood experiences, rather than controllable ones, such as emotional distress.

These results, however, are not entirely consistent with previous research in the area of disengagement among sex offenders. For instance, Scully and Marolla (1985) and Loza and Clements (1991) both found that rapists tended to blame the victim. Only a third of the child molesters in this sample felt that the victim was somewhat responsible for the offense. Scully and Marolla also found that blame was attributed to substance

abuse and emotional problems. In contrast, attributing the offense to substance abuse had the lowest endorsement rate in the present study.

As with Scully (1988), only a third of the participants reported a guilt reaction following the offense(s). As previously mentioned, the experience of guilt works to deter future detrimental conduct; hence, without guilt, the commission of this behaviour becomes easier. In light of the average number of previous sexual offenses in the present study ($M = 5.48$), it is not unreasonable to speculate that there would be a lack of guilt. Moreover, the endorsement of seemingly uncontrollable versus controllable factors in attributing blame for the offense is consistent with the relatively few participants reporting guilt. By perceiving oneself as powerless against personal experiences, this may ease culpability and resulting guilt feelings.

To examine the impact of treatment on disengagement mechanisms used, the sample was divided into two groups depending on whether or not they have had sex offender treatment. Examination of the frequency of responses for each group, reveals that untreated participants, like the sample as a whole, felt lack of control and childhood experiences were the major instigators surrounding the offense. These participants were also likely to minimize the consequences. The majority did not report experiencing guilt following the sexual contact. The responses were slightly different among the treated participants. In addition to attributing blame to lack of control, this group felt the contact was also influenced by emotional distress. The untreated offender may be more

defensive about their sexual behaviour, and thus attempt to preserve his self concept and his own perception of emotional control. Treated offenders, on the other hand, may have previously addressed these issues during treatment.

Limitations/Weaknesses

In considering the results of this study, it is important to bear in mind several of its major limitations/weaknesses. For instance, many of the participants may have felt inhibited and uneasy about discussing not only the characteristics of their offense(s), but also their beliefs and attitudes surrounding it; in which case, their disclosure may be censored. Even though anonymity and confidentiality were ensured, taking into account the circumstances surrounding the interview (i.e., being in prison, wanting early release, etc.) the participants may not have trusted the interviewer's motives. In fact, the interviewer was told by several potential participants that they did not want to participate because they were suspicious of her motives.

The use of extrafamilial child molesters who were incarcerated limits the generalizability of the study. The results cannot be extended to incest offenders and non-incarcerated child molesters. In addition, the participants were self-selected for this study. Those who chose to take part may have particular characteristics which may facilitate their participation; those who did not take part, may lack these characteristics (Dyer, 1995). For instance, Rosenthal and Rosnow (1991) conclude that people who are intelligent, approval-motivated, and unconventional are more likely to volunteer to

participate in a research project than their counterparts. The sample size of the study also presents a limitation by restricting the power of the results. Lastly, as previously mentioned regarding retrospective guilt, there are problems inherent with using variables that are retrospective in nature; essentially, the time delay between the offense and the interview will be reflected in a recall bias (Mitchell & Jolley, 1996).

Directions for Future Research

The problem of limited generalizability can be addressed in future research by exploring these variables with suspected child molesters referred for treatment (prior to starting treatment). In addition, taking into account that child molesters may have an early history of sexually offending (Abel & Rouleau, 1990; Longo & Groth, 1983; Marshall, Barbaree, & Eccles, 1991), it may be useful, in terms of prevention, to examine guilt and disengagement in adolescent sex offenders. A longitudinal or matched-groups study, comparing guilt and disengagement in convicted child molesters prior to and following treatment would also provide, not only an assessment of the program's efficacy, but also of the mechanisms that are more resistant to treatment.

The present research also raises the question of predictability. The path of influence between disengagement, guilt and psychopathy needs to be addressed; that is, when, in the behaviour process does disengagement occur? Is it etiologically significant or does it simply occur as a reaction to some behaviour? What role do guilt and psychopathy play in influencing sexually aggressive behaviour? It is likely that guilt and

psychopathy act as a path influence to both disengagement mechanisms and sexually aggressive behaviours.

Conclusions and Implications

In sum, the present study provided evidence that disengagement of self-punishment and the experience of guilt following the sexual offense(s) are inversely related. The disposition to feeling guilt, in everyday situations, was negatively related to the antisocial component of psychopathy. In addition, the more psychopathic the offender is, particularly in terms of antisocial behaviour, the less likely he was to experience disengagement, the more extensive his nonsexual offense history and the younger he was when he was first charged with a sexual offense. Regardless of psychopathy, with treatment, the blame for the offense(s) shifted from external to internal factors. In general though, participants considered internal factors, such as lack of control, to be the instigators of the sexual contact. Excuses were provided more often than justifications, while only a few reported guilt feelings following the contact.

The association between retrospective guilt feelings and the neutralization of self-punishment has implications for the treatment of child molesters. Recall that the guilt experience is linked to the motivation toward repairing the negative consequences of one's behaviour. From this it can be inferred that child molesters who feel guilt will also be motivated toward treatment (Czuduer & Mueller, 1987), coupled with the willingness

to accept responsibility and acknowledge the wrongfulness of their actions, this may positively influence the efficacy of treatment programs.

Taking into consideration the manipulative, pathological lying and self-centered nature of the psychopath, the relation between psychopathy and disengagement should be interpreted with caution. These “correct” responses may be endorsed simply as a way to manipulate decision makers into giving them early release or parole. Along these lines, it is clear that “these individuals [be] scrutinized intensely in the context of treatment evaluation and parole decision making processes” (Brown, 1994, p. 150).

The results of the present study have implications for, not only the forensic community, but also society in general. Through the systematic study of the use of disengagement and the relation with psychopathy and guilt, this will further the development of theories of child sexual abuse, treatment planning, and the assessment of risk of recidivism. Ultimately, this will lead to early identification of and intervention with at-risk individuals.

References

Abel, G., Becker, J., Cunningham-Rathner, J. (1984). Complications, consent, and cognitions in sex between children and adults. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 7, 89-103.

Abel, G., Gore, D., Holland, C., Camp, N., Becker, J., & Rathner, J. (1989). The measurement of the cognitive distortions of child molesters. Annals of Sex Research, 2, 135-153.

Abel, G., Mittleman, M., & Becker, J. (1985). Sexual offenders: Results of assessment and recommendations for treatment. In M. Ben-Aron, S. Hucher, and C. Webster (Eds.), Clinical criminology: The assessment and treatment of criminal behaviour (pp. 191-205). Toronto: M & M Graphics, Ltd.

Abel, G., & Rouleau, J. (1990). Male sex offenders. In M. Thase, B. Edelstein, & M. Hersen (Eds.), Handbook of outpatient treatment of adults: Nonpsychotic mental disorders (pp. 271-290). NY: Plenum Press.

Ajzen, I. (1988). Attitudes, personality, and behavior. Chicago, IL: Dorsey Press.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 888-918.

American Psychiatric Association (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. Washington, DC: Author.

Arkin, R., & Baumgardner, A. (1985). Self-handicapping. In J. Harvey & G. Weary (Eds.), Attribution: Basic issues and applications (Chapter 7). NY: Academic Press, Inc.

Badgley, R. (1984). Sexual offenses against children: A report of the committee on sexual offenses against children and youth. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

Bandura, A. (1973). Maintaining conditions. In A. Bandura (Ed.), Aggression: A social learning analysis (pp. 206-222). Toronto: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1976). Social learning analysis of aggression. In E. Ribes-Inesta and A. Bandura (Eds.), Analysis of delinquency and aggression (pp. 203-232). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bandura, A. (1977). Consequent Determinants. In A. Bandura (Ed.), Social learning theory (pp. 128-158). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bandura, A. (1979). The social learning perspective: Mechanisms of aggression. In H. Toch (Ed.), Psychology of crime and criminal justice (pp. 198-236). NY: Hold, Rinehart and Winston.

Bandura, A. (1986). Self-regulatory mechanisms. In A. Bandura (Ed.), Social foundation of thought and action (pp. 335-369). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of moral thought and action. In W. Kurtines, & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), Handbook of moral behavior and development: Volume 1: Theory. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 364-374.

Baumeister, R., Stillwell, A., Heatherton, T. (1994). Guilt: An interpersonal approach. Psychological Bulletin, 115, 243-267.

Baxter, D., Marshall, W., Barbaree, H., Davidson, P., & Malcolm, P. (1984). Deviant sexual behavior: Differentiating sex offenders by criminal and personal history, psychometric measures, and sexual response. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 11, 477-501.

Bradley, G. (1978). Self-serving biases in the attribution process: A reexamination of the fact or fiction question. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 56-71.

Brown, B. (1970). The impact of imprisonment on selected attitudes of recidivists and first offenders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 26, 435-436.

Brown, S. (1994). Sexually aggression and psychopathy among convicted rapists: Static, dynamic, and motivational precursors. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Brown, S., & Forth, A. (in press). Psychopathy and sexual assault: Static risk factors, emotional precursors, and rapists subtypes. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.

Bumby, K. (1996). Assessing the cognitive distortions of child molesters and rapists: Development and validation of the MOLEST and RAPE scales. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 8, 37-54.

Burt, M. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 217-230.

Cleckley, H. (1976). The mask of sanity (5th ed.). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.

Cohen, M., Seghorn, T., & Calmas, W. (1969). Sociometric study of the sex offender. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 74, 249-255.

Conte, J. (1985). Clinical dimensions of adult sexual abuse of children. Behavioural Sciences and the Law, 3, 341-354.

Di Fazio, R., Kroner, D., & Forth, A. (1997). The attribution of blame scale with an incarcerated sample: factor structure, reliability and validity. Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 7, 153-164.

Doren, D. (1987). Understanding and treating the psychopath. NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Dutton, D. (1995). The domestic assault of women. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dyer, C. (1995). Beginning Research in Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods and Statistics. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Ferguson, R., & Stegge, H. (1995). Emotional states and traits in children: The case of guilt and shame. In J. Tangney & K. Fischer (Eds.), Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride (pp. 174-197). NY: Guilford Press.

Finkelhor, D. (1979). Sexually victimized children. NY: The Free Press.

Finkelhor, D. (1984). Child sexual abuse: New theory and research. NY: Free Press.

Gadd, J. (1997, July 9). More boys physically abused than girls. The Globe and Mail, pp. A1, A6.

Gerstley, L., Alterman, A., McLellan, A., & Woody, G. (1990). Antisocial personality disorder in patients with substance abuse disorders: A problematic diagnosis? American Journal of Psychiatry, 147, 173-178.

Gizzarelli, R. (1993). Comparison of male incest offenders with men who present no sexual deviancy and men who are involved with domestic assault. Unpublished Master's Thesis, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Gudjonsson, G. (1984). Attribution of blame for criminal acts and its relationship with personality. Personality and Individual Differences, 5, 53-58.

Gudjonsson, G., & Singh, K. (1989). The revised Gudjonsson blame attribution inventory. Personality and Individual Differences, 10, 67-60.

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

Hanson, R., & Tangney, J. (1996). Test of Self Conscious Affect - Social Deviant Version. Corrections Research, Department of the Solicitor General of Canada.

Hare, R. (1981). Psychopathy and violence. In J. Hays, T. Roberts, & K. Soloway (Eds.), Violence and the violent individual (pp. 53-74). Jamaica, NY: Spectrum.

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

Hare, R. (1991). The Hare psychopathy checklist-revised: Manual. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems, Inc.

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

Hare, R., & Cox, D. (1978). Clinical and empirical conceptions of psychopathy, and the selection of subjects for research. In R. Hare and D. Schalling (Eds.), Psychopathic behaviour: Approaches to research (pp. 1-21). NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Hare, R., Forth, A., & Hart, S. (1989). The psychopath as prototype for pathological lying and deception. In J. Yuille (Ed.), Credibility assessment (pp. 25-49). NY: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hare, R., Harpur, T., Hakstian, A., Forth, A., Hart, S., & Newman, J. (1990). The revised psychopathy checklist: Reliability and factor structure. Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 2, 338-341.

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

Harpur, T., Hakstian, A. & Hare, R (1988). Factor structure of the psychopathy checklist. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56, 741-747.

Harpur, T., Hare, R., & Hakstian, A (1989). Two-factor conceptualization of psychopathy: Construct validity and assessment implications. Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1, 6-17.

Harry, B. (1992a). Criminals' explanations of their criminal behavior, Part I: The contribution of criminologic variables. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 37, 1327-1333.

Harry, B. (1992b). Criminals' explanations of their criminal behavior, Part II: A possible role for psychopathy. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 37, 1334-1340.

Hart, S., Forth, A., & Hare, R. (1991). The MCMI-II and psychopathy. Journal of Personality Disorders, 5, 318-327.

Hart, S., & Hare, R. (1989). Discriminant validity of the psychopathy checklist in a forensic psychiatric population. Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1, 211-218.

Hart, S., & Hare, R. (in press). Psychopathy: Assessment and association with criminal conduct. In D. M. Stoff, J. Brieling, & J. Maser (Eds.), Handbook of Antisocial Behavior. NY: Wiley.

Hart, S., Kropp, P., & Hare, R. (1988). Performance of male psychopaths following conditional release from prison. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 2, 227-232.

Hayashino, D., Wurtele, S., & Klebe, K. (1995). Child molesters: An examination of cognitive factors. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10, 106-116.

Heiman, G. (1995). Research Methods in Psychology. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, Co.

Hemphill, J., Hemphill, K., & Hare, R. (1993). Attributions for crimes by psychopaths. Unpublished manuscript. University of British Columbia.

Henderson, M., & Hewstone, M. (1984). Prison inmates' explanations for interpersonal violence: Accounts and attributions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52, 789-794.

Henn, F., Herjanic, M., & Vanderpearl, R. (1976). Forensic psychiatry: Profiles of two types of sex offenders. American Journal of Psychiatry, 133, 694-696.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1988). Causal attributions in marital violence: Theoretical and methodological issues. Clinical Psychology Review, 8, 331-344.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1992). Attributions and maritally violent men: The role of cognitions in marital violence. In J. Harvey, T. Orbuch, A. Weber (Eds.), Attributions, accounts, and close relationships (pp. 165-175). NY: Springer-Verlag.

Howells, K. (1981). Adult sexual interest in children: Considerations relevant to theories of aetiology. In M. Cook and K. Howells (Eds.), Adult sexual interest in children (pp. 55-94). NY: Academic Press.

Johnston, L., & Ward, T. (1996). Social cognition and sexual offending: A theoretical framework. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 8, 55-89

Jones, W., Kugler, K., & Adams, P. (19). You always hurt the one you love: Guilt and transgressions against relationship partners. In J. Tangney & K. Fischer (Eds.), Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride (pp. 301-321). NY: Guilford Press.

Kelley, H. (1973). The process of causal attribution. American Psychologist, 28, 107-128.

Kelley, H., & Michela, J. (1980). Attribution theory and research. Annual Review of Psychology, 31, 457-501.

Kennedy, H., & Grubin, D. (1992). Patterns of denial in sex offenders. Psychological Medicine, 22, 191-196.

Knight, R. (1992). The generation and corroboration of a taxonomic model of child molesters. In W. O'Donohue, and J. Geer (Eds.), The sexual abuse of children: Clinical issues: Volume 2 (pp. 24-70). Hillsdale, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Knight, R., Carter, D., & Prentky, R. (1989). A system for the classification of child molesters: Reliability and application. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4, 3-23.

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

Langevin, R., Paitich, D., Mann, K., & Handy, L. (1978). Personality characteristics and sexual anomalies in males. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 10, 222-238.

Lewis, H. (1971). Shame and guilt in neurosis. NY: International Universities Press, Inc..

Lilienfeld, S. (1994). Conceptual problems in the assessment of psychopathy. Clinical Psychology Review, 14, 17-38.

Lindsay-Hartz, J., De Rivera, J., & Mascolo, M. (1995). Differentiating guilt and shame and their effects on motivation. In J. Tangney & K. Fischer (Eds.), Self-conscious emotions: Shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride (pp. 274-300). NY: Guilford Press.

Longo, R., & Groth, A. (1983). Juvenile sexual offenses in the histories of adult rapists and child molesters. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 27, 150-155.

Lottes, I. (1988). Sexual socialization and attitudes toward rape. In A. Burgess (Ed.), Rape and sexual assault II (pp. 193-220). NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Loza, W. & Clements, P. (1991). Incarcerated alcoholics' and rapists' attributions of blame for criminal acts. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 23, 76-83.

Marshall, W., & Barbaree, H. (1990). Outcome of comprehensive cognitive-behavioral treatment programs. In W. Marshall, D. Laws, and H. Barbaree (Eds.), Handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender (pp. 363-385). NY: Plenum Press.

Marshall, W., Barbaree, H., & Eccles, A. (1991). Early onset and deviant sexuality in child molesters. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6, 323-336.

McCaghy, C. (1966). Child molesters: A study of their careers as deviants. In M. Clinard and R. Quinney (Eds.), Criminal behaviour systems: A typology (pp. 75-88). NY: Hold, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

McCord, W., & McCord, J. (1964). The psychopath: An essay on the criminal mind. Toronto: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.

Miller, D., & Ross, M. (1975). Self-serving biases in the attribution of causality: Fact or fiction? Psychological Bulletin, 82, 213-225.

Mills, C. (1940). Situated actions and vocabularies of motive. American Sociological Review, 5, 904-913.

Mitchell, M., & Jolley, J. (1996). Research design explained. NY: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Mosher, D. (1966). The development and multitrait-multimethod matrix analysis of three measures of three aspects of guilt. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 30, 25-29.

Mosher, D. (1968). Measurement of guilt in females by self-report inventories. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 690-695.

Mosher, D.L. (1979). The meaning and measurement of guilt. In C. E. Izard (Ed.), Emotions in personality and psychopathology (pp. 105-130). NY: Plenum Press.

Mosher, D., & Mosher, J. (1967). Guilt in prisoners. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 23, 171-173.

Motiuk, L., & Belcourt, R. (1996). Profiling the Canadian federal sex offender population. Forum on Correctional Research, 8, 3-7.

Motiuk, L., & Belcourt, R. (1997). Homicide, sex, robbery and drug offenders in federal corrections: An end-of-1996 review. (Brief No. 16), Ottawa, Canada: Research Branch Correctional Services Canada.

Murphy, W. (1990). Assessment and modification of cognitive distortions in sex offenders. In W. Marshall, D. Laws, and H. Barbaree (Eds.), Handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender (pp. 331-342). NY: Plenum Press.

Murphy, W., & Stalgaitis, S. (1987). Assessment and treatment considerations for sexual offenders against children: Behavioral and social learning approaches. In J. McNamara & Appel, M. (Eds.), Critical issues, developments, and trends in professional psychology (pp. 177-210). NY: Praeger Publishers.

Nexhipi, G. (1993). A structural analysis of the attitudes of those who sexually abuse children: Pedophilotypic, sexist or antisocial. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Overholser, J., & Beck, S. (1989). The classification of rapists and child molesters. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 13, 15-25.

Panton, J. (1978). Personality differences appearing between rapists of adults, rapists of children and non-violent sexual molesters of female children. Research Communications in Psychology, Psychiatry, and Behavior, 3, 385-393.

Paulhus, D. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 598-609.

Paulhus, D. (1992). Measurement and control of response bias. In J. Robinson, P. Shaver, & L. Wrightsman (Eds.), Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes (pp. 17-59). NY: Academic Press, Inc.

Persons, R. (1970). Intermittent reinforcement, guilt, and crime. Psychological Reports, 26, 421-422.

Pollock, N., & Hashmall, J. (1991). The excuses of child molesters. Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 9, 53-59.

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

Rice, M., Harris, G., & Cormier, C. (1992). An evaluation of a maximum security therapeutic community for psychopaths and other mentally disordered offenders. Law and Human Behavior, 16, 399-412.

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

Robins, L. (1978). Aetiological implications in childhood disorders relating to Antisocial personality. In R. Hare & D. Schalling (Eds.), Psychopathic behaviour: Approaches to research (pp. 255-272). NY: Wiley.

Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. (1991). Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis. NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

- Russell, D. (1986). The secret trauma: Incest in the lives of girls and women. NY: BasicBooks.
- Scott, M., & Lyman, S. (1968). Accounts. American Sociological Review, 34, 46-62.
- Scully, D. (1988). Convicted rapists' perceptions of self and victim: Role taking and emotions. Gender and Society, 2, 200-213.
- Scully, D., & Marolla, J. (1984). Convicted rapists' vocabulary or motive: Excuses and justifications. Social Problems, 31, 530-544.
- Segal, Z., & Stermac, L. (1990). The role of cognition in sexual assault. In W. Marshall, D. Laws, and H. Barbaree (Eds.), Handbook of Sexual Assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender (pp. 161-174). NY: Plenum Press.
- Serin, R. (1991). Psychopathy and violence in criminals. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6, 423-431.
- Serin, R. (1992). The clinical application of the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R) in a prison population. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 48, 637-642.
- Serin, R. (1996). Violent recidivism in criminal psychopaths. Law and Human Behavior, 20, 207-217.
- Serin, R., & Amos, N. (1995). The role of psychopathy in the assessment of dangerousness. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 18, 231-238.

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

Serin, R., Peters, R., & Barbaree, H. (1990). Predictors of psychopathy and release outcome in a criminal population. Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 2, 419-422.

Simkins, L. (1993). Characteristics of sexually repressed child molesters. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8, 3-17.

Smith, R. (1978). The psychopath in society. NY: Academic Press.

Snyder, M. (1976). Attribution and behavior: Social perception and social causation. In J. Harvey, W. Ickes, & R. Kidd (Eds.), New directions in attribution research: Volume 1 (pp. 53-72).

Speilberger, C., Kling, J., & O'Hagan, S. (1978). Dimensions of psychopathic personality: Antisocial behaviour and anxiety. In R. Hare and D. Schalling (Eds.), Psychopathic behaviour: Approaches to research (pp. 23-46). NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Stermac, L., & Segal, Z. (1989). Adult sexual contact with children: An examination of cognitive factors. Behavior Therapy, 20, 573-584.

Stevens, G. (1994). Prison clinicians' perception of Antisocial Personality Disorder as a formal diagnosis. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 20, 159-185.

Sykes, G., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. American Sociological Review, 22, 664-670.

Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (1996). Using multivariate statistics. NY: HarperCollins College Publishers, Inc.

Tangney, J. (1990). Assessing individual differences in proneness to shame and guilt: Development of the self-conscious affect and attribution inventory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 102-111.

Tangney, J. (1991). Moral affect: The good, the bad, and the ugly. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 598-607.

Tangney, J. (1992). Situational determinants of shame and guilt in young adulthood. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 199-206.

Tangney, J., Wager, P., Fletcher, and Gramzow, R. (1992). Shamed into anger? The relation of shame and guilt to anger and self-reported aggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62, 669-675.

Tangney, J., Wager, P., Hill-Barlow, D., Marschall, D., & Gramzow, R. (1996). Relation of shame and guilt to constructive versus destructive responses to anger across the lifespan. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 797-809.

Taylor, L. (1972). The significance and interpretation of replies to motivational questions: The case of sex offenders. Sociology, 6, 23-39.

Ward, T., Hudson, S., & Marshall, W. (1995). Cognitive distortions and affective deficits in sex offenders: A cognitive deconstructionist interpretation. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 7, 67-83.

Weiner, B. (1995). Judgments of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct. NY: The Guilford Press.

Williamson, S., Hare, R., & Wong, S. (1987). Violence: Criminal Psychopaths and their victims. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 19, 454-462.

Wong, S. (1984). The criminal and institutional behaviours of psychopaths. Ottawa, Ontario: Programs Branch Users Reports, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.

Zinger, I., & Forth, A. (in press). Psychopathy and Canadian criminal proceedings. A review of case law and psychological research. Law and Human Behavior.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Items Comprising the PCL-R

1. Glibness/Superficial Charm
2. Grandiose Sense of Self-Worth
3. Need For Stimulation/Proneness to Boredom
4. Pathological Lying
5. Conning/Manipulative
6. Lack of Remorse or Guilt
7. Shallow Affect
8. Callous/Lack of Empathy
9. Parasitic Lifestyle
10. Poor Behavioural Controls
11. Promiscuous Sexual Behaviour
12. Early Behavioural Problems
13. Lack of Realistic, long-term Goals
14. Impulsivity
15. Irresponsibility
16. Failure to Accept Responsibility for Own Actions
17. Many Short Term Marital Relationships
18. Juvenile Delinquency
19. Revocation of Conditional Release
20. Criminal Versatility

Appendix B

Items Loading on Factor 1 and Factor 2 of the PCL-R

Factor 1: Interpersonal/Affective Items	Factor 2: Behaviour/Antisocial Items
1. Glibness/Superficial Charm	3. Need for Stimulation/Proneness to Boredom
2. Grandiose Sense of Self-Worth	9. Parasitic Lifestyle
4. Pathological Lying	10. Poor Behavioural Controls
5. Conning/Manipulative	12. Early Behavioural Problems
6. Lack of Remorse or Guilt	13. Lack of Realistic, Long-term Goals
8. Callous/Lack of Empathy	14. Impulsivity
16. Failure to Accept Responsibility for Own Actions	15. Irresponsibility
	18. Juvenile Delinquency
	19. Revocation of Conditional Release

Items not loading on either factor

- 11. Promiscuous Sexual Behaviour
- 17. Many Short Term Marital Relationships
- 20. Criminal Versatility

Appendix C

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR)
Version 6--Form 40

Read each of the statements below carefully, and then circle the number that indicates your agreement with it

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not true			Somewhat true			Very true

[The preceding scale follows each item in the questionnaire presented to participants]

1. My first impressions about people usually turn out to be right.
- *2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.
3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.
- *4. I have not always been honest with myself.
5. I always know why I like things.
- *6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.
7. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.
- *8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.
9. I am fully in control of my own fate.
- *10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.
11. I never regret my decisions.
- *12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.
13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.
- *14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.
15. I am a completely rational person.
- *16. I rarely appreciate criticism.
17. I am very confident of my judgments.
- *18. I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover.
19. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.
- *20. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.
- *21. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.
22. I never cover up my mistakes.
- *23. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
24. I never swear.
- *25. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
26. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.
- *27. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.

- 28. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
- *29. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
- 30. I always declare everything at customs
- *31. When I was young I sometimes stole things.
- 32. I have never dropped litter on the street.
- *33. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
- 34. I never read sexy books or magazines
- *35. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.
- 36. I never take things that don't belong to me.
- *37. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.
- 38. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
- *39. I have some pretty awful habits.
- 40. I don't gossip about other people's business.

Items 1-20 assess self deception; items 21-40 assess impression management. Add one point for every "6" or "7" (minimum = 0; maximum = 20).

* refers to items keyed in the "False" (negative) direction.

Appendix D

Disengagement Interview

The questions I will be asking will focus on the sex offense(s) that you are currently serving time for. As much as possible, I'd like you to recall what was happening then. Remember, everything you tell me is strictly confidential.

Before I ask you those questions, I would first like to ask you some demographic questions.

- i. How old are you?
- ii. What is the highest grade you've completed in school?
- iii. Are you married?
- iv. Do you have any children? Step-children? If so, how old are they?
- v. How did you support yourself on the street?

Now I'm going to ask you questions about your current offense.

1. What are you serving time for right now? How many counts? How many victims were involved altogether?
2. How long is your sentence? How much time do you have left? How long have you been at this institution?
3. Have you completed or are you currently involved in any programs? If so, what types? How many??
4. How did you plea? guilty or not guilty?

For each victim:

5. Now, in your own words, I want you to describe your interaction with the/each child (if there were a number of interactions with the same child, then describe the most representative).

First let the offender provide a general answer. Then ask him the following questions if not answered in description.

- a) How old was the victim(s)?

- b) Was it a boy or a girl?
 - c) How did you know him/her?
 - d) Did you know him/her before the sexual interaction(s) started? If so, how long?
 - e) Were you drinking or stoned at the time of the offense?
 - f) Were you the only person involved, or were you with others?
 - g) Was it planned or was it spur of the moment?
6. Right after the interaction, how do you think this child felt?
Emotionally?? Physically??
7. Do you think the child benefited in any way from this experience? If so, how?
8. Right after the interaction, how did you feel? Why did you feel that way?
Did you tell anyone? Why/Why not?

If the victim is now a teenager or adult, ask:

9. Do you think this experience had an effect on his/her relationships with other people? (i.e., family, friends, boyfriends/girlfriends)
- If yes, what kind of effect? why?
- If no, why not?

If the victim is still a child, ask:

10. Do you think this experience will have an effect on his/her relationships with other people? (i.e., family, friends, boyfriends/girlfriends)
- If yes, what kind of effect? why?
- If no, why not?

11. Why do you think this interaction occurred? That is, why do you think you and this person had sexual contact?

Who or what is to blame for this event? Why?

For the next few questions, I'd like you to reflect on your interaction(s) with XX.

12. On a scale from 1 to 4 (1=none, 2=somewhat, 3=mostly, 4=entirely) how much do you think the interaction is due to...
- a) ...some behaviour or characteristics of the child?
 - b) ...your emotional state at the time (i.e., stress, frustration, arousal)?
 - c) ...your experiences growing up (i.e., experienced abuse as a child, had problems at home)?
 - d) ...alcohol or drugs that were consumed at the time?
 - e) ...lack of control on your part?
 - f) ...feeling more comfortable with children, lack of social skills, etc. (i.e., personal defects)?

Appendix E

Disengagement Interview Coding Scheme

A. Attribution of Blame (coded on 1-4 scale by respondent)

1. Victim Blame

Degree to which offense is attributed to the behaviour or characteristics of the victim.

0. Not at all	N/A (not asked/applicable)
1. Somewhat	D/K (offender answers "don't know")
2. Mostly	
3. Entirely	

2. Distress/Emotional Factors

Degree to which the offense is attributed to the offender's emotional state (i.e., stress, frustration, arousal).

0. Not at all	N/A
1. Somewhat	D/K
2. Mostly	
3. Entirely	

3. Childhood Experience

Degree to which the offense is attributed to the offender's upbringing (i.e., experiences growing up, childhood sexual abuse)

0. Not at all	N/A
1. Somewhat	D/K
2. Mostly	
3. Entirely	

4. Substance Abuse

Degree to which the offense is attributed to substance abuse (was intoxicated/high at the time).

0. Not at all	N/A
1. Somewhat	D/K
2. Mostly	
3. Entirely	

5. Control problems

Degree to which the offense is attributed to lack of control.

0. Not at all	N/A
1. Somewhat	D/K
2. Mostly	
3. Entirely	

6. Personal "Deficiencies"

Degree to which the offense is attributed to personal deficiencies (i.e., feeling uncomfortable with peers, inadequate, lack of social skills, etc.).

0. Not at all	N/A
1. Somewhat	D/K
2. Mostly	
3. Entirely	

B. Justifications versus excuses

1. Excuses

Degree to which individual denies personal responsibility or causality for the offense (such as alcohol/drugs, accident, emotional arousal over which the offender has no control, situational factors; i.e., offender reports their crime was accidental or due to alcohol/drugs, or state of mind, hormones).

0. Not at all	N/A
1. Somewhat	D/K
2. Mostly	

3. Entirely

2. Justification

Degree to which the individual accepts personal responsibility for the offense by attempting to justify the act in terms of certain valid reasons or norms (i.e., offender mentions victim wrong doing, or conflicts he had with victim, relationship with victim, showing love to victim etc.).

0. Not at all	N/A
1. Somewhat	D/K
2. Mostly	
3. Entirely	

C. Consequences to victim

1. Negative

Degree to which the incident emotionally and/or physically hurt the child (i.e., look at issues such as, effect on present/future relationships, how they felt afterward).

0. Not at all	N/A
1. Little	D/K
2. Somewhat	
3. Definitely	

2. Beneficial

Degree to which the incident benefited the child (i.e., teaches them something (e.g., love, sex, relationships, life), shows them something (e.g., love, care)).

0. Not at all	N/A
1. Little	D/K
2. Somewhat	
3. Definitely	

E. Offender's feelings after contact

1. Guilt feelings

Degree to which offender experienced negative emotions following the contact (i.e., guilty, bad, regretful, remorseful).

0. Not at all	N/A
1. Little	D/K
2. Somewhat	
3. Definitely	

Appendix F

Attribution for Criminal Events (ACE)

Please think about your current sex offense(s) and answer the following questions based on it/them.

What is the importance of the following factors in contributing to your current sex offense(s)? (if the item doesn't apply to you, circle "1" for "not at all important").

	Not at all important					Very important			
1. I was unemployed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
2. I was abused as a child	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
3. I have a chronic alcohol problem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
4. I have a bad temper	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
5. I had problems at home	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
6. I am convinced easily by others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
7. I was drinking at the time of the incident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
8. My parents didn't treat me right	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
9. I wanted to maintain my pride	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
10. I wanted to maintain control	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
11. I was under stress	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
12. I was on drugs (other than alcohol)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
13. I defended myself in self-defense	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
14. The victim was doing something I didn't like	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
15. I was influenced by my friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
16. I needed the money	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
17. I am immature	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
18. Crime is a part of my personality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
19. I grew up or lived in a bad neighborhood	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
20. I wanted to stand-up for myself	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
21. I have a lack of control	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
22. I was frustrated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
23. I was aroused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
24. I wanted to uphold my reputation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
25. It was an accident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
26. The victim asked for it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

27. The victim started it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
28. The situation I was in caused me to do it	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
29. I was psychologically disturbed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Others (please list):

_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Appendix G

Cognition Scale (CS)

Read each of the statements below carefully, and then circle the number that indicates your agreement with it.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

[The preceding scale follows each item in the questionnaire presented to participants]

1. If a young child stares at my genitals it means the child likes what she/he sees and is enjoying watching my genitals.
2. A man is justified in having sex with his children or step-children, if his partner doesn't like sex.
3. A child 13 or younger can make her/his own decision as to whether she/he wants to have sex with an adult or not.
4. A child who doesn't physically resist an adult's sexual advances, really wants to have sex with the adult.
5. If a 13 year old (or younger) child flirts with an adult, it means he/she wants to have sex with the adult.
6. Sex between a 13 year old (or younger) child and an adult causes the child no emotional problems.
7. Having sex with a child is a good way for an adult to teach the child about sex.
8. If I tell my young child (step-child or close relative) what to do sexually and they do it, that means they will always do it because they really want to.

9. When a young child has sex with an adult, it helps the child learn how to relate to adults in the future.
10. Most children 13 (or younger) would enjoy having sex with an adult, and it wouldn't harm the child in the future.
11. Children don't tell others about having sex with a parent (or other adult) because they really like it and want to continue.
12. Sometime in the future, our society will realize that sex between a child and adult is all right.
13. An adult can tell if having sex with a young child will emotionally damage the child in the future.
14. An adult just feeling a child's body all over without touching her/his genitals is not really being sexual with the child.
15. I shown my love and affection to a child by having sex with her/him.
16. It's better to have sex with your child (or someone else's child) than to have an affair.
17. An adult fondling a young child or having the child fondle the adult will not cause the child any harm.
18. A child will never have sex with an adult unless the child really wants to.
19. My daughter/son or other young child knows that I will still love her/him even if she/he refuses to be sexual with me.
20. When a young child asks an adult about sex, it means that she/he wants to see the adult's sex organ or have sex with the adult.
21. If an adult has sex with a young child it prevents the child from having sexual hang-ups in the future.
22. When a young child walks in front of me with no or only a few clothes on, she/he is trying to arouse me.

23. My relationship with my daughter/son or other child is strengthened by the fact that we have sex together.
24. If a child has sex with an adult, the child will look back at the experience as an adult and see it as a positive experience.
25. The only way I could do harm to a child when having sex with her/him would be to use physical force to get her/him to have sex with me.
26. When children watch an adult masturbate, it helps the child learn about sex.
27. An adult can know just how much sex between him/her and a child will hurt the child later on.
28. If a person is attracted to sex with children, he/she should solve that problem themselves and not talk to professionals. *[this item omitted in present study]*

Appendix H

Cognition Scale Filler Items

1. A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.
2. People are so complex it is hard to know what “makes them tick.”
3. One reason that women falsely report a rape is that they frequently have a need to call attention to themselves.
4. If you give the average person a job to do and leave him or her to do it, the person will finish it successfully.
5. When women go around braless or wearing short shirts and tight tops, they are just asking for trouble.
6. If most people could get into a movie without paying and be sure they were not seen, they would do it.
7. Women who get raped while hitchhiking get what they deserve.
8. The typical person is sincerely concerned about the problems of others.
9. If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she’s just met there, she should be considered, “fair game” to other males at the party who want to have sex with her too, whether she wants to or not.
10. There is far too much emphasis on success and getting ahead in our society; people are becoming things or objects rather than human beings.
11. Women’s position in our society is about as equal as could reasonably be expected.
12. In a country like ours, with its wealth and technology, the fact there are millions of families living below the “poverty line” means that there is something terribly wrong with our economic system.
13. Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.

14. If you want people to do a job right, you should explain things to them in great detail and supervise them closely.
15. If a girl engages in necking or petting and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her.
16. Most people do not hesitate to go out of their way to help someone in trouble.
17. A woman who is stuck-up and thinks she is too good to talk to guys on the street deserves to be taught a lesson.
18. Most people would stop and help a person whose car is disabled.
19. The average person is conceited.
20. Most people exaggerate their troubles in order to get sympathy.
21. Most people will speak out for what they believe in.
22. Nowadays many people won't make a move until they find out what other people think.
23. The important thing in being successful nowadays is not how hard you work, but how well you fit in with the crowd.
24. If a person tries hard enough, he will usually reach his goals in life.
25. Most persons have a lot of control over what happens to them in life.
26. Most people have a good idea of what their strengths and weaknesses are.
27. Our success in life is pretty much determined by forces outside our own control.
28. There's little one can do to alter his fate in life.
29. I think you can never really understand the feelings of other people.
30. You can't classify everyone as good or bad.
31. Any female can get raped.

32. When I meet a person, I look for one basic characteristic through which I try to understand him.
33. A person's reaction to things differs from one situation to another.
34. Different people react to the same situation in different ways.
35. A child who is popular will be popular as an adult, too.
36. Most people would be horrified if they knew how much news that the public hears and sees is distorted.

Appendix I

Test of Self-Conscious Affect - Social Deviant Version (TOSCA-SD)

Below are some situations, followed by some common reactions to these situations. As you read each scenario, try to imagine yourself in that situation. Then indicate how likely you would be to react to each of the ways described. Please rate all the responses since people may feel or react more than one way to the same situation, or they may react different ways at different times.

For example:

A. You wake up early one Saturday morning. It is cold and rainy outside.

- | | not
likely | 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 | very
likely |
|--|---------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| a) You would telephone a friend to catch up on the news. | 1----- | 2----- | 3-----4-----5 |
| b) You would take the extra time to read the paper. | 1----- | 2----- | 3-----4-----5 |
| c) You would feel disappointed that it's raining. | 1----- | 2----- | 3-----4-----5 |
| d) You would wonder why you woke up so early. | 1----- | 2----- | 3-----4-----5 |

In the above example, I've rated ALL of the answers by circling a number. I circled a "1" for answer (a) because I wouldn't want to wake up a friend very early on a Saturday morning--so it's not at all likely that I would do that. I circled a "5" for answer (b) because I almost always read the paper if I have time in the morning (very likely). I circled a "3" for answer (c) because for me it's about half and half. Sometimes I would be disappointed about the rain then sometimes I wouldn't--it would depend on what I had planned. And I circled a "4" for answer (d) because I would probably wonder why I had awakened so early.

Please do not skip any items--rate all responses.

[the scale above is presented following each item, as in the example, in the questionnaire presented to participants]

1. You make plans to meet a friend for lunch. At 5 o'clock you realize you stood him up.

- a) You would think: "I'm inconsiderate".
- b) You would think: "Well, he'll understand".
- c) You would try to make it up to him as soon as possible.
- d) You would think: "My boss distracted me just before lunch".

2. You break something at a restaurant and then hide it.

- a) You would think: "This is making me anxious. I need to fix it or talk to the ---- manager".
- b) You leave as quickly as you can.
- c) You would think: "A lot of things are not made very well these days".
- d) You would think: "It was only an accident".

3. You make a mistake at work and find out a co-worker is blamed for the error.

- a) You would think that the company did not like the co-worker.
- b) You would think: "Too bad, life is not fair".
- c) You would keep quiet and avoid the co-worker.
- d) You would feel unhappy and eager to correct the situation.

4. While playing around, you throw a ball and it hits your friend in the face.

- a) You would feel inadequate that you can't even throw a ball.
- b) You would think maybe your friend needs more practice at catching. ---
- c) You would think: "It was just an accident".
- d) You would apologize and make sure your friend feels better.

5. You are driving down the road and hit a small animal.

- a) You would think that the animal shouldn't have been on the road.
- b) You would think: "I'm terrible".
- c) You would feel: "Well, it was an accident".
- d) You would probably think it over several times wondering if you could have avoided it.

6. **You make a big mistake on an important project at work. People are - ---- depending on you and your boss criticizes you.**
 - a) You would think your boss should have been more clear about what was expected of you.
 - b) You would feel like you wanted to hide.
 - c) You would think: "I should have recognized the problem
 - d) You would think: "Well, nobody's perfect".
7. **You borrow your friend's car and accidentally scratch it.**
 - a) You think that they sure make cars cheaply these days.
 - b) You would think: "No big deal, his insurance will cover it".
 - c) You would apologize and offer to repair it.
 - d) You would never ask to borrow anything again.
8. **You go out on a date with a woman/man and have sex. Afterwards she/he says that she/he felt forced into it.**
 - a) You would think: "She/he will soon get over it".
 - b) You would think: "I am a disgusting person".
 - c) You would try to understand what you did to hurt her/him.
 - d) You would think that she/he really enjoyed it and is just trying to get back at you.
9. **You are working with several other people on a rush job. You don't do your part and the job is late.**
 - a) You would think that the job wasn't that important anyhow.
 - b) You would think that the others should have done more to help.
 - c) You would be afraid of being criticized so you phone in sick.
 - d) You would go to your boss and take responsibility for the job being late.
10. **A woman asks you for directions. After you have given her the directions, she hurries off. You then realize the directions were wrong.**
 - a) You think that she will find her way anyway.
 - b) You would feel badly for having misled her.
 - c) You leave before she has a chance to realize that your directions were wrong.
 - d) You think that since she hurried off so fast, it is no wonder she gets lost.

11. You want to buy some exercise equipment from your friend and he offers to let you pay next month. Once you get the equipment, you realize you will not be able to pay until next year.

- a) You explain your situation and offer to return the equipment.
- b) You keep the equipment, but feel so badly that you don't use it.
- c) You think that it is your boss's fault for not giving you a raise.
- d) You would figure that he probably doesn't need the money, otherwise he would not have given you the equipment in the first place.

12. You are telling loud jokes at a party and say something that hurts one of your friend's feelings.

- a) You would feel badly about offending your friend and think about how to avoid it in the future.
- b) You immediately become silent and leave at the first opportunity.
- c) You think it was only a joke and he will get over it.
- d) You think: "These guys have no sense of humor".

13. You leave out rat poison that accidentally kills your neighbour's cat.

- a) You think that the cat was pretty stupid to eat rat poison.
- b) You go to your neighbour and apologize.
- c) You would feel small...like an idiot.
- d) You would think: "He can always get another cat".

Scoring Key

E = externalization

M = minimization/detached

G = construction/guilt

S = shame/avoidance

Question	Response			
	a	b	c	d
1.	S	M	G	E
2.	G	S	E	M
3.	E	M	S	G
4.	S	E	M	G
5.	E	S	M	G
6.	E	S	G	M
7.	E	M	G	S
8.	M	S	G	E
9.	M	E	S	G
10.	M	G	S	E
11.	G	S	E	M
12.	G	S	M	E
13.	E	G	S	M

Appendix J

Questionnaire Instructions

Thank you for agreeing to complete this questionnaire. On the next few pages you will be asked a number of questions--there are no right or wrong answers (this is not a test); we are interested in your opinions. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential, only your identification code developed for this study will appear on the questionnaire to ensure confidentiality.

There are five parts to this booklet, please read the instructions for each part. Make sure you answer every question. Please answer the questions in the order that they appear in the booklet. If you make an error and wish to make an alternative answer for a question, please cross out the undesired answer and clearly make the appropriate choice.

Some questions are very similar, so it is important for you to read the questions very carefully before answering them.

If you have any questions, feel free to ask the investigator. Please be sure to answer all the questions.

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix K

File Review Coding Manual

Identification Code: _____
Date of Consent: _____
Date Interviewed: _____
Date of File Review: _____

A. Offender Demographics

1. Date of Birth (yy/mm/dd): ____/____/____

2. Ethnicity

1. Caucasian
2. Asian
3. Black
4. Native
5. Other (specify): _____
9. not known

3. Preferred working language

1. English
2. French
3. Other (specify): _____
9. not known

B. Marital/Family Background

1. Marital status at time of conviction

1. Single/never married
2. Common-law union (relationship more than six months)
3. Married
4. Separated
5. Divorced
6. Widowed
9. not known

2. Enter the exact number of years of formal education

i.e., Someone who has completed a master's degree would be given 19 years of formal education

3. Employment status at the time of the conviction

1. Employed
2. Unemployed
3. Student
4. On social assistance (welfare, UI)
5. On pension
6. Other (specify): _____
9. not known

C. Treatment History

1. Offender has received or is currently undergoing sex offender treatment since the date of admission for the current sex offense

1. Yes
2. No
9. not known

D. Details of the Most Recent Sex Offense

1. Age of offender when most recent sex offense(s) occurred

9. not known

2. Duration of sexual offending (from first assault to most recent following completion of last prison sentence for a sexual offense) in months

8. one occurrence
9. not known

3. Date charged (yy/mm/dd)

___/___/___

4. Date convicted (yy/mm/dd)

___/___/___

5. Length in months of carceral sentence

999. Indeterminate sentence (Dangerous offender)

6. Current sex offense charge(s):

_____	X	___	___
_____	X	___	___
_____	X	___	___
_____	X	___	___

7. Total number of sexual victims in most recent sex offense(s)

9. not known

Items 8 through 24 should be coded for each sexual victim.

8. Number of victims

9. Sex of victim(s)

1. Male
2. Female
3. Male and Female
9. not known

10. Age of victim(s)

1. ____ Youngest
2. ____ Oldest
9. not known

11. Relationship of victim(s) to offender (indicate number of victims)

1. ____ Casual acquaintance
2. ____ Significant other (student, neighbor, team participant)
3. ____ Stranger

Code "2" if victim belonged to a club such as Boy Scouts or a Sports team in which the offender was in a position of authority, such as a leader or coach.

E. Official Criminal History Record (adult)

Enter the number of offenses (charges and convictions) for each individual crime. If there is none enter "0". This section is to be coded exclusively from official criminal history FPS records.

Nonviolent offenses

1. ____ Theft, breaking and entering, possession of housebreaking tools, possession of stolen property, theft of telecommunications, disguise with intent, forcible entry, unlawfully in a dwelling house.
2. ____ Drug offenses (possession, trafficking).
3. ____ Criminal negligence, including serious driving offenses (impaired or dangerous driving, failure to stop at the scene of an accident, hit-and-run).
4. ____ Fraud, forgery, false pretenses, impersonation, uttering, possession of a stolen credit card.
5. ____ Escape, unlawfully at large, prison break

6. ____ ____ Obstruction of justice, perjury, contempt of court, resist arrest, give contrary evidence.
7. ____ ____ Crimes against the state, including treason, espionage, smuggling, evasion of income tax, contempt of court, resist arrest, and giving contrary evidence.
8. ____ ____ Miscellaneous offenses, including vandalism, causing a disturbance, mischief, willful damage, trespassing, conspiracy to commit, setting off a fire alarm, vagrancy, contributing to juvenile delinquency, living off the avails of prostitution, attempted suicide, harassing phone calls, and minor driving offenses (e.g., driving while license suspended).
9. ____ ____ age onset of nonviolent offenses (adult).

Violent Offenses (excluding sexual-related crimes)

10. ____ ____ Robbery, armed robbery, robbery with violence, extortion.
11. ____ ____ Assault, assault causing bodily harm.
12. ____ ____ Uttering threats, taking place in a riot, intimidation.
13. ____ ____ Attempted murder.
14. ____ ____ Murder.
15. ____ ____ Manslaughter.
16. ____ ____ Possession of a weapon, possession of explosives.
17. ____ ____ Assault with a weapon, pointing a firearm.
18. ____ ____ Arson, firesetting.
19. ____ ____ Kidnapping, unlawful confinement, forcible seizure, hijacking.
20. ____ ____ Wounding.
21. ____ ____ Other

22. ____ ____ Age of onset for violent offenses (adult).

Sexual Offenses (excludes current sex offense)

For this section the primary source of information will be obtained from two sources:
Official criminal history records and institutional files.

23. _____ X ____ ____

24. _____ X ____ ____

25. _____ X ____ ____

26. _____ X ____ ____

27. _____ X ____ ____

28. _____ X ____ ____

29. ____ ____ Age onset of sexual offending (adult)

Appendix L

Information Form (Federal/Sexual Offender)

This study is aimed at examining the background factors and attitudes of sex offenders. This information would be helpful in improving treatment programs in institutions like this one. This study is being conducted by Janice Cripps, a Master's candidate from Carleton University under the direct supervision of Dr. Adelle Forth.

Each individual who takes part in the study will be asked to fill out a questionnaire booklet, and to be interviewed. The interview will take from 30 to 45 minutes and the questionnaire booklet should take about 45 minutes to complete. Most of the questions are about your attitudes and the circumstances and motivations surrounding current sex offense(s). I would also like to obtain some information from institutional files. The interview will audio-taped. This will allow me to concentrate on what you have to say, rather than half listening while trying to take notes.

If you agree to participate, you will be helping me and perhaps also other residents, at this institution and ones like it. It is also important to understand that I am **ONLY** collecting information, and that I **DO NOT** have any official positions within Correctional Services Canada (CSC).

Whatever you tell me will be kept strictly confidential, and all information will be coded in our reports so that no person's answers could be identified. The interview tapes, information collected from your institutional files and questionnaire, will be kept in separate compartments in a locked filing cabinet. Your name will not be put on this material, rather, you will have a code number (which you will formulate). This confidentiality is guaranteed by the Canadian Human Rights Act, and I will also give my personal guarantee that it is respected.

The data will be used **ONLY** for research purposes. Whether or not you agree to participate will **NOT** count for or against you with CSC. It is strictly voluntary and you may choose to leave or refuse to answer any questions. However, if you do agree to take part I will try my best to listen to what you have to say.

If you have any questions now, please ask them. If you have any comments or questions about this study later, you should call Dr. Adelle Forth (613-520-2600 ext. 1267). Or you may also wish to write to myself or Dr. Forth at the Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 5B6. If you are still not satisfied, you should call or write to the Chair of the Psychology Department, Dr. Bill Jones (613-520-2600, ext. 2644).

Appendix M

Information Form (Federal/Nonsexual Offender)**I need your help...**

My name is Janice and I am currently working toward my career goal of becoming a psychologist in an institution much like this one. However, in order to reach this goal I must complete my Master's degree (through Carleton University). In an effort to complete my degree by the end of this summer, I am asking for your help; that is, I am asking you to participate in a research project. This project is aimed at examining the background factors and attitudes/beliefs of offenders. The goal of this project is in improving treatment programs in institutions like this one.

This project involves three parts: 1) questionnaire, which will take about 45 minutes to complete, 2) interview, which will take approximately 30 to 45 minutes, and 3) a review of your institutional file. Most of the questions are about your attitudes/beliefs, and the circumstances and motivations surrounding your current offense(s). The interview will be audio-taped; this will allow me to concentrate on what you have to say, rather than half listening while trying to take notes. The tape will be destroyed once the project is completed.

If you agree to participate, you will not only be helping me, but you may also be helping other residents, at this institution and ones like it. It is also important to understand that I am **ONLY** collecting information, and that I **DO NOT** have any official positions within Correctional Services Canada (CSC). The information you provide me with will be used **ONLY** for research purposes. Whether or not you agree to participate will **NOT** count for or against you with CSC. It is strictly voluntary and you may choose to leave or refuse to answer any questions. However, if you do agree to take part I will try my best to listen to what you have to say.

Whatever you tell me will be kept strictly confidential, and all information will be coded in our reports so that no person's answers could be identified (i.e., just like it is when you complete the Canada Census every 5 years). The interview tapes, information collected from your institutional files and questionnaire, will be kept in separate compartments in a locked filing cabinet, in which I only have access. Your name will **NOT** be put on this material, rather, you will have a code number (which you will formulate). This confidentiality is guaranteed by the Canadian Human Rights Act, and I will also give my personal guarantee that it is respected.

Also, although there are 3 parts to this project, you may decide that you would only like to consent to only one or two parts; for example, you may agree to complete the questionnaire, but not the interview, or vice-versa. That's OK; however, your participation in all three parts would be greatly appreciated.

Please take some time and consider participating in this project. I will be in touch within the next few days/week(s) to ask you, once again, if you would help me. Your assistance is needed and appreciated.

Thank you.

Janice Cripps

Appendix N

Information Form (Provincial)

This study is aimed at examining the background factors and attitudes of sex offenders. This information would be helpful in improving treatment programs in institutions like this one.

This study is being conducted by Janice Cripps, a Master's candidate from Carleton University under the direct supervision of Dr. Adelle Forth.

Each individual who takes part in the study will be asked to fill out a questionnaire booklet, and to be interviewed. The interview will take from 1.5 to 3 hours and the questionnaire booklet should take about 30 minutes to complete. Most of the questions are about your attitudes, personal/family history, employment/education history, past offense history, current offense history, and the circumstances and motivations surrounding past and current sex offenses. I would also like to obtain some information from institutional files. The interview will be audio-taped. This will allow me to concentrate on what you have to say, rather than half listening while trying to take notes.

If you agree to participate, you will be helping me and perhaps also other residents, at this institution and ones like it. It is also important to understand that I am **ONLY** collecting information, and that I **DO NOT** have any official positions within the Ontario Correctional Institute.

Whatever you tell me will be kept strictly confidential, and all information will be coded in our reports so that no person's answers could be identified. The interview tapes, information collected from your institutional files and questionnaire, will be kept in separate compartments in a locked filing cabinet. Your name will not be put on this material, rather, you will have a code number (which you will formulate). This confidentiality is guaranteed by the Canadian Human Rights Act, and I will also give my personal guarantee that it is respected.

The data will be used **ONLY** for research purposes. Whether or not you agree to participate will **NOT** count for or against you, in any way, with the Ontario Correctional Institute (i.e., in terms of treatment provided, sentence, parole decisions, etc.). The information gathered about you will **NOT** be placed in your institutional file. Participation is strictly voluntary and you may choose to leave or refuse to answer any

questions. However, if you do agree to take part I will try my best to listen to what you have to say.

If you have any questions now, please ask them. If you have any comments or questions about this study later, you should call Dr. Adelle Forth (613-520-2600 ext. 1267). Or you may also wish to write to myself or Dr. Forth at the Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 5B6. If you are still not satisfied, you should call or write to the Chair of the Psychology Department, Dr. Bill Jones (613-520-2600, ext. 2644).

Appendix O

Consent Form #1 (Federal)

I, _____ have been asked to take part in a study about the background factors and attitudes of sex offenders which is being conducted by Janice Cripps, under the supervision of Dr. Adelle Forth from the Department of Psychology at Carleton University. I have read the "Information Form" describing the study.

I understand that my participation in this study is purely voluntary. I am free to refuse to answer any specific questions, and I may withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that my participation in the study will not count against me in any way with Correctional Services Canada.

I understand that any information I give will be strictly confidential. My answers will be used for scientific purposes, in order to better understand the personal factors that may influence people to commit sexual offenses. I have been told that answers will be coded or changed so that I cannot be identified in any report of the results.

I agree to take part in this study, and to be interviewed by Janice Cripps about my life experiences, particularly of the offenses I have committed. I also agree to allow this interview to be audio-taped.

I also agree to fill out questionnaires about my attitudes, behaviours, and experiences. Finally, I agree to allow the researcher to obtain additional information from my institutional files.

My signature below indicates that I have read the above, and that I agree to take part and give my consent to the researcher having access to my institutional files. The researcher will also sign to guarantee the conditions stated above.

Inmate's signature

Date

Researcher's signature

Date

Appendix P

Consent Form (Provincial)

I, _____ have been asked to take part in a study about the background factors and attitudes of sex offenders which is being conducted by Janice Cripps, under the supervision of Dr. Adelle Forth from the Department of Psychology at Carleton University. I have read the "Information Form" describing the study.

I understand that my participation in this study is purely voluntary. I am free to refuse to answer any specific questions, and I may withdraw from the study at any time.

I understand that any information I give will be strictly confidential and that this information will not be placed in my institutional file. In addition, I understand that the information gathered will not be placed in my institutional file. My answers will be used for scientific purposes, in order to better understand the personal factors that may influence people to commit sexual offenses. I have been told that answers will be coded or changed so that I cannot be identified in any report of the results. In keeping with the purpose of this study, I have been told that my participation will not influence count for or against me, in any way, with the Ontario Correctional Institute (i.e., in terms of treatment provided, sentence, parole decisions, etc.).

I agree to take part in this study, and to be interviewed by Janice Cripps about my life experiences, particularly of the offenses I have committed. I also agree to allow this interview to be audio-taped.

I also agree to fill out questionnaires about my attitudes, behaviours, and experiences. Finally, I agree to allow the researcher to obtain additional information from my institutional files.

My signature below indicates that I have read the above, and that I agree to take part and give my consent to the researcher having access to my institutional files. The researcher will also sign to guarantee the conditions stated above.

Resident's signature

Date

Researcher's signature

Date

Appendix Q

Consent Form #2 (Federal)

I. _____ have agreed to take part in a study about the background factors and attitudes of sex offenders which is being conducted by Janice Cripps, under the supervision of Dr. Adelle Forth from the Department of Psychology at Carleton University. I have read the "Information Form" describing the study.

I understand that my participation in this study is purely voluntary. I am free to refuse to answer any specific questions, and I may withdraw from the study at any time. I understand that my participation in the study will not count against me in any way with Correctional Services Canada.

I understand that any information I give will be strictly confidential. My answers will be used for scientific purposes, in order to better understand the personal factors that may influence people to commit sexual offenses. I have been told that answers will be coded or changed so that I cannot be identified in any report of the results.

I agree to be interviewed by Janice Cripps about my life experiences, particularly of the offenses I have committed. I also agree to allow this interview to be audio-taped.

I also agree to fill out questionnaires about my attitudes, behaviours, and experiences.

My signature below indicates that I have read the above, and that I agree to take part. The researcher will also sign to guarantee the conditions stated above.

Inmate's signature

Date

Researcher's signature

Date

Appendix R

Participant Form

Institution: _____

Name: _____

Identification #: _____

Unit #: ____ (Provincial)

Consent signed: ____ / ____ / ____
 y y m m d dQuestionnaire booklet start: ____ / ____ / ____ ____:____ am/pm
 y y m m d dfinish: ____ / ____ / ____ ____:____ am/pm
 y y m m d dFile Review start: ____ / ____ / ____
 y y m m d dfinish: ____ / ____ / ____
 y y m m d dInterview start: ____ / ____ / ____ ____:____ am/pm
 y y m m d dfinish: ____ / ____ / ____ ____:____ am/pm
 y y m m d d

Type of Setting: _____

PCL-R Rating: ____ / ____ / ____ Rater: _____
 y y m m d dCSR Rating: ____ / ____ / ____ Rater: _____
 y y m m d d

Appendix S

Feedback Form

One way in which our behaviour is controlled is by the way we think about it. If we think we behaved in a way that violated our own beliefs and those of society in general, then we may experience negative emotions, such as guilt and disappointment. As a result, we won't behave that way again. People tend to behave in ways that make them feel good about themselves, while they avoid behaving in a way that makes them feel bad about themselves. However, this does not always happen this way; people sometimes do things that make them feel bad, but continue that behaviour. One way this happens is by changing the way they think about the behaviour. People can change the way they think about: 1) why the behaviour happened, that is, they can justify or excuse the behaviour; 2) the consequences of their behaviour, that is, they can distort or minimize the negative effect their behaviour actually had on someone; 3) the attribution of blame for the behaviour, for example, they can attribute the blame to alcohol/drugs, stress, or to the victim, rather than accepting the blame themselves. After restructuring ones' thoughts about the behaviour, it then becomes easier to continue the behaviour.

Past research has shown that people who behave in ways that harm others tend to have attitudes that minimize, justify, or even rationalize their offending behaviour. For example, a property offender may feel that a person deserved their home being broken into if they found a window unlocked; a sex offender may feel their behaviour benefited the victim, or that the victim had motivations for the contact.

The purpose of the study you participated in was to examine the use of the mechanisms I mentioned above (justification, minimizing consequences, and attribution of blame) in offenders, and how they relate to personal characteristics, such as past anti-social behaviours, their interactions with others, and their emotional being.

The results of this study will help institutions like this one to develop appropriate treatment programs for offenders who have committed an offense against another person.

If you have any comments or questions about this study, you should write to myself or Dr. Adelle Forth at the Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 5B6. If you are still not satisfied, you should write to the Chair of the Psychology Department, Dr. Bill Jones.

Thank you for your participation, your help was greatly appreciated!

Appendix T

Inter-Correlations (r) (two-tailed) Between Disengagement Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2.	-.87 ^d	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3.	-.57 ^d	.49 ^c	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4.	.21	-.09	-.30 ^a	--	--	--	--	--	--
5.	.23	-.17	-.34 ^b	.05	--	--	--	--	--
6.	-.09	.16	.32 ^a	-.03	-.21	--	--	--	--
7.	.52 ^d	-.34 ^a	-.41 ^b	.25	.51 ^c	-.23	--	--	--
8.	-.24	.46 ^c	.39 ^b	-.03	-.18	.59 ^d	-.12	--	--
9.	-.68 ^d	.81 ^d	.75 ^d	-.16	-.28 ^a	.47 ^c	-.35 ^b	.82 ^d	--

Note. ^a $p < .10$. ^b $p < .05$. ^c $p < .005$. ^d $p < .001$. $df = 34$ to 45 .

Component variables comprising "self blame", "other blame", and "general disengagement" are not included. 1 = excuse. 2 = justification. 3 = minimize consequences. 4 = cognitive distortions. 5 = internal blame. 6 = external blame. 7 = self blame. 8 = other blame. 9 = general disengagement. "--" indicates not applicable.

Appendix U

Partial Inter-Correlations (two-tailed) Between Disengagement Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2	-.87 ^c	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3	-.56 ^c	.48 ^d	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4	.20	-.08	-.28 ^a	--	--	--	--	--	--
5	.21	-.15	-.31 ^a	-.02	--	--	--	--	--
6	-.05	.12	.27	.03	-.11	--	--	--	--
7	.51 ^c	-.32 ^a	-.39 ^b	.24	.49 ^d	-.18	--	--	--
8	-.21	.44 ^c	.35 ^b	.02	-.13	.52 ^c	-.05	--	--
9	-.68 ^c	.81 ^c	.74 ^c	-.13	-.24	.40 ^b	-.31 ^a	.79 ^c	--

Note. ^a $p < .10$, ^b $p < .05$, ^c $p < .01$, ^d $p < .005$, ^e $p < .001$. $df = 33$ to 42 . Component variables comprising "self blame", "other blame", and "general disengagement" are not included. 1 = excuse. 2 = justification. 3 = minimize consequences. 4 = cognitive distortions. 5 = internal blame. 6 = external blame. 7 = self blame. 8 = other blame. 9 = general disengagement. "--" indicates not applicable.

IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (QA-3)

APPLIED IMAGE, Inc
1653 East Main Street
Rochester, NY 14609 USA
Phone: 716/482-0300
Fax: 716/288-5989

© 1993, Applied Image, Inc., All Rights Reserved