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CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION

Background and Purpose

Since the 1960s, several forms of child maltreatment have entered widespread public awareness. One of these types, child sexual abuse (sometimes referred to as child molestation), has been recognized only within the past two decades as a serious social problem (Finkelhor, 1984c). Sgroi, Blick, and Porter (1982) defined child sexual abuse as "a sexual act imposed on a child who lacks emotional, maturational, and cognitive development" (p. 9). Reporting of offenses has increased dramatically, though it is likely that much adult sexual activity with children remains undetected (Finkelhor, Hotaling, & Yllo, 1988; Sheldon, 1988).

Recent data and clinical experiences have challenged the widely held view that an insignificant amount of child sexual abuse is perpetrated by women. Although available services are designed primarily to treat male abusers, programs for female offenders have begun to spring up around the country (Knopp & Lackey, 1989). As a consequence, there is a need for research to aid in the development of practice models tailored more specifically for work with female perpetrators (Mathews, 1987). Such research will facilitate development and testing of much-needed theoretical models to explain gender differences in needs and motivations of offenders.
In addition to its clinical relevance, research comparing men and women who sexually abuse children can serve broader purposes. To study perpetration by both males and females is to confront discrimination that is largely against women and children. Such discrimination stems from assumptions that, among those who sexually abuse children, females are somehow more "sick" or morally reprehensible than males. As possible consequences of such assumptions, female offenders may be treated punitively by the system or regarded as an extremely deviant and insignificant minority (Allen, 1989). To the extent that any group of perpetrators is socially defined as negligible, children and families whose lives are affected are also ignored.

Presently, very little knowledge exists concerning gender-based differences between perpetrators of child sexual abuse. The major aim of this dissertation is to explore the influence of what will be termed "gender factors"—gender and gender identity—on offenders' perceived sexual and emotional needs in relationships with adult partners.

For the purposes of this investigation, the term "gender" will be used to distinguish between males and females. This concept has often been used interchangeably with the term "sex," though a distinction can be drawn between the two. As a categorical variable, "sex" generally refers to the biological fact of being male or female (e.g., Al-Issa, 1982; Katchadourian, 1979). On the other hand, "gender" additionally takes into account social meanings of maleness and femaleness, over and above biological definitions (e.g., Al-Issa, 1982; Losh-Hesselbart, 1987).
The sense that men and women have of their own masculinity and femininity has been termed "gender identity" (Spence, 1985). In the present context, this term will be used to refer to self-attributions in accordance with cultural definitions. "Gender identity" has also been used in connection with psychiatric disorders, such as transsexualism (American Psychiatric Association, 1987); the latter use of the term will not apply in this dissertation. Moreover, the term can also be distinguished from the related concept of "gender role." That is, "identity" involves a cognitive self-representation, and "role" denotes behavior and rules of conduct consistent with social expectations (Money & Tucker, 1975; Spence, 1985).

In subsequent sections of this chapter, issues and literature will be reviewed concerning the general proposition that gender and gender identity affect perceived need fulfillment of child molesters in their intimate adult relationships. Four general areas will be covered: (a) the scope of male and female perpetration of child sexual abuse; (b) behavioral implications of gender and gender identity; (c) sexual and emotional need fulfillment of adult intimate partners; and (d) sexual and emotional relationship needs of child sexual abuse perpetrators. The research propositions and hypotheses will then be stated.

Literature Review

Scope of Male and Female Peretration

In this section, two approaches will be taken to review literature on the scope of male and female perpetration of child sexual abuse.
First, a historical perspective will be presented to acquaint the reader with cultural, legal, and professional traditions that have affected societal awareness of the extent of the problem. Next, literature will be reviewed concerning the incidence and prevalence of molestation by males and females.

Historical Perspective

Cultural and legal perspectives. Child sexual abuse is not new historically. Adult sexual activity with children, even socially sanctioned child prostitution, has been noted in Greek, Roman, and medieval times (Rush, 1980; Schultz, 1982). Clearly, history has shown that the phenomenon of child sexual abuse extends across cultures and epochs.

The vast majority of historical accounts have described perpetration by men against both male and female children. Nevertheless, mention has been made of women engaging in sexual acts with children. For example, one anecdote from early Rome depicted older women assisting and applauding an adult male's rape of a young girl (Schultz, 1982, pp. 21-22). According to another historical note, Sigmund Freud could not identify father-perpetrated incest as a factor in his own neurosis, though he apparently had early sexual experience with a female caretaker:

As [Freud's] letters to [colleague Wilhelm] Fliess reveal, he recalled that he, like so many European boys, had been introduced to sexuality in his earliest years not by his father but by his nanny (Rosenfeld, 1987, p. 487).

The legal environment has also been important historically in recognition of the problem. In the eighteenth century, Western societies
began to recognize the need for the state to assume ultimate protective power over children. This concept, known in the English legal tradition as the doctrine of *parens patriae*, has had its historical antithesis in society's high valuation of the sanctity of the family (Giovannoni, 1987). It has been suggested that, prior to the 1960s, reluctance to intrude upon the family's privacy contributed greatly to a failure to acknowledge any form of child abuse as a major problem (Giovannoni, Conklin, & Iiyama, 1978).

The 1960s marked a turning point in public and professional awareness and attitudes. After publication of "The Battered Child Syndrome" (Kempe, Silverman, Steele, Droegemueller, & Silver, 1962), a landmark article identifying the widespread physical abuse of children, a movement was started to enact state child abuse reporting statutes. Increased reporting of child sexual abuse followed an upsurge in reports of physical abuse. In addition, feminist activists in the 1970s publicized sexual abuse of children as acts of dominance and exploitation perpetrated almost exclusively by males (Finkelhor, 1982).

**Theoretical and clinical perspectives.** Theoretical and clinical views have also influenced societal awareness of, and response to, child sexual abuse. One theory in particular that has had considerable impact is Freud's psychoanalytic approach. Freudian theory has been very influential because of its emphasis on the incest taboo and because of its assertion that much sexual victimization reported by females is actually fantasized (Haugaard & Reppucci, 1988). Both of these ideas
discourage acceptance of child sexual abuse as anything other than a highly unusual occurrence.

Early theoretical work on child sexual abuse was based on the psychoanalytic strain (Meiselman, 1978). Such theory assumed the incest taboo to be a social norm so powerful that those who violate it "must be" pathological individuals. However, research has not supported the notion that many offenders, whether incestuous or nonincestuous, are extremely disturbed (e.g., Cavallin, 1966; Faller, 1987; Finkelhor, 1979; Krug, 1989; Wyatt, 1985). These findings have opened a door for development of theories that do not confine the range of potential offenders to those defined as extremely psychologically deviant.

As already mentioned, child sexual abuse has, for the most part, been framed as a male-perpetrated phenomenon. Indeed, most criminological theories have traditionally assumed that the deviant role is a male role, with the result that female criminality has been largely ignored in theory and research (Harris, 1977). In view of recent clinical and empirical evidence suggesting that the amount of child molestation by females is significant, it would seem prudent to appeal to explanations that do not assume female offenders to be extreme aberrations (Allen, 1989; Catanzarite & Combs, 1980; Groth, 1982). In the instance of women who sexually abuse children, a parallel can be drawn with the earlier reluctance--because of an assumption of extreme psychopathology in offenders--to "see" child sexual abuse in any form.

In historical perspective, it is apparent that the pattern has been one in which society "awakens" after being confronted with the existence
and magnitude of a problem. This awakening occurred first in regard to physical abuse and later in connection with sexual abuse by males. Another awakening is in progress—to the fact that the preponderance of child sexual abuse perpetrated by men does not constitute, as Finkelhor (1986) put it, a "male monopoly" (p. 126). Indeed, it appears that Finkelhor (1984b) made an appropriate assessment that "theories applicable to female offenders are badly needed" (p. 38).

Empirical Perspective

Recognizing female perpetration. Empirical literature on female perpetrators is scant, consisting primarily of case studies (e.g., Chasnoff et al., 1986; Goodwin & DiVasto, 1979; Krug, 1989; Lewis & Sarrel, 1969; Maisch, 1973; Margolis, 1984; Marvasti, 1986; Mathews, 1987; Sarrel & Masters, 1982; Wahl, 1960; Wolfe, 1985; Yates, 1982; Yorukoglu & Kemph, 1966). Commenting on the rate of detection of incestuous mothers, Groth (1982) made an early challenge to the assumption that sexual abuse of children by females is extremely rare:

Typically such women are described as retarded or psychotic, but in fact our clinical research would suggest that incest offenses by mothers may be more frequent than one would be led to believe from a review of the few cases documented in the literature. The socially accepted physical intimacy between a mother and her child may serve to mask incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse on the part of a mother. It may be that only sexually abusive mothers who are handicapped by serious mental illness or intellectual deficiency are detected since, by reason of their psychological impairment, they lack the skills to conceal successfully this behavior (p. 230).

Possible underreporting of female perpetration. Groth’s comments suggest two reasons why underreporting of female perpetration may occur. The first of these, discussed by Allen (1989) and by Catanzarite and
Combs (1980) is the potentially biasing effect of the assumption that only extremely psychologically impaired women would sexually abuse children. The second possibility is that women can more easily conceal sexual acts with children under the guise of maternal care. This possibility has been questioned by some authors (e.g., Finkelhor & Russell, 1984).

It is possible that the gender and age of victims differ for male and female perpetrators; these victim characteristics suggest further possibilities for relatively greater underreporting of female perpetration. Research suggests that female offenders have a higher percentage of male victims than do male molesters (Faller, 1987). In addition, perpetration against boys is thought to be more underreported than abuse of girls, possibly because of stigma attached to the victim’s insulted masculinity (Finkelhor, 1984a; Nasjleti, 1980). Thus, to the extent that female abusers have a higher percentage of male victims than do male offenders, and to the extent that victimization of boys is underreported, reporting of female perpetration is biased downward.

Another possible reason why female offenders might be less likely to be reported for child sexual abuse has to do with victims’ ages. Data show that victims’ ages at the time of onset tend to be much higher in studies of reported cases than in self-report surveys of victims. Finkelhor and Baron (1986) speculated that this reflects the likelihood that older children, who are cognitively better able to interpret the experience, are more likely to report abuse. Thus, further evidence of underreporting of female perpetration is suggested by recent studies.
showing that victims of female abusers tend to be younger than those of male molesters (Faller, 1987; Fehrenbach & Monastersky, 1988).

Both the nature and the extent of unreported child sexual abuse are major unanswered questions (Finkelhor, Hotaling, & Yllo, 1988). It is difficult to gauge the representativeness of samples of victims and offenders reported to professionals and agencies. If unreported cases differ from reported ones in terms of perpetrator variables, then a biased picture of offender characteristics is presented. Perpetrator gender is one variable that could be biased in reported cases.

Prevalence of victimization. Studies of the rates of victimization in the general population have given estimates of 3% to 31% for male children and 6% to 62% for females (Peters, Wyatt, & Finkelhor, 1986). Although estimates vary considerably--mostly because of differences in methodology and definitions of child sexual abuse--all of them show that a substantial number of children are victimized. What has been more controversial, however, is the extent of female perpetration. Prior to reviewing investigations of perpetrator sex ratios, two survey studies will be described in which inquiry was limited to the prevalence and nature of sexual contact by females with younger males.

In a sample of 83 incarcerated male rapists 49 (59%) indicated an experience before age 16 of molestation by an older female (Petrovich & Templer, 1984). The victims' ages at the time of the abuse ranged from 4 to 16, with a mean age of 10.8. A total of 73 female perpetrators was identified, and of these, 56 (77%) molested more than once. Sixty (82%) of the 73 female perpetrators engaged in sexual intercourse with their
victims. Twenty (24%) of the 83 inmates reported molestation before age 12 by at least one female age 16 or older. Obviously, this sample is not representative of males in the general population; however, assuming the validity of these findings, they are of much interest because of what they reveal about the extent and nature of sexual abuse by females in this very specific group of males.

Condy, Templer, Brown, and Veaco (1987) also investigated the incidence of sexual contact with boys by older females. Fifty-seven (15.9%) of a sample of 359 college men and 97 (45.7%) of 212 prison men (mostly sex offenders) reported childhood sexual experiences with females who were at least five years older and at least 16 years of age. Of those reporting early contact, 78% of the college group and 87% of the inmates indicated more than one contact; 49% of the college men and 71% of the prison men reported such an experience with more than one female partner. In addition, 39 (68%) of the "contact" college men and 80 (82%) of the "contact" prison men indicated having intercourse with the older female. Finally, of those with early experience, 8 (14%) of the college respondents and 11 (11%) of the prison group indicated that the sexual contact was forced by the female; 4 (7%) of the college men and 3 (3%) of the prison sample reported forcing sexual acts on the female.

In the same study, Condy et al. included samples of 638 college women and 172 prison women, who reported on their sexual activity with boys as described in the preceding paragraph. Three (0.48%) of the college group and 13 (7.5%) of the prison sample indicated such contact. Of the "contact" prison group, 8 (61%) reported more than one sexual
experience. 6 (46%) noted more than one younger male partner, and 11 (84%) reported having intercourse. All three of the college women indicated that the sexual activity was mutually desired; 2 (15%) of the prison women reported using force, and 2 (15%) reported the male's use of force.

The Condy et al. data should be interpreted with caution, as the samples were nonrandom and of questionable generalizability. The prison samples in particular were subject to bias because of participants' self-selection. However, these data support the conclusion that, while child sexual abuse is a predominantly male offense, female perpetration is not the extremely rare event it was once believed to be.

Comparative surveys. Survey research yielding data on rates of male and female perpetration can be classified according to methodological differences. One type of study uses case reports from agency samples of identified victims. A second type provides data from nonagency groups in which individuals identifying themselves as victims provide information about perpetrators. A third type includes case reports of molesters identified by agencies with which they come in contact. A fourth type involves surveys of nonagency samples in which offenders, including previously undisclosed ones, identify themselves. (The present effort is part of a larger project in which a component has been designed for identifying previously undetected offenders; this is the only research of the latter type known to the author.)

Before reviewing comparative studies of the scope of male and female perpetration, a comment is in order regarding the format to be used for
reporting offender sex ratios. It is recognized that relative amounts could be reported in three ways: male percentages, female percentages, or both genders' percentages. Because of its awkwardness and redundancy, the latter method will not be used. As a general rule, perpetration rates pertaining to both genders will be conveyed by presenting female percentages only. (Obviously, the male rates can then be determined by subtraction from 100 percent.) This convention is consistent with the thesis that female rates of perpetration are sufficiently large, in an empirical and practical sense, to merit attention in their own right. However, this is not intended to minimize the extent or seriousness of child sexual abuse by males.

**Case reports from agency samples of victims.** Survey investigations of agency samples provide estimates of rates of male and female perpetration among groups of reported victims. A range of rates has been found in studies of cases coming to the attention of professionals, human service settings, and law enforcement agencies. Percentages of female offenders range from 0% to 4% in case report studies. These include studies of male victims (DeJong, Hervada, & Emmett, 1983; Ellerstein & Canavan, 1980) and studies with mixed samples of male and female victims (DeFrancis, 1969; Jaffe, Dynneson, & ten Bensel, 1975; Kendall-Tackett & Simon, 1987). The number of male and female offenders identified in these five studies range from 16 to 365, with an average of 205.

Data concerning perpetrator sex ratios in separate groups of male and female children have been provided by several large-scale case report
studies. The first of these includes data collected from child protective service agencies in 31 states (American Humane Association, 1981). Finkelhor (1984a) noted that these data are biased toward intrafamilial child sexual abuse. Moreover, they do not make a straightforward distinction between those who passively "allowed" abuse and those who actively engaged in sexual contact (Finkelhor & Russell, 1984). Considering only the females who were listed as acting alone, the latter authors found 14% of 757 offenders against boys and 6% of 5,052 offenders against girls to be women.

Another survey, the National Incidence Study, gathered data from professionals and agencies in 26 counties considered representative of the United States (National Center for Child Abuse and Neglect, 1981). These data were also analyzed by Finkelhor and Russell (1984), who subtracted out the "passive" perpetrators to obtain a sex ratio. From this analysis, female molesters represented 10% of 91 offenders against boys and 4% of 664 offenders against girls.

Finally, the Committee on Sexual Offenses Against Children and Youth (1984) reported the results of two large-scale Canadian case report studies. Both of these sources provide estimates of the perpetrator sex ratio in mixed samples of male and female victims under the age of 16. In the first of these studies, 28 police forces nationwide reported 6,203 cases of adult sexual offenses against children; among these, 1.8% of the perpetrators were female. In the other study, 1,438 molestation cases were reported by a nationwide group of Canadian child protection agencies; ten percent of these involved female offenders. The aggregated
police and child protection agency data show that 3.1% of the perpetrators against boys, and 0.8% of the offenders against girls, were women.

**Victims’ self-reports: nonagency samples.** Self-report surveys of victims cast a broader net than agency case reports by providing estimates of male and female perpetration against both reported and unreported victims. Studies of this type have required adult respondents to recall incidents of childhood sexual victimization. In a study by Fromuth (1983), 482 female college students identified 139 offenders, 7 (5%) of whom were female. In a widely cited random survey of 930 women in San Francisco, Russell (1983) reported that 25 (4%) of 647 molesters were female.

Wyatt (1985) studied the prevalence of childhood sexual victimization in two probability samples, one comprised of 126 Afro-American women and the other consisting of 122 white American women. Of the 147 abuse incidents reported by the Afro-American group, 4% were perpetrated by females; none of the 158 incidents reported by the white group involved a female offender.

Nonagency studies focusing on male victims have obtained somewhat higher rates of female perpetration. Johnson and Schrier (1987) found that, among 1000 patients seen in an adolescent medicine clinic from 1982 to 1984, 25 males reported a history of molestation; the offenders were female in 11 (44%) of these cases.

Other nonagency research has estimated perpetrator sex ratios by sampling both male and female victims. In Finkelhor’s (1979) sample of
796 college students, victims indicated that 5 (21%) of 23 offenders against males were women; 10 (8%) of 119 offenders against females were women. In the Canadian National Population Survey, 2.8% of 2,008 men and women reported sexual victimization by a female prior to age 16 (Committee on Sexual Offenses against Children and Youth, 1984).

Finally, in a survey of college students, 42 (7.7%) of 540 women and 20 (4.8%) of 412 men reported having been sexually abused as children (Fritz, Stoll, & Wagner, 1981). Sixty percent of the molested males and ten percent of the molested females reported female perpetration. This study is noteworthy in that it reports the highest published rate of female sexual abuse of boys. However, Finkelhor and Russell (1984) expressed skepticism concerning the offender sex ratio presented for male victims in this study:

It is interesting that this finding is so dramatically at variance with the findings of the Finkelhor (1979) student sample, which used a similar type of population, a similar definition of molestation, and a similar questionnaire methodology. . . . It seems likely that the Fritz, Stoll, and Wagner findings resulted from an unusual sample or an error in tabulation (pp. 175-176).

Case reports from agency samples of perpetrators. Another approach to studying the comparative extent of male and female offending is to document proportions of males and females in identified groups of perpetrators. McCarty (1986) pioneered this type of research with a sample identified by a treatment agency. Her study of 29 incestuous mothers represented 4% of the offender population seen during a three-year period at the Dallas Incest Treatment Program. It should be remembered that this proportion pertains to mothers among a group of incest offenders. Other relatives, such as aunts, grandmothers, and
older siblings were not included. Furthermore, extrafamilial perpetrators, such as babysitters, were excluded by definition.

A similar investigation was conducted by Faller (1987) at a clinic sponsored by the University of Michigan Interdisciplinary Project on Child Abuse and Neglect. She reported that 40 (13.8%) of a total sample of 289 offenders were women. Faller concluded that

while this incidence is higher than the very early clinical estimates, it probably represents an increased awareness, rather than an increased occurrence, of sexual abuse by women (p. 273).

This statement implies that the higher recent estimate is more accurate than earlier estimates in reflecting the actual amount of female-perpetrated child sexual abuse. This suggestion should be considered in light of sampling limitations of this type of study, however.

One possible source of bias in Faller's data, as discussed earlier, stems from problems in detection, and consequently in reporting, of abuse. Moreover, the referral patterns resulting in the treatment agency's contact with offenders may operate differently for men than for women, creating a selection bias of unknown direction (Allen, 1989). Nevertheless, Faller's data are consistent with a number of studies already presented, especially those focusing on the victims' self reports. The empirical basis for her statement that child sexual abuse by women has probably not increased, however, is not clear.

In a group of 305 adolescent offenders seen between 1976 and 1981 at the University of Washington Adolescent Sexual Offender Project, eight (2.5%) were females (Fehrenbach, Smith, Monastersky, & Deisher, 1986).
All eight were involved in acts of sexual touching and fondling with children six years old or younger. The 297 males' acts ranged from "hands-off" offenses to rape, and their victims included adults and children.

In a follow-up study, Fehrenbach and Monastersky (1988) extended the female (but not the male) sample of the preceding investigation. These authors described 28 adolescent female offenders (including the eight who were in the original sample) seen at the same clinic between 1978 and 1985. Unfortunately, the latter data do not permit calculation of an offender sex ratio. However, the number of females seen at the clinic between 1981 and 1985 (i.e., 40) represented a fivefold increase over the total seen between 1976 and 1981.

Summary

Historically, a large majority of individuals who have sexually abused children have been male; however, evidence of female perpetration has existed for some time. Current data provide at best a clouded picture of the prevalence and incidence of male and female perpetration of child sexual abuse. Nevertheless, researchers and clinicians increasingly have become aware of a small group of women who molest. In absolute numbers, the offenders, children, and families whose lives are affected—in cases of both male- and female-perpetrated child sexual abuse—are significant.

As will be discussed later in this chapter, failure (or perceived failure) to meet sexual and/or emotional needs with adult partners may motivate sexual abuse of children. The present investigation will
address the question of whether gender factors influence perpetrators’ perceptions of need fulfillment in their intimate adult relationships. In the sections that follow, literature will be presented concerning two major ideas. The first is that males and masculine socialization place an emphasis on fulfillment of sexual needs. The second notion is that females and feminine socialization emphasize gratification of emotional needs. These ideas are central to the discussion in the remainder of the literature review.

The next section presents a general picture of differences based on gender and gender identity; a narrower discussion of gender factors and human sexuality will follow. The final literature review section will be yet more specific in its focus on the perceived need fulfillment of child molesters.

**Behavioral and Perceptual Implications of Gender and Gender Identity**

In recent years, much attention has been given to the merits of biological, social, psychological, and combined explanations of gender-based differences in behavior. In this section, literature will be reviewed concerning the concepts of gender and gender identity and their general implications for such differences.

**Gender**

Researchers addressing gender and human behavior have concluded that much variability exists among both males and females (Kenrick, 1987). Nevertheless, a theme that has emerged in a number of societies has been
greater dominance and aggression in males (Archer & Lloyd, 1985; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Seward & Seward, 1980). Moreover, it has been suggested that the consistency of such findings provides evidence of a physiological basis for behavioral differences between men and women (Losh-Hesselbart, 1987).

Other research has approached differences in the behavior of males and females by exploring the effects of sex hormones. Ehrhardt (1985) noted that, in general, hormonal patterns associated with male development have been linked with aggression and activity; to a lesser extent, patterns characteristic of female development have been linked with nurturance. However, the findings from this line of research are inconsistent, often based on studies of extreme groups and many times lacking controls on environmental variables. Ehrhardt (1985) suggested predisposing hormonal influences on behavior, but concluded:

The extent of the behavior difference between girls and boys depends on the degree of gender-specific reinforcement. Traditionally, Western society has reinforced rough-and-tumble play in boys and doll play and infant care in girls. The socialization process has widened the gap between girls and boys and has misled us into believing that the differences are greater than they actually are (p. 46).

Within the past two decades, social and psychological explanations of gender differences in behavior have increased in importance relative to biological theories (Stewart & Lykes, 1985). Recent theorizing has attempted to integrate biological models with approaches emphasizing socialization processes (e.g., Condry, 1984; Ehrhardt, 1985; Kenrick, 1987). One prominent view considers gender differences in characteristics such as aggressiveness and nurturance to be consistent
with the respective cultural stereotypes of masculinity and femininity (Bem, 1974).

**Gender Identity**

Two interrelated lines of thought have been especially important in theorizing about psychosocial aspects of gender: social learning models and social cognition models. Social learning formulations focus on reward and punishment structures in shaping gender-specific sets of behaviors (gender roles) and self-attributions (gender identities) (e.g., Mischel, 1966). Social cognition theories posit the influence of individuals’ definitions of self and others in the acquisition and maintenance of gender roles and identities (e.g., Bem, 1985; Simon and Gagnon, 1986). Both of these models emphasize processes of socialization that highlight and reinforce behavioral differences between males and females (Kenrick, 1987).

Two important self-attributions, masculinity and femininity, are the core dimensions of gender identity. There is general agreement within this culture as to traits and behaviors considered masculine and feminine. This has been demonstrated in the research of Bem (1974), who identified a set of gender-stereotyped characteristics. Table 1 lists these elements of culturally defined masculinity and femininity.

Until the 1970s, the prevailing view was that masculinity and femininity are opposite poles of a continuum (Spence, 1985). Bem (1974) tested this idea, using stereotypic descriptions of males and females (see Table 1) to develop scales of masculinity and femininity. She found that, while males tended to be more masculine and females more feminine,
## Table 1

**Bem’s (1974) Components of Masculinity and Femininity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculinity</th>
<th>Femininity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts as a leader</td>
<td>Affectionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Childlike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>Does not use harsh language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defends own beliefs</td>
<td>Flatterable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>Gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td>Gullible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has leadership abilities</td>
<td>Loves children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Loyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Sensitive to the needs of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions easily</td>
<td>Shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>Soft spoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>Tender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong personality</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to take a stand</td>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to take risks</td>
<td>Yielding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
there was no significant negative correlation between masculinity and femininity for persons of either sex. Bem concluded that a bi-dimensional model (in which masculinity and femininity vary independently) is preferable to a single-factor model in which the two concepts are considered mutually exclusive. Much research on gender identity has been based on the two-factor model.

Further conceptual refinement has resulted in a widely used scheme of gender identity "types." These types are produced by cross-classifying high and low levels of the masculinity and femininity dimensions. The following categories are thus formed: masculine-typed (high masculinity/low femininity), feminine-typed (high femininity/low masculinity), androgynous (high masculinity/high femininity), and undifferentiated (low masculinity/low femininity).

**Summary**

Gender and gender identity appear to be variables that offer considerable potential for illuminating differences in behavior and perception. There has been increased interest in social and psychological processes as these interact with biological factors in the development of gender identity. Of major importance, too, has been the conceptualization of gender identity--self-attribution of culturally stereotyped masculinity and femininity--as a phenomenon comprised of two independent dimensions.

From what has been presented so far, it can be suggested that males and highly masculine individuals tend to be more aggressive and less nurturant (or affection-oriented). The opposite tendencies can be
proposed for females and highly feminine persons. These ideas will be carried forward and elaborated further in the next section, which will focus on the implications of gender factors for sexual and emotional need fulfillment.

This section has outlined behavioral implications of gender and gender identity. A background has thus been presented for reviewing an area in which differences in gender and gender identity are of great importance: the area of human sexuality. The next section will focus on the effects of gender and gender identity on perceptions of sexual and emotional need fulfillment.

Human Sexuality: Need Fulfillment in Intimate Relationships

In addition to being necessary for reproduction, human sexuality consists of a mix of motivational components, including both sensual pleasure and emotional intimacy (Gochros, 1987). Stayton (1980) suggested that the human species possesses a "panerotic potential" that permits a variety of individual styles and emphases in need fulfillment. An important issue is whether perceived satisfaction of sexual and emotional needs differs as a function of gender and/or gender identity. This section will review theoretical and empirical literature relevant to this question.

Theoretical Perspectives

Human sexuality is very complex and has been approached from the perspectives of a number of disciplines (Francoeur, 1987). Much of the
major theorizing and research in the field is rooted in biological orientations and has supported cultural stereotypes of male sexual responsiveness and female passivity. For example, Freud's psychoanalytic formulation portrayed the female as an innately passive participant in sexual relations (Campbell, 1982). Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, and Gebhard (1953) later reported males to be more arousable to sexual stimuli than females. More recently, Symons (1979) has argued an evolutionary basis for supposedly greater erotic drive in men than in women.

Nevertheless, biologically grounded theories suggesting major differences in male and female sexual response have decreased in importance relative to psychosocial models. Research has shown that males and females are much more similar in their physiological potential for sexual response than was once thought (Gillan & Frith, 1979; Masters & Johnson, 1966). This "convergence" of males and females in the area of sexual responsiveness has been considered in light of scripting theory, a social cognition approach.

According to scripting theory, patterns of behavior are socially attributed to individuals, and these attributions (scripts) become the basis for expectations of self and others in social interactions. From this perspective, orgasmic competence has, until recently, been scripted as an essentially masculine characteristic. Moreover, this script has played a major part in the socialization of both males and females (Gagnon, 1974, 1979; Simon & Gagnon, 1986). Increasingly, such socialization models are being called upon to explain differences between
men and women in their fulfillment of sexual and emotional needs in intimate relationships.

Another socialization model applies concepts of need achievement to sexuality. Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt (1979) suggested that two types of need achievement take place in human sexual relationships. The first of these is termed the "direct" type, which emphasizes initiative and command over the environment. The second type is termed the "relational" approach, which often involves vicarious identification with another person's need fulfillment. In this model, traditional male and female sexuality emphasize "achievement" of physical pleasure and "achievement" of emotional bonds, respectively.

Gross (1978) emphasized the "training" aspects of socialization into heterosexual roles and reached a conclusion consistent with the model presented in the preceding paragraph:

Because of earlier differences in learning how to be sexual, males committed to sexuality but less trained in affection and love, may interact with females who are committed to love but relatively untrained in sexuality (p. 92).

Again, this is consistent with the notion that differential socialization of men and women is reflected in their patterns of sexual and emotional need fulfillment.

Empirical Data

Consistent with cultural stereotypes, research suggests that the physical pleasure aspect of intimate relationships is more salient for men than for women. At the same time, there is evidence that the interpersonal dimension is more significant for women than for men. For
example, Nevid (1984) found that men were more interested than women in physical characteristics of prospective partners, while women were more concerned than men about personal qualities. Other research has found that men express greater willingness than women to have intercourse without emotional involvement (Carroll, Volk, & Hyde, 1985).

In studies of dating, marriage, and similar relationships, men have indicated greater concern than women about sexual aspects of the relationship; women, on the other hand, have placed more importance on the emotional side (DeBurgher, 1972; Ehrmann, 1960; Hite, 1976, 1981, 1989). In an investigation of extramarital relationships, Glass and Wright (1985) found men to have more intense sexual activity and women to have deeper emotional involvement.

Other research has explored between-gender differences in emphasis on sensual and affectionate sexual behaviors. Denney, Field, and Quadagno (1984) found that men were more likely than women to report enjoying intercourse, while women were more likely to prefer foreplay and afterplay. The latter authors suggested that females value foreplay and afterplay more than males because of the types of physical and verbal affection associated with these activities. They further suggested that males regard affectionate, noncoital sexual behaviors (which are usually part of foreplay and afterplay) as ways to achieve intercourse.

Recent efforts have focused on developing and refining measures that discriminate between men and women in their sexual and love attitudes. The sexual attitudes of women, as compared to men, have been found to be more responsible, conventional, and idealistic; moreover, they appear to
be less permissive, instrumental, and power-oriented (Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote, & Foote, 1985). Using a scale to measure love attitudes, Hendrick and Hendrick (1986) found that men scored higher than women on factors depicting love as a manipulative game with multiple partners and low levels of emotional commitment. Women, on the other hand, scored higher than men on dimensions emphasizing intense emotion, commitment, and friendship.

There is preliminary evidence of the usefulness of the concept of gender identity in predicting attitudes toward love and sex. Bailey, Hendrick, and Hendrick (1987) used the same scales as those used in the studies mentioned in the preceding paragraph; gender identity was included as a predictor in addition to gender. Attitudinal patterns were similar to those in the earlier research, and both gender and gender identity appeared to influence these results. Bailey et al. suggested that their data provide evidence of an effect of gender identity, over and above that of gender, on attitudes toward love and sex.

Summary

In the arena of human sexuality, differences based on gender and gender identity appear to be important in understanding patterns of sexual and emotional need fulfillment. Available data provide support for the idea that gender-based differences exist in the emphasis placed on meeting sexual and emotional relationship needs. Men in general appear to focus more on meeting sexual needs with intimate partners. Women, on the other hand, emphasize satisfaction of needs for love and affection.
The material reviewed in this section pertains to satisfaction of sexual and emotional needs in adult relationships. At this point, two important questions can be asked: What patterns of need fulfillment are expressed by individuals who relate to children sexually? Do men and women who molest differ in this regard? The next section will review literature concerning the sexual and emotional needs of men and women who sexually abuse children.

**Relationship Needs of Perpetrators**

As the literature review in the preceding section shows, differential patterns of sexual and emotional need fulfillment characterize the intimate relationships of men and women in this culture. Furthermore, theorists have suggested that child sexual abuse occurs partly because of blockage of an adult perpetrator's access to gratification through socially approved channels (Finkelhor & Araji, 1986). In view of the blockage idea, gender differences in terms of unmet needs with adult partners may provide clues concerning abusers' motivations for sexual abuse of children. This section will review literature concerning intimate relationship needs of perpetrators.

**Literature**

The literature on child molestation contains some discussion of both sexual and emotional factors as these contribute to adult sexual behavior with children. Frude (1982), for example, presented a model of father-daughter incest that regards the abuse as an expression of sexual needs that are frustrated in the marital relationship. Others have
presented evidence that molestation by males is behavior that meets primarily nonsexual needs of perpetrators, who feel threatened in relationships with adult women (Fisher & Howell, 1970; Groth & Burgess, 1977; Panton, 1979). Still others have noted both sexual and emotional inadequacy of male molesters in relating to adult females (Fisher, 1969; Howells, 1979; Kopp, 1962; Pacht & Cowden, 1974; Stokes, 1964).

In an attempt to explain the preponderance of male sexual abusers, Finkelhor and Russell (1984) suggested that males and females differ in the ways in which they respond sexually within the context of a relationship:

Men seem to be able to be aroused more easily by sexual stimuli divorced from any relationship context—by pornography, for example. Women, on the other hand, may rely more on a totality of cues including the nature of the relationship with the sexual partner. The fact of a partner being a child may interfere more with women’s ability to experience sexual arousal (p. 183).

The same authors further asserted that women seem better able to distinguish situations of affection and intimacy that do not involve sex (such as family relationships) from those that do (p. 183).

If, as Finkelhor and Russell suggest, males focus on sexual arousal and females attend to emotional aspects of a relationship, gender differences in perpetrators’ motivations are implied.

Preliminary speculations have been advanced regarding differences in sexual and emotional relationship needs of male and female molesters. Marvasti (1986) reviewed five case reports of incestuous mothers and suggested that female perpetrators have a higher threshold of sexual arousal to children than do male molesters. Wolfe (1985) concluded from 12 case studies of women who sexually abuse children that female
perpetrators are less likely than male molesters to reach orgasm while offending. Moreover, she concluded that female molesters are less likely than male offenders to induce a child to manipulate their genitalia. Although these clinical impressions are mere glimpses, the suggestion seems to be that male molesters focus more than female offenders on gratification of sexual needs.

In contrast to data suggesting that male molesters are sexually aroused by children, O'Connor (1987) found no indications of sexual gratification as a motive in a sample of 62 female sex offenders (including 39 child molesters). Instead, attention-seeking was identified as a key motivational factor. These findings are consistent with the clinical suggestion that exhibitionism accomplishes primarily erotic stimulation for males and meets nonsexual needs such as attention and validation for females (Grob, 1985; Hollender, Brown, & Roback, 1977).

The significance of nonsexual relationship needs for female perpetrators is suggested by reports of higher proportions of women than men who co-offend with another adult. McCarty (1986) reported that, of 21 incestuous mothers in her sample, 9 (43%) were co-offenders. One-half of Wolfe's (1985) sample of 12 female molesters were co-offenders who tended to be very dependent on the adult (usually a male) with whom they participated in abusive acts. Other significant affectional needs described among female perpetrators include needs for social contact and warmth (Chasnoff et al., 1986; Finch, 1973; Goodwin & DiVasto, 1979;
Krug, 1989) and a need to be taken care of in the absence of an adult partner (Courtois, 1988; Crigler, 1984; Groth, 1982; Krug, 1989).

**Summary**

The failure to satisfy intimate relationship needs with adult partners has been suggested as an underlying motivational process in the sexual abuse of children. That is, blockage of access to socially accepted outlets can be seen as a predisposing condition for adults who turn to children in an apparent attempt to meet these needs. Although by definition molestation is sexual behavior, both sexual and emotional needs may be involved.

The limited literature on male and female molesters is generally consistent with the broader literature that shows the existence of gender differences in patterns of intimate need fulfillment. Sexual needs appear to be more prominent for male perpetrators than for female offenders. The evidence also suggests that, among perpetrators, females more than males value the emotional aspects of sexual relationships with children.

**Statement of the Problem**

A general proposition of this study is that the factors of gender and gender identity affect patterns of perceived need fulfillment in the intimate adult relationships of child molesters. Gender refers to the male-female dichotomy, and gender identity involves self-attribution of culturally defined traits of masculinity and femininity. The relationship needs under consideration are sexual and emotional needs.
On the basis of the literature reviewed in this chapter, two propositions will be stated, each followed by relevant hypotheses. The first proposition links gender factors and sexual needs, and the second relates gender factors to emotional needs.

**Gender Factors and Sexual Needs**

**Discussion**

The literature provides evidence that men differ from women in the emphasis they place on gratifying sexual needs. Some of this literature suggests that males are innately more aggressive in general, and more sexually aggressive in particular. These notions of greater "animal drive" in males and relative passivity in females imply that men place greater emphasis than women on satisfying needs of a physical, sensual nature.

In addition to this biological "component" of relative male and female emphases on meeting sexual needs, a considerable amount of literature suggests effects of socialization. This influence of cultural stereotypes encourages men in general to value masculine characteristics emphasizing sexual competence and "direct achievement" of pleasure. A highly masculine orientation might be considered one in which relationships present an opportunity for obtaining sexual pleasure. Because of the salience of sexual gratification for highly masculine individuals, such persons would be expected to be more sensitive to such needs and, as a result, more likely to perceive them as unmet.
Women, on the other hand, are expected to fit more the feminine stereotype of a sexually passive being whose "relational" approach subordinates her own pleasure to the goal of affectional closeness. It would be expected that a highly feminine orientation would focus more on development of interpersonal bonds than on individualistic sensual pleasing. Thus, it would be expected that women and highly feminine individuals attribute less significance to direct sexual satisfaction. Based on the idea that sexual gratification is a less salient need for them, it would be predicted that feminine individuals are more likely to indicate a perception of satisfied sexual needs in an adult partnership.

First Proposition and Hypotheses

The first proposition of this study is as follows: Gender and gender identity are related to perpetrators' perceptions of their sexual needs in adult relationships. (For simplicity, "needs" will mean the same as "unmet needs.") The following hypotheses reflect this proposition:

\[ H_1: \text{Male perpetrators will perceive greater sexual need in adult partnerships than will female perpetrators.} \]
\[ H_2: \text{Perpetrators' masculinity will be positively related to their perceived sexual need in adult partnerships.} \]
\[ H_3: \text{Perpetrators' femininity will be negatively related to their perceived sexual need in adult partnerships.} \]

The reader will recall the earlier discussion of gender identity types resulting from cross-classification of low and high levels of masculinity and femininity. The strongest effects would be expected for
the masculine- and feminine-typed categories because of the opposite predicted tendencies of masculinity and femininity in their respective influences on the dependent variables under study. Similarly, the androgynous and undifferentiated types would be expected to have effects between the masculine- and feminine-typed categories; this would be anticipated because of the "offsetting" or "balanced" levels of masculinity relative to femininity in these types. Thus, the fourth hypothesis is as follows:

\[ H_4: \text{Among perpetrators, perceived sexual need will be greatest for those who are masculine-typed, less for those of the "balanced" (androgynous and undifferentiated) types, and least for those who are feminine-typed.} \]

**Gender Factors and Emotional Needs**

**Discussion**

Some of the literature presented earlier suggests endogenous characteristics of aggression in males and nurturance in females. It would seem that the theme of male aggression is congruent with emotional distancing in adult partnerships. On the other hand, female nurturance could be considered consonant with a perceived need for affectional bonding in such relationships.

Again, to the degree that gender identity distinguishes men from women, the components of masculinity and femininity may contribute to gender differences in perceived emotional need satisfaction.

Socialization in accordance with the masculine cultural stereotype
emphasizes independence, competitiveness, and aggressiveness, and would be expected to deemphasize a need for emotional involvement. Thus, it would be expected that males and highly masculine individuals would be more likely than females and less masculine persons to perceive their emotional needs as met.

In contrast, traits such as expressiveness, nurturance, and preference for mutuality are consistent with the feminine stereotype. Such attributes are consistent with emotional commitment in a relationship. Because of the salience of such needs for females and for highly feminine individuals, it can be postulated that such persons would be less likely than males and less feminine persons to perceive their emotional needs as met.

Second Proposition and Hypotheses

The second proposition of this study is as follows: Gender and gender identity are related to perpetrators' perceptions of their emotional needs (i.e., unmet needs) in adult relationships. The next set of hypotheses pertains to this proposition:

\( H_5: \) Female perpetrators will perceive greater emotional need in adult partnerships than will male perpetrators.

\( H_6: \) Perpetrators' masculinity will be negatively related to their perceived emotional need in adult partnerships.

\( H_7: \) Perpetrators' femininity will be positively related to their perceived emotional need in adult partnerships.
Again, an additional hypothesis can be stated relating perceived emotional need to gender identity type based on combinations of low and high levels of masculinity and femininity:

H₇: Among perpetrators, perceived emotional need will be greatest for those who are feminine-typed, less for those of the "balanced" (androgy nous and undifferentiated) types, and least for those who are masculine-typed.

Conclusion

Present knowledge of the nature and extent of child sexual abuse represents a tip of the iceberg. The mystery and lack of understanding surrounding this problem are the laments of professionals; they are also the pain and desperation of untold numbers of human lives.

Almost unthinkable several years ago, women who turn to children in an apparent attempt to fulfill intimate relationship needs have been "discovered." Increased awareness of the existence of female molesters brings important gender issues to bear on attempts to understand the needs and motivations of both male and female offenders.

Recent theory and research have suggested new ways of looking at traditional ideas of masculinity and femininity. The concept of gender identity has become an important part of theory seeking to explain gender-based behavioral differences in terms of more than biology alone. This study will consider the effects of both gender and gender identity on child sexual abuse perpetrators' perceived sexual and emotional needs with adult partners.
CHAPTER II.

METHOD

Sample and Procedures

The sample for this study was obtained for a larger project comparing male and female child sexual abusers with male and female nonoffenders. The present sample consists of 75 male, and 38 female, molesters. All of the men and 30 of the women are listed on the Iowa Department of Human Services (DHS) Child Abuse Registry. All of these perpetrators were drawn from the DHS registry period of January, 1984 through June, 1986. Because a limited number of female offenders were available in Iowa, an additional 8 women were located and interviewed in Minnesota.

Only actively offending caretakers are included in the sample. Passive (i.e., "omission") offenses--those in which the caretaker could have prevented the abuse from occurring but failed to do so--are not included. The Iowa DHS investigative social workers' guidelines for interpreting the law and for substantiating cases of sexual abuse are outlined in Appendix A. These guidelines were in effect at the time of the investigations of individuals sampled from the DHS registry.

The sample is comprised mostly of offenders residing in the community. These individuals experienced a variety of responses by the system, including jail, probation, treatment, and removal of themselves or their children from the home. In addition, some respondents reported other consequences such as job loss, psychological distress, a sense of
being ignored by authorities, and social ostracism. Many seemed eager to
discuss their experiences. Some expressed remorse and a wish to prevent
the victimization of other children; others denied molesting altogether.

Male Sample

The first step in sampling the men was to identify the entire
population of male offenders recorded on the Iowa DHS registry during the
time period sampled. Appendix B contains a copy of the letter that was
sent by the DHS to each of these individuals. The letter described the
research and requested those interested in participating to contact
project staff at Iowa State University. Respondents wanting to
participate contacted project staff directly by return postcard or by
telephone. An interview appointment was then scheduled.

Female Sample

The sampling frame for the Iowa female offenders was the entire
population of 145 women who engaged in active sexual abuse and who were
placed on the DHS registry during the time span sampled. Current Iowa
addresses were obtained for 104 of these women. In a number of cases
this was done by utilizing records from Aid to Families with Dependent
Children (AFDC) or other social welfare programs. For the remaining 41
women on the registry, either a current address could not be found, the
individual was out of state, or the person was a minor. The procedures
for contacting the 104 female offenders in Iowa, and for arranging
interviews with the 30 among them who agreed to participate, were the
same procedures as those described for the male perpetrators.
The remaining 8 women in Minnesota were contacted through treatment and correctional settings. All were in therapy, and 3 of these individuals were also in a state women's reformatory.

**Interviews**

The interviewers were hired and trained in consultation with the Iowa State University Statistical Laboratory. Data collection took place between July, 1987, and December, 1988. Whenever necessary, the interviewers traveled to meet with respondents in settings acceptable to the latter. Meeting places included homes, a therapy office, public libraries, churches, correctional settings, the Iowa State University campus, parks, and automobiles.

Prior to each interview, a consent form was read and signed by the participant (see Appendix C). All but one of the respondents were interviewed face-to-face; one woman was interviewed by telephone. Each meeting lasted approximately two hours. A $50 stipend was paid to each participant following completion of an interview.

**Measures**

**Independent Variables**

The independent variables for this investigation are gender and gender identity. Gender, operationalized as male or female, is based on respondents' biological sex. As indicated in Chapter I, gender identity has shown promise as a concept that can contribute beyond the
explanatory power of gender alone. Thus, both gender and gender identity will be included as explanatory variables in this study.

The two core dimensions of gender identity--masculinity and femininity--are operationalized using the short form of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (SBSRI) (Bem, 1981). The short form was developed to refine the original Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974), an instrument that has been used extensively in research over the past 15 years. An assumption underlying the Bem scales is that masculinity and femininity are separate dimensions rather than opposite extremes of a single continuum.

The SBSRI items consist of 30 traits to which respondents are asked to indicate on a seven-point scale the frequency with which each trait is true of him or her. The response categories and corresponding values are as follows: 1 = Never or almost never true; 2 = Usually not true; 3 = Sometimes but infrequently true; 4 = Occasionally true; 5 = Often true; 6 = Usually true; and 7 = Always or almost always true. Ten items are culturally stereotyped masculine traits, 10 are consistent with feminine stereotypes, and 10 are neutral. Scale items are summed and divided by the number of items in the scale (i.e., 10). Appendix D contains the SBSRI along with notation of the scale (Masculinity [M], Femininity [F], or Social Desirability [SD]) to which each of its items belongs. The SD items are not used in scoring.

One method of scoring the SBSRI is to split both the Masculinity and Femininity scales at their respective median values and to cross-classify the two dimensions according to their above-median (high) and below-median (low) levels. Bem (1981) reported medians from her
normative sample; however, she recommended median splits based on the researcher’s own sample (provided the sample is sufficiently large and contains both males and females).

Halving of the Bern scales produces a two-by-two matrix of high and low levels of masculinity and femininity. The cells of the matrix correspond to the four commonly used gender identity types mentioned earlier: masculine-typed (high masculinity/low femininity), feminine-typed (high femininity/low masculinity), androgynous (high masculinity/high femininity), and undifferentiated (low masculinity/low femininity).

Debate has centered on the relative merits of the simple median split in comparison to other techniques for constructing a typology from the Bern scales. For example, Orlofsky, Aslin, and Ginsburg (1977) suggested a method that takes into account the distances between masculinity and femininity scores. Still others have recommended an additive, rather than a subtractive, procedure for combining information from the two scales (Roe & Prange, 1982). However, in his review of the Bern scales, Payne (1985) concluded that "in many cases the median split approach is better" (p. 179).

Another method of scoring the Bern scales is to treat them as variables at the interval level of measurement. This technique has the advantage of preserving information otherwise lost in analysis at the categorical level (Strahan, 1982). In the present investigation, masculinity and femininity will be treated both as continuous variables and as dichotomies.
Bem (1981) reported reliability data on the SBSRI-M and -F scales. In two samples of college men and women, evidence of internal consistency was shown by alpha coefficients ranging from .75 to .87. Test-retest reliabilities between first and second administrations were shown by Pearson correlations ranging from .75 to .94.

More recent analyses by Martin and Ramaniah (1988) suggest that the SBSRI is a psychometric improvement over the long form from which it is derived. The latter authors found evidence of improved validity, as shown by greater goodness of fit of the SBSRI with a two-factor (masculinity and femininity) structure. Moreover, the same study provided evidence of increased internal consistency of the Femininity scale.

**Dependent Variables**

The dependent variables in this study are perceived sexual need and perceived emotional need. These two concepts are operationalized using a short version (Form IIB) of the Partner Relationship Inventory (PRI) (Hoskins, 1988). This short form (SPRI) consists of two scales: a six-item Sexual Needs (S) scale and a 27-item Interactional/Emotional Needs (IE) scale. A copy of this instrument is in Appendix E, with the S and IE scale items identified.

The two factors comprising the short form Sexual Needs (SPRI-S) scale are sexual satisfaction and sexual imposition. Hoskins (1989) defined sexual satisfaction as the "perception of openness and sharing in meeting one another's sexual needs" (p. 4); she further defined sexual
imposition as "perceived inequality and lack of mutuality in fulfillment of sexual needs" (p. 4).

The original PRI Long Form contains separate scales to measure interactional and emotional needs; these are combined in the short form IE scales. The eight dimensions of perceived needs tapped by the short form Interactional/Emotional Needs (SPRI-IE) scale are: agreement in thinking, communication, openness, disagreement in behavior, perceived degree of the partner's sensitivity, companionship and sharing, emotional satisfaction, security, and recognition. The SPRI-IE scale measures a broad spectrum of interactional and emotional aspects of relationships and is satisfactory for the present exploratory purposes. (In this connection, it can also be noted that the interweaving of partners' interactions and emotions has long been recognized [e.g., Ackerman, 1958; Beavers, 1982; Guerin, Fay, Burden, & Kautto, 1987; Minuchin, 1974]).

The items of the SPRI are personalized statements about various aspects of an intimate relationship. Some of them contain reverse phrasing to reduce response-set bias. Response categories and their assigned values are as follows: 1 = Definitely feel, 2 = Feel slightly, 3 = Cannot decide, and 4 = Definitely do not feel. Although the "Cannot decide" category does not permit a logically true scale, Hoskins (1988, p. 8) argues that this format enhances the naturalness of the instrument to the respondent. The range of possible scores on the Sexual Needs scale is from 6 to 24, and the range on the Interactional/Emotional Needs scale is from 27 to 108. Higher scores reflect greater perceived need.

The PRI user's manual provides evidence of the content and construct validity of the separate Interactional and Emotional Needs scales of the
original long form. In addition, it presents conceptual and theoretical background information suggesting content validity of the various short forms (Hoskins, 1988). Elsewhere, Hoskins (1989) reported alpha reliability coefficients ranging from .64 to .91 for the two factors of the Sexual Needs scale and for the eight factors of the Interactional/Emotional Needs scale.

Analytical Procedures

Univariate frequency distributions describing demographic characteristics of the male and female subsamples will be presented. In addition, medians, means, and standard deviations will be computed to summarize the interval-level demographic variables.

Conditional percentages, in addition to measures of central tendency and dispersion, will be used to describe the response distributions of men, women, and the combined sample on the SBSRI and SPRI scales. Coefficient alpha will also be computed for reliability analysis of each of these scales.

Other analyses will be performed to make a preliminary assessment of the tenability of theoretical assumptions underlying the SBSRI scales. Specifically, the extent to which the concepts of masculinity and femininity are independent of gender will be examined. For this purpose, independent sample t-tests will be computed to compare males and females with respect to scores on the Masculinity and Femininity scales.

Another theoretical assumption, that masculinity and femininity are separate dimensions rather than opposite poles of a continuum, will be addressed. This will be done by computing, for the men and women
separately. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between the SBSRI-M and SBSRI-F scales. A negative correlation between masculinity and femininity would support the premise that these concepts are polar opposites (and therefore not separate dimensions).

Several statistical procedures will be employed to test, and to elaborate upon, the hypotheses under investigation. Zero-order tests of the hypotheses in which gender is the independent variable will use a nonparametric statistic, the two-sample Wilcoxon rank sum W. This procedure (which is equivalent to the Mann-Whitney test) will be used instead of the more common t-test. Unlike t, the Wilcoxon test does not require that the conditional distributions of the dependent variable be normal in shape; instead, the latter procedure requires only that the conditional distributions be approximately the same shape. From a technical standpoint, the Wilcoxon procedure is more efficient than the t-test; in fact, it has been suggested that t is often used in situations for which W is better suited (Hodges, Krech, & Crutchfield, 1975).

Zero-order tests of the hypotheses that consider masculinity and femininity as separate independent variables will utilize Pearson correlations in addition to Wilcoxon tests as described in the preceding paragraph. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) will be used in tests of hypotheses in which the masculinity and femininity variables are combined to form four gender identity types. A three-way ANOVA will be used to analyze the 2 x 2 x 2 nonorthogonal data structure defined by three dichotomous independent variables: gender, masculinity (low/high), and femininity (low/high). For statistical control purposes, analysis of
covariance (ANCOVA) will be used to introduce age and income as covariates.

All computations will utilize computer routines available in Release 3 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-X) (SPSS, 1988).

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the sample, procedures, measures, and analyses for the present investigation. The next chapter will extend statistically the description of the sample and measures before proceeding with hypothesis testing and elaboration.
CHAPTER III.

RESULTS

Having presented the theoretical background, propositions, hypotheses, and methods of this dissertation, the discussion turns to the data analysis and presentation of the results. This chapter will consist of two major sections. The first will describe the sample and instruments. The second will present the tests of hypotheses and analytical elaborations.

Descriptive Analysis

Sample Characteristics

As described in Chapter II, this study includes two subsamples, one a group of 75 men and the other a group of 38 women. All of these individuals had been previously identified as perpetrators of child sexual abuse. Table 2 describes the demographic composition of these two groups of offenders.

The age distributions of the male and female groups differ somewhat. The men's ages range from 21 to 76, with a median of 40, mean of 41.4, and standard deviation of 11.6. The women range in age from 23 to 62, with a median of 31, mean of 32.8, and standard deviation of 7.4. While only 12% of the men are age 30 or younger, nearly half (44.7%) of the women are in this category. Moreover, only 10.4% of the women are over age 40, compared to almost half (45.3%) of the men. These age distributions for both the male and female subsamples are similar to
### Table 2

**Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 or older</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, not Hispanic</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, not Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Males N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Females N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less than 12 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post high school</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13-15 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16 or more years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th>Males N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Females N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When Investigated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$19,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$29,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$39,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (interpolated)</td>
<td>$16,051</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 6,606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (interpolated)</td>
<td>$17,957</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 9,324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Males N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Females N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional or managerial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsperson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service worker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never worked/unemployed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed, looking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed, not looking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired or disabled</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of marriages</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married/cohabiting</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
those reported in other studies (e.g., Faller, 1987; Gebhard, Gagnon, Pomeroy, & Christensen, 1965; Wolfe, 1985).

The vast majority of both men and women in this study are white. One male is white and Hispanic, one is black and non-Hispanic, and two are American Indians. One female is black and non-Hispanic.

Educational levels of the male and female groups are similar, though there is somewhat more dispersion for the men. In spite of comparable education levels, the income distribution for the men and women differs considerably. As Table 2 shows, approximately one-third of the men had an annual household income of less than $10,000 at the time they were investigated for child sexual abuse, compared to almost three-fourths of the women. Consistent with other reports in the literature (e.g., Faller, 1987; Vander Mey, 1988), the male perpetrators in the present investigation have higher incomes than the females. However, the women in the present study have more education than those in Faller’s (1987) sample.

Data concerning the occupational and employment status of the men and women in this study are consistent with the income gap. Over half of the women are service workers, while the men are represented more evenly in the various occupational categories. At the time of the interview, less than a quarter of the men, but more than half of the women, reported being unemployed, retired, or disabled.

The final demographic dimensions reported in Table 2 are marital history and status. On average, male and female respondents were married at least twice. Over two-thirds of the men, but less than half of the women, were married or cohabiting at the time of the interview;
furthermore, less than one quarter of the men, but more than one-half of
the women, were separated or divorced.

**Instrument Data**

**Bem Sex-Role Inventory Short Form**

The distributions of offenders’ responses on the short form of the
Bem Sex-Role Inventory (SBSRI) are summarized in Table 3 for the separate
and combined groups of men and women. A *t*-test for independent samples
was performed to contrast mean scores of men and women on the Masculinity
(M) and Femininity (F) scales. No statistically significant difference
was found in the SBSRI-M scores of men and women (*t* = 1.10, *p* = .27,
two-tailed); on the other hand, the difference between men and women on
the SBSRI-F scale approached significance (*t* = 1.19, *p* < .06,
two-tailed).

Bem (1981) reported SBSRI Masculinity and Femininity scale norms for
476 male and 340 female undergraduates. As shown in Table 3, the SBSRI-M
statistics for the respondents in the present research are fairly similar
to those obtained from Bem’s normative samples. The SBSRI-F median and
mean scores are somewhat higher for the male and female offenders than
for the corresponding normative groups.

As noted previously, the Bem scales treat masculinity and femininity
as independent constructs rather than as a single bipolar dimension. In
the present study, the scales are positively related, supporting the
notion that they are not conceptual opposites. Pearson product-moment
coefficients between the SBSRI-M and SBSRI-F scales are .23 and .57
Table 3

**Conditional Percentages and Summary Statistics for Responses on the Short Form Bem Sex-Role Inventory (SBSRI)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Masculinity (M) Scale</th>
<th>Femininity (F) Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males%</td>
<td>Females%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Md**

| 4.80 | 4.65 | 4.80 |
| 5.70 | 6.00 | 5.80 |

**M**

| 4.85 | 4.65 | 4.79 |
| 5.60 | 5.90 | 5.70 |

**SD**

| 0.76 | 1.17 | 0.92 |
| 0.77 | 0.82 | 0.80 |

Note: N = 75 males, 38 females, 113 total.

*The following medians were reported by Bem (1981) in normative samples of 476 male and 340 female undergraduates: males/M scale, 4.90; females/M scale, 4.80; males/F scale, 5.30; females/F scale, 5.70.

bMeans from Bem's (1981) normative samples: males/M scale, 4.88; females/M scale, 4.78; males/F scale, 5.19; females/F scale, 5.57.

Standard deviations from Bem's (1981) normative samples: males/M scale, 0.79; females/M scale, 0.81; males/F scale, 0.78; females/F scale, 0.76.
within the male and female samples, respectively. Bem (1981) reported correlations between these dimensions of the SBSRI for two groups of undergraduates. In the first sample, the respective coefficients for males and females were .33 and .10; in the second sample, these values were .12 for males and .19 for females. Thus, it appears that, for the female offenders in the present study, there is a considerably stronger correlation between masculinity and femininity than for other groups of women in the general population.

A reliability analysis was performed to assess the internal consistency of both SBSRI scales. Alpha coefficients are .79 and .88 for the Masculinity and Femininity scales, respectively. These values are similar to those reported in other studies (Bem, 1981; Payne, 1985) and are judged to be acceptable for the present purposes.

As described previously, one widely used procedure in research employing the Bem inventory is a median split of both the Masculinity and Femininity scales (Payne, 1985). For the combined male and female groups, cutting points were sought as near to the median values as possible without separating individuals with the same score. Cases at or below the value of 4.7 on the SBSRI-M are assigned to the "low" masculinity category; those with scores above 4.7 are considered to be in the "high" group. For the SBSRI-F scores, individuals in the "low" category have values of 5.7 or less, and the "high" cases are those above 5.7.
Partner Relationship Inventory Short Form

As noted in Chapter II, the Partner Relationship Inventory short form (SPRI) is comprised of two scales, Sexual Needs (S) and Interactional/Emotional Needs (IE). Four of the men and one of the women in the study had not been in a marital or cohabiting relationship. As a result, subsequent analyses using the SPRI scales will be based on data obtained from 71 men and 37 women.

Table 4 summarizes the response distributions for the overall sample on both of the SPRI scales. Alphas are .70 for the SPRI-S scale and .94 for the SPRI-IE scale. Again, the coefficients are comparable to those reported elsewhere (Hoskins, 1989) and are considered satisfactory.

Norms for the Partner Relationship Inventory short forms have not been established as yet (Hoskins, 1988). Although data are not available for comparing the present groups of male and female molesters with normative samples, the empirical literature provides information regarding gender differences in marital satisfaction. There is evidence that, while marital satisfaction of both husbands and wives varies over the stages of the family life cycle, neither overall satisfaction across stages, nor satisfaction within specific stages, differs appreciably between genders (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Rollins & Cannon, 1974).

Tests of Hypotheses

This section will present tests of the hypotheses enumerated in Chapter I. The hypotheses concerning gender factors and perceived sexual need will be addressed first, followed by those pertaining to gender
Table 4

Conditional Percentages and Summary Statistics for Responses on the Short Form Partner Relationship Inventory (SPRI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Sexual Needs (S)</th>
<th>Interactional/Emotional Needs (I/E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scale(^a)</td>
<td>Combined Males%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-43</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.5-59.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-76</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.5-92.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-108</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(N = 71\) males, 37 females, 108 total

\(^a\)Sexual Needs scores are multiplied by 4.5 to produce equivalence of S and IE scales.
factors and perceived emotional need. The reader is reminded that higher scores on the sexual and emotional need scales indicate greater perceived need. For both sets of hypotheses, results of zero-order tests and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) will be presented first. These procedures will be followed by more complex analyses that elaborate upon the initial tests.

**Gender Factors and Perceived Sexual Need**

**Initial Tests**

**Hypothesis one: gender and perceived sexual need.** A zero-order test does not support the first hypothesis, that males will perceive greater sexual need. In fact, there is a strong relationship ($p < .01$) in the direction opposite to that which was predicted. Table 5 shows the SPRI-S scale means for males and females; in addition, the results of a two-sample Wilcoxon rank sum $W$ test are shown. This result is a surprisingly strong contradiction to the first hypothesis; it suggests a need for critical reexamination of the notion that frustrated adult sexual relationship needs are more characteristic of male perpetrators than of female offenders.

**Hypothesis two: masculinity and perceived sexual need.** The second hypothesis, that masculinity will be positively related to perceived sexual need, is not supported. A two-sample Wilcoxon test does not reveal a significant difference between the low- and high-masculinity groups in terms of mean rank on the sexual need scale. Treating both variables as continuous, the Pearson product-moment correlation
Table 5

Zero-Order Test of Hypothesis One: Gender and Sexual Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Sexual Need Score (SPRI-S)</th>
<th>Males (n=71)</th>
<th>Females (n=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Mean Rank</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Rank Sum W</td>
<td>2440.5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Higher scores indicate greater perceived need.

\[ z(\text{absolute value, corrected for ties}) = 2.76, \ p < .01, \text{ two-tailed}. \]
coefficient (r) between the SBSRI-M and SPRI-S scores is -.11. Table 6 shows the SPRI-S scale means and standard deviations for the low- and high-masculinity groups in addition to statistics summarizing the zero-order tests of the second hypothesis.

**Hypothesis three: femininity and perceived sexual need.** The third hypothesis, that femininity will be negatively related to perceived sexual need, is not supported. Again, the two-sample Wilcoxon test comparing low- and high-femininity groups is not significant. The Pearson correlation coefficient between SBSRI-F and SPRI-S scale scores is .10. The SPRI-S scale means for the low- and high-femininity groups are shown in Table 7, along with the results of the zero-order tests of the third hypothesis. Thus, the initial tests of the second and third hypotheses indicate that, in the absence of controls for extraneous effects, neither masculinity nor femininity affects perceived sexual need.

**Hypothesis four: gender identity type and perceived sexual need.** The fourth hypothesis will be addressed by using a one-way ANOVA. This hypothesis states that perceived sexual need among masculine-typed individuals will be greater than among those in the "balanced" (androgynous and undifferentiated) categories; in turn, it is predicted that classification in the "balanced" categories will be associated with greater perceived sexual need than will membership in the feminine-typed group. The gender types are formed by cross-classifying the low and high groups on both the SBSRI-M and SBSRI-F scales. The scales are divided by the median split technique described earlier.
### Table 6

**Zero-Order Tests of Hypothesis Two: Masculinity and Sexual Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Sexual Need Score (SPRI-S)^a</th>
<th>Low Masculinity (n=52)</th>
<th>High Masculinity (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Mean Rank</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Rank Sum W</td>
<td>2950.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \chi ) (SBSRI-M &amp; SPRI-S)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.11**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aHigher scores indicate greater perceived need.

\( \chi \) (absolute value, corrected for ties) = 0.72, \( p = .47 \), two-tailed.

**\( \chi(106) = -1.18, p = .24 \), two-tailed.**
### Table 7

**Zero-Order Tests of Hypothesis Three: Femininity and Sexual Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Sexual Need Score (SPRI-S)(^a)</th>
<th>Low Femininity (n=51)</th>
<th>High Femininity (n=57)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Mean Rank</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Rank Sum (W)</td>
<td>2824.5(^*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r(SBSRI-F &amp; SPRI-S))</td>
<td>(0.10^{**})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Higher scores indicate greater perceived need.

\(^*\)\(z(\text{absolute value, corrected for ties}) = 0.28, p = .78,\) two-tailed.

\(^{**}\)\(t(106) = 1.04, p = .30,\) two-tailed.
Table 8 shows the results of this ANOVA. Clearly, the attained probability level (p=.97) for the omnibus F test shows that the fourth hypothesis is not supported by these data. As can be seen in the array of category means in Table 9, the groups are nearly equal in their average sexual need scores.

Elaboration

The preceding analyses can be augmented by further examination of the factors of gender, masculinity, and femininity within the context of a 2 x 2 x 2 nonorthogonal factorial design. Noting that it is not feasible with nonorthogonal designs to partition the model (between groups) sum of squares into mutually exclusive variance components, Pedhazur (1982, chap. 10) outlined a procedure for analyzing such designs. This procedure will be used to elaborate upon the analyses presented so far.

Table 10 shows the results of the ANOVA for the full three-factor (gender, masculinity, and femininity) model. The first test of significance to be considered is the test of the proportion of variance explained by the comprehensive model; this model contains main effects, two-way interactions, and a three-way interaction. The $R^2$ value computed for the overall ANOVA is .10 ($F[7,100] = 1.71$, $p = .12$). This overall $R^2$ value estimates that the full model accounts for approximately 10% of the variance in perceived sexual need; this estimate approaches conventional levels of statistical significance.

The specific main and interaction effects, each associated with a single degree of freedom, are listed in Table 10. Each of these effects
### Table 8

**One-Way Analysis of Variance for Hypothesis Four: Gender Identity Type and Sexual Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2156.19</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2160.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Analysis based on N = 108.

<sup>a</sup>The four gender identity types are: masculine-typed (high masculinity/low femininity), androgynous (high masculinity/high femininity), undifferentiated (low masculinity/low femininity), and feminine-typed (high femininity/low masculinity).
Table 9

Mean Perceived Sexual Need Score, by Gender Identity Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine-typed</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine-typed</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Based on short form Partner Relationship Inventory Sexual Needs scale, with higher scores indicating greater perceived need.*
Table 10

Full Factorial Model Analysis of Variance for Gender Factors and Perceived Sexual Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156.86</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x masculinity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-way interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x masculinity x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.92</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>230.93</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1929.98</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2160.91</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Analysis based on N = 108.

^ Single degree of freedom effects are adjusted for all other main effects.

^ Single degree of freedom effects are adjusted for all other two-way interactions.

^ Single degree of freedom effect is adjusted for all other effects.

\[ R^2 = .10. \]
is analyzed by testing the proportion of explained variance incremented by that effect over and above all other effects of the same, or of a lower, order. It can be seen that the $F$-test of the variance incremented by the highest-order effect (i.e., the three-way interaction of gender, masculinity, and femininity) suggests a trend ($F [1,100] = 2.17, p < .15$).

Prior to undertaking a closer examination of the eight cell means corresponding to the three-way classification of gender factors, the possible extraneous effects of age and income can be explored using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). As Table 11 shows, the $F$-tests remain virtually unchanged for the main and interaction effects of gender factors on perceived sexual need, after age and income are introduced as covariates.

Table 12 presents, in ascending order, the array of observed SPRI-S scale means in each of the gender x masculinity x femininity categories. All possible post hoc contrasts of these means are shown, using Duncan's multiple range procedure. As a result of these comparisons, differences appear between several means at the .10 level of significance; one contrast, the one between the androgynous males and females, reaches the .05 level. (Such tests should be regarded with caution, especially when only one contrast is significant [Steel & Torrie, 1980].) The gender difference within the androgynous category is of interest and will be discussed in the next chapter.

The levels of statistical significance obtained in these analyses are marginal for the most part; however, patterns seem to emerge. First,
Table 11

**Full Factorial Model Analysis of Covariance for Gender Factors and Perceived Sexual Need. Adjusting for Age and Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age &amp; income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>177.70</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x masculinity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-way interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x masculinity x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>263.48</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1897.44</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2160.91</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Analysis based on N = 108.

*a* Single degree of freedom effects are adjusted for covariates and for all other main effects.

*b* Single degree of freedom effects are adjusted for covariates, for all main effects, and for all other two-way interactions.

*c* Single degree of freedom effect is adjusted for covariates and for all other effects.

*d* $R^2 = .12$. 


### Table 12

**Mean Perceived Sexual Need Scores and Pairwise Contrasts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Factor Category</th>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Group Contrasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>G, H&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine-typed</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine-typed</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine-typed</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine-typed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>A&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>A&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;, B, C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Higher scores indicate greater perceived need.

<sup>a</sup>Unless otherwise noted, column entries indicate codes of groups with which contrasts attained significance at \(0.05 < p \leq 0.10\), using Duncan's multiple range test.

<sup>b</sup>\( p \leq 0.05\).
it can be seen from the rank ordering of SPRI-S score means in Table 12 that the eight categories are split clearly along gender lines. The male and female categories sort in a manner such that the four lowest scoring groups contain males, and the four highest consist of females. Again, this is consistent with a gender effect in the direction opposite to that which was hypothesized.

None of the "steps" between adjacent categories reflects a statistically significant difference in mean SPRI-S score; therefore, considerable caution is warranted in making statements about them. However, a general observation is that the data in Table 12 suggest a "mirroring" phenomenon between genders. That is, it can be seen that the two central categories, the masculine-typed males and females, have nearly the same mean SPRI-S scores. Moving away from the center in both directions, the feminine-typed males and females are the groups with the next higher and next lower scores, respectively. Finally, the mirroring of the gender identity types is completed by the positions of the two "balanced" types, androgynous and undifferentiated.

Several observations can be made concerning this pattern of results. First, with regard to the androgynous type, one would not expect to find a gender difference if indeed this category reflects psychologically "equivalent" realities for males and females. Furthermore, if one assumes the premise that androgyny is associated with adaptability in meeting psychosocial needs (a premise which will be discussed in the next chapter), then the "adaptability hypothesis" is supported for male, but not for female, offenders. Another point is that, as hypothesized, masculine-typed individuals average the highest sexual need score among
the men; however, among the women, masculine-typed persons perceive the least sexual need. Indeed, on the basis of their mean SPRI-S score, the masculine-typed women appear more similar to the men than to the other female offenders. These issues will be considered further in the next chapter.

Referring again to Table 10, none of the two-way interactions increment a significant proportion of explained variance after adjusting for effects of the same, and lower, orders. Similarly, neither masculinity nor femininity contributes a significant increment after adjusting for the other two main effects. However, a strong effect of gender (opposite the predicted direction) is once again in evidence, over and above the effects of masculinity and femininity.

Gender Factors and Perceived Emotional Need

Initial Tests

Hypothesis five: gender and perceived emotional need. The fifth hypothesis, that female molesters will perceive greater emotional need in adult partnerships, is strongly supported by the zero-order test: the one-tailed test is significant beyond the .001 level. Table 13 displays the category means and standard deviations as well as the results of the two-sample Wilcoxon procedure. This finding provides strong evidence that female molesters bring into the abuse situation significantly greater perceived emotional need than do male offenders.

Hypothesis six: masculinity and perceived emotional need. As was done for the second and third hypotheses, the zero-order tests of the
Table 13

Zero-Order Test of Hypothesis Five: Gender and Emotional Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Emotional Need Score (SPRI-IE)</th>
<th>Males (n=71)</th>
<th>Females (n=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>54.46</td>
<td>69.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>19.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Mean Rank</td>
<td>46.80</td>
<td>69.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Rank Sum W</td>
<td>2563.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Higher scores indicate greater perceived need.

* | (absolute value, corrected for ties) = 3.54, p < .001, one-tailed.
sixth and seventh hypotheses utilize the Wilcoxon test and Pearson correlation. The sixth hypothesis, that masculinity will be negatively related to perceived emotional need, is not supported. The means and standard deviations of the emotional need scores for the low- and high-masculinity groups are shown in Table 14, along with statistics computed to test the sixth hypothesis.

**Hypothesis seven: femininity and perceived emotional need.** The seventh hypothesis, that femininity will be positively related to perceived emotional need, was not supported, though a slight trend was noted in the predicted direction. Table 15 shows the means and standard deviations of the SPRI-IE scores for the low and high femininity categories, as well as the results of the zero-order tests.

**Hypothesis eight: gender identity type and perceived emotional need.** Paralleling the analysis for hypothesis four, a one-way ANOVA will be used to test hypothesis eight. According to this hypothesis, perceived emotional need will be highest among feminine-typed individuals, next highest among those in the "balanced" (androgynous and undifferentiated) types, and lowest among the masculine-typed offenders.

The results of this ANOVA are shown in Table 16. The overall F test is not statistically significant; as was the case for the one-way ANOVA in which perceived sexual need was the dependent variable, the mean SPRI-IE scores do not differ significantly among the gender identity types. Table 17 presents these means.
Table 14

Zero-Order Tests of Hypothesis Six: Masculinity and Emotional Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Emotional Need Score (SPRI-IE)(^a)</th>
<th>Low Masculinity (n=52)</th>
<th>High Masculinity (n=56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Mean Rank</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Rank Sum W</td>
<td>2792.5(^*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rho(SBSRI-M &amp; SPRI-IE))</td>
<td>(-.02^{**})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Higher scores indicate greater perceived need.

\(^*\)\(z(\text{absolute value, corrected for ties}) = 0.026, \ p = .80\), two-tailed.

\(^{**}\)\(t(106) = -0.17, \ p = .87\), two-tailed.
Table 15

Zero-Order Tests of Hypothesis Seven: Femininity and Emotional Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Emotional Need Score (SPRI-IE)</th>
<th>Low Femininity (n=51)</th>
<th>High Femininity (n=57)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>58.61</td>
<td>60.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>22.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Mean Rank</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon Rank Sum (W)</td>
<td>2734.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r (SBSRI-F &amp; SPRI-IE))</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Higher scores indicate greater perceived need.

\(z(absolute\ value,\ corrected\ for\ ties) = 0.28, p = .39, \text{ one-tailed.}\)

\(\hat{r}(106) = 0.44, p = .33, \text{ one-tailed.}\)
### Table 16

**One-Way Analysis of Variance for Hypothesis Eight: Gender Identity Type and Emotional Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>509.99</td>
<td>169.99</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48,059.29</td>
<td>462.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>48,569.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: Analysis based on N = 108.

<sup>a</sup>The four gender identity types are: masculine-typed (high masculinity/low femininity), androgynous (high masculinity/high femininity), undifferentiated (low masculinity/low femininity), and feminine-typed (high femininity/low masculinity).
Table 1/

**Mean Perceived Emotional Need Score, by Gender Identity Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine-typed</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine-typed</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Based on short form Partner Relationship Inventory Sexual Needs scale, with higher scores indicating greater perceived need.*
Elaboration

The effects of gender, masculinity, femininity, and the interactions of these factors will again be analyzed within the context of a 2 x 2 x 2 nonorthogonal factorial design, this time considering perceived emotional need as the dependent variable. The comments made earlier concerning the analysis of such factorials will apply as well to the elaboration that follows.

Table 18 shows the results of an ANOVA for the full model in which SPRI-IE score is the dependent variable. The overall model is useful in explaining variance in perceived emotional need, as can be seen in the attained significance level (p < .02) for the omnibus F-test. The $R^2$ value computed for the full model is .15, indicating that about 15% of the variance in SPRI-IE score is accounted for by the main and interaction effects. A further delineation of the single degree of freedom main and interaction effects is presented in Table 18. Again, the sum of squares for each effect represents the unique contribution of that effect, over and above all other effects of the same, and of a lower, order.

As was done in the earlier analysis of gender factors and sexual need, statistical control for age and income is again accomplished using ANCOVA. As can be seen by comparing the tests of effects in Tables 18 and 19, the main effect of gender continues to be highly significant, and the three-way interaction remains marginally significant, after adjusting for age and income.

The first effect to be examined is the three-way interaction of gender, masculinity, and femininity. The proportion of explained
Table 18

**Full Factorial Model Analysis of Variance for Gender Factors and Perceived Emotional Need**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5731.43</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>259.49</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-way interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x masculinity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240.09</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three-way interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x masculinity x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1385.44</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explained</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7567.81</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41,001.58</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>48,569.29</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Analysis based on N = 108.

- ^a^ Single degree of freedom effects are adjusted for all other main effects.
- ^b^ Single degree of freedom effects are adjusted for all main effects and all other two-way interactions.
- ^c^ Single degree of freedom effect is adjusted for all other effects.
- ^d^ $R^2 = .15$. 
Table 19

Full Factorial Model Analysis of Covariance for Gender Factors and Perceived Emotional Need, Adjusting for Age and Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age &amp; income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1035.38</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effects^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4781.79</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>230.62</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way interactions^b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x masculinity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.22</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>207.17</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-way interaction^c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x masculinity x femininity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1419.95</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained^d</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7758.49</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40,810.79</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>48,569.29</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Analysis based on N = 108.

^a Single degree of freedom effects are adjusted for covariates and for all other main effects.

^b Single degree of freedom effects are adjusted for covariates, for all main effects, and for all other two-way interactions.

^c Single degree of freedom effect is adjusted for covariates and for all other effects.

^d $R^2 = .16$. 
variance incremented by this joint effect approaches statistical significance ($p < .07$). In order to further clarify the three-way interaction, the observed mean SPRI-IE scores in the eight categories defined by the factorial design were contrasted using Duncan's multiple range procedure. These means and the results of pairwise comparisons are shown in Table 20. Again, based on the multiple comparisons, patterns can be noted. First, males and females, respectively, comprise the four lowest and four highest scoring groups; this repeats the earlier finding concerning the eight factorial groups and perceived sexual need. Further evidence is thus provided for a gender effect on perceived emotional need.

Another observation that can be made regarding the means in Table 20 is that the female groups are all ranked in the same order according to emotional need score as they were in terms of the sexual need scores presented earlier in Table 12. The fact that the ordering of category means for sexual need and for emotional need scores was identical for the females but not for the males suggests a closer correspondence between sexual needs and emotional needs for female molesters than for male offenders. Indeed, this is supported by Pearson correlations, computed within the male and female groups, between SPRI-S and SPRI-IE scores. These $r$ coefficients are .64 and .80 for the men and women, respectively. Possible implications of these results will be discussed in the next chapter.

All except one of the differences in mean emotional need score between the "balanced" (i.e., undifferentiated and androgynous) female groups and the groups comprised of males are significant at $p \leq .05$. The
Table 20

Mean Perceived Emotional Need Scores and Pairwise Contrasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Factor Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Group Contrasts^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>G, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>G, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine-typed</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>G, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine-typed</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>G^, H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine-typed</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine-typed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>A, B, C, D^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>A, B, C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Higher scores indicate greater perceived need.

^aUnless otherwise noted, column entries indicate codes of groups with which contrasts attained significance at p ≤ .05, using Duncan's multiple range test.

^b.05 < p ≤ .10.
scores of the masculine- and feminine-typed females do not differ significantly from any of the other groups; however, their category means are somewhat closer to those of the male groups than to those of the undifferentiated and androgynous females. Considering these results in conjunction with the patterns of perceived sexual need noted earlier, there is strong evidence that female offenders of the "balanced" gender identity types (especially those in the androgynous category) are distinguished by their high levels of perceived need in intimate adult relationships.

Another interesting finding is the mean SPRI-IE scores for males and females within the gender-typed (i.e., masculine- and feminine-typed) categories. As can be seen in Table 20, there is little difference in perceived emotional need between masculine-typed males and masculine-typed females; this essentially repeats the earlier finding (see Table 12) of virtually no difference between these groups in terms of perceived sexual need.

The feminine-typed females have higher SPRI-IE scores than do the feminine-typed males, although the difference is not statistically significant. This is consistent with the earlier finding of greater (though not significantly so) perceived sexual need for the feminine-typed females than for the feminine-typed males. In terms of perceived relationship needs overall, these results suggest similarity between masculine-typed perpetrators of both genders; they also suggest a slight difference between men and women who are feminine-typed.

Finally, having considered the pattern of means within the joint classification of gender, masculinity, and femininity, the next effects
to be examined are the two-way interactions. Referring again to Table 18, it can be seen that none of the tests of the first-order interactions, after adjustment for effects of the same and of the lower order, reach statistical significance. Of the main effects, only gender accounts for a significant proportion of variance explained in emotional need, over and above the other main effects.

Conclusion

This chapter began with a presentation of the demographic characteristics of the 75 male and 38 female child sexual abuse perpetrators comprising the sample for this investigation. The vast majority of the male and female offenders is white. Two variables reflecting major gender differences are age at the time of the interview and income at the time of investigation. The mean ages for the men and women are similar to averages found in other samples of molesters. Furthermore, the large income difference between genders is consistent with the empirical literature. Interestingly, educational levels are very similar for the men and women in the present study. Members of both groups average more than one marriage (or cohabiting relationship), though a higher percentage of the women were separated or divorced at the time of the interview.

Several descriptive analyses of the instruments were conducted. Mean scores of the men and women on the Masculinity (M) scale of the short form Bem Sex Role Inventory (SBSRI) do not differ significantly; on the Femininity (F) scale, women score higher—a marginally significant difference. The present results on the SBSRI-M scale are comparable to
normative data; both the male and female offenders average moderately higher SBSRI-F scores than the normative groups.

Consistent with the theoretical premise that masculinity and femininity are independent dimensions, the Pearson correlation coefficient between the M and F scales is positive for both the men and the women. For the women, this correlation is unexpectedly high. Finally, the SBSRI reliability coefficients for the present sample are comparable to those reported in the literature.

Data on the short form Partner Relationship Inventory (SPRI) are available for 71 of the male, and 37 of the female, offenders. Although SPRI norms are not available for the short forms of this instrument, marital satisfaction research suggests that, in general, men and women are similar in their perceived need fulfillment. Adequate internal consistency of the SPRI Sexual Needs (S) and Interactional/Emotional Needs (IE) scales was shown in the present data.

In the first set of hypotheses, it was predicted that male gender, higher masculinity, and lower femininity would be associated with greater perceived sexual need. The zero-order test provided strong evidence of a gender effect opposite the predicted direction. However, when considered separately, neither masculinity nor femininity was related to perceived sexual need. Furthermore, no relationship was found between gender identity type (i.e., masculine-typed, feminine-typed, androgynous, and undifferentiated) and perceived sexual need.

In the ANOVA that elaborated upon the zero-order tests of the hypotheses in which perceived sexual need was the dependent variable, there was a significant main effect of gender (opposite the predicted
direction). In addition, there was a marginally significant interaction of gender, masculinity, and femininity. These effects remained after adjustment for age and income.

Mean sexual need scores within gender identity types were then arrayed separately for the men and women. Among the eight groups formed in this manner, one pairwise contrast, the difference between the androgynous males and females, was statistically significant (again, opposite the predicted direction). Within the remaining gender identity types, no significant differences in SPRI-S scores appeared between men and women. However, the difference within the undifferentiated group (i.e., the other "balanced" category besides the androgynous type) was marginally significant.

In the second set of hypotheses, it was further predicted that female gender, lower masculinity, and higher femininity would be associated with greater perceived emotional need. The zero-order test of the relationship between gender and emotional need yielded strong evidence supporting the predicted gender effect. Separate zero-order tests of the effects of masculinity and femininity failed to support the hypotheses relating these variables to perceived emotional need. Moreover, gender identity type (using combined masculinity and femininity dichotomies) was not related to perceived emotional need.

Again, a three-way ANOVA was performed to elaborate upon the zero-order tests of the hypotheses involving perceived emotional need. The main effect of gender--this time in the predicted direction--was statistically significant, and the interaction of gender, masculinity, and femininity approached significance. The gender effect remained
highly significant, and the three-way interaction continued to be marginally significant, when age and income were controlled.

In a pairwise comparison of mean emotional need scores among the eight gender x masculinity x femininity groups, the androgynous women scored significantly higher on the SPRI Interactional/Emotional Needs scale than did the men in all of the gender identity types. The undifferentiated women averaged significantly higher emotional need scores than did the males in the androgynous, undifferentiated, and feminine-typed categories; the contrast between the undifferentiated women and the masculine-typed men approached statistical significance. Strong evidence was thus provided that female offenders in the "balanced" (androgynous and undifferentiated) categories perceive themselves as having greater emotional need than do male perpetrators in adult partnerships.

As was the case with sexual need, no significant between-gender difference in perceived emotional need was found within either the masculine-typed or feminine-typed category. As also occurred for sexual need scores, the masculine-typed category was the one in which men and women scored most alike on the emotional need scale. Within the feminine-typed category, the women averaged higher (though not significantly) emotional need scores than the men; this echoes the difference, found earlier on the sexual need scale, between these two groups.

In conclusion, the data analyses suggest a number of points of departure for future theory building and research. In the next chapter.
the major findings of this study will be considered further, limitations will be noted, and implications will be discussed.
CHAPTER IV.

DISCUSSION

Overview

This study investigated gender and gender identity as predictors of child sexual abusers' perceived sexual and emotional need fulfillment in adult partnerships. The overall sample of 75 male, and 38 female, perpetrators of child sexual abuse was obtained as part of a larger study including perpetrators and nonperpetrators of both genders. Demographic comparison of the subsamples of male and female offenders showed the females to be younger and more economically disadvantaged than the males. Educational levels were found to be similar for both groups.

For gender, the results showed both perceived sexual need and perceived emotional need to be significantly greater for the women than for the men. This contradicts the predicted relationship between gender and perceived sexual need and supports the hypothesized effect of gender on perceived emotional need.

The Masculinity and Femininity scales of the Short Form Bem Sex Role Inventory were used to operationalize gender identity. Perceived sexual and emotional needs were measured using a short form of the Partner Relationship Inventory.

For gender identity, no significant effects were found. Independent variables considered were masculinity, femininity, and a cross-classification of high and low levels of these dimensions into gender identity types. The mean sexual need scores of the androgynous
(high masculinity/high femininity) females were significantly higher than those of the androgynous males. The androgynous females averaged significantly higher emotional need scores than did males in all of the gender identity types. Mean emotional need scores of the undifferentiated (low masculinity/low femininity) females were also higher than those of males in all of the gender identity types, and these differences were significant or marginally significant. All significant or nearly significant effects remained when statistical controls for age and income were introduced.

Limitations

Several limitations and suggestions for improvement of the present investigation can be noted. First, a larger sample, especially in terms of the number of female respondents, would be preferable. A larger N contributes to greater power of statistical tests and to increased cell sizes of categorical variables such as gender identity type. An increase in the size of the female subsample, particularly an increase distributed evenly across gender identity types, would result in more uniform category sizes. In turn, the ANOVA assumption of equal group variances can be relaxed if the categories are approximately the same size (Norusus, 1989, chap. 18).

Other issues can be raised with regard to the sample. Although the original design called for random sampling of male and female perpetrators, practical constraints dictated the need to compromise. It is not known to what extent, if any, bias resulted from the nonrandom procedures for selecting participants. Another possible source of bias.
discussed in Chapter I, is the reliance upon data obtained from reported perpetrators. It is possible that the nature and amount of bias from these sources are different for men than for women.

Another area of concern pertains to attempts to fit gender into a theoretical framework. Although this variable is of primary importance in the study of deviance (Harris, 1977; Weisheit, 1984), its explanatory utility may be limited. As Bailey, Hendrick and Hendrick (1987) assert:

Biological sex is not per se an explanatory variable, at least in a psychological sense. Rather, biological sex is merely a categorical grouping, a partition around which differences can be conveniently gathered and described. True explanation requires the identification of further psychological variables, in addition to masculinity and femininity. . . . (p. 645).

Regardless of the problem of conceptual coarseness, however, it would seem that the exploration of gender differences between child sexual abuse perpetrators is a useful starting point in an inductive theory building process.

Conceptual clarity is also a problem in connection with both the Short Form Bem Sex Role Inventory and the Short Form Partner Relationship Inventory. Particularly in the case of the Bem scales, much controversy has developed over the question of validity. It is true that the short form has succeeded in reducing the factorial complexity that plagued the original version; however, it remains questionable that such an instrument can actually capture concepts as global and complex as masculinity and femininity (Morawski, 1987; Spence, 1985). Indeed, in reference to the SBSRI, Payne and Futterman (1983) conclude:

Although Bem apparently still regards these scales as indices of global masculinity (M) and femininity (F), judging from previous factor analyses the SBSRI consists of two relatively orthogonal factors that deal with instrumentality, assertiveness, or dominance
and expressiveness, interpersonal sensitivity, or nurturance (F) (p.111).

The Short Form Partner Relationship Inventory is a relatively new instrument, and as such has not had as much research application and psychometric scrutiny as the Bem scales. The strength of the correlation between the Sexual Needs and Interactional/Emotional Needs scales of the SPRI may reflect confounding of the concepts purportedly measured by these scales. Furthermore, examination of the SPRI-S scale suggests that its items focus on interactional aspects of sexual need fulfillment without directly tapping the domain of physical pleasure. Future research addressing offenders' perceived sexual need may be improved through the use of instrumentation that adequately taps the sensuality dimension.

Also relevant to the validity of the present data are possible response distortions due to social desirability bias and/or denial. It is not known to what extent, if any, these problems affect the data from this investigation. Research is needed to address the methodological issue of possible distorted responses among child sexual abusers.

Implications

Matters raised in the description of the sample were the younger ages, and the relative economic disadvantage, of the women relative to the men in this study. Although statistical controls for these variables did not result in the disappearance of relationships that were tested for significance, such demographic gender differences between perpetrators merit attention in their own right. Age is an especially important
variable because it has causal primacy over income and many other variables. To what factors, then, might age differences between male and female offenders be attributable? Several possibilities can be suggested.

One reason for the age differential could be that male perpetrators molest over a longer "career" than do female offenders, and thus may have a greater chance to enter the system at a later age. This would also help to explain the preponderance of reported male offenders, since a longer time span as an abuser might increase an individual's risk of being reported.

Why might males tend to molest over a longer period of time? One conjecture is that this has to do with the ways in which male and female molesters orient themselves toward their victims. It has been observed that male abusers often receive physical gratification while psychologically blocking out the fact that their victims are children (Gilgun & Connor, 1989). Given such an orientation, a male offender might be inclined to "discard" one victim and to "move on" to another, in serial fashion over a period of time. Female perpetrators may also block out the fact that their victims are children, though they may do so within a context of intense emotional, as well as sexual, involvement with one "object" child.

Detection and reporting biases may also present reasons for the male-female age differential. It is possible that, because of economic vulnerability and other stresses, younger women are especially subject to scrutiny by outside agencies. This may produce a bias toward detection of younger females who molest. Furthermore, a cultural bias may operate
toward recognizing perpetration by younger and lower-income women who have deviant status by virtue of their being in the social welfare system.

Other major differences between male and female offenders were found in the tests of the hypotheses under study. In strong contradiction to the first hypothesis, female molesters more than male offenders perceive themselves as having greater sexual need (as measured by the SPRI-S scale) in adult partnerships. Assuming that sexual abuse of children reflects, to some extent, a perpetrator's frustrated needs in adult relationships, the view that these needs are more likely to be sexual in nature for male offenders than for female abusers is not supported by the data. Thus, the present study fails to support the notion suggested by other authors (e.g., Marvasti, 1986; O'Connor, 1987; Wolfe, 1985) that sexual need fulfillment is a more salient motivation for male than for female perpetration.

On the other hand, the data strongly support the hypothesis that females who sexually abuse children perceive greater emotional need with adult partners than do male abusers. This finding is consistent with the clinical observations and empirical conjectures discussed in Chapter I. An important treatment focus in female offender programs is suggested by the findings that female offenders perceive greater sexual and emotional needs than do male perpetrators. It is quite possible that frustrated intimate needs, along with impaired capacity to meet them appropriately, figure more prominently in the etiology of child sexual abuse by women than by men.
Perhaps the present findings provide—particularly in the case of the female molesters—evidence of what Finkelhor and Browne (1986) termed "traumatic sexualization." This concept refers to a process by which an individual develops a confused or distorted sexuality as a result of earlier sexual victimization. In the present context, the relatively high levels of perceived sexual and emotional needs among the female offenders may be indicative of "blurring" of these two types of needs—possibly as a consequence of traumatic sexualization. Other evidence of the confounding of sexual and emotional needs, for both the males and females, was shown earlier by the high correlations between the sexual and emotional need scales. Further research is needed to address these issues.

The statistically significant and nearly-significant differences between the males and females within the "balanced" (androgynous and undifferentiated) types—but not within the gender-typed (masculine- and feminine-typed) categories—are findings that may have considerable theoretical and practical relevance. These results provide preliminary evidence that, although female perpetrators as a group perceive much greater sexual and emotional need than do male molesters, there appear to be fairly strong predictors of convergence and divergence between genders. Unravelling the basis for these similarities and differences would seem to be an important direction for future research.

Much of the vast literature on gender identity has stemmed from the work of Sandra Bem (1974; 1975; 1985), who has advanced arguments favoring an "androgyne model" of psychological adjustment. Briefly, this model postulates that, because of their repertoire of both masculine and
feminine characteristics, androgynous individuals possess greater flexibility and adaptiveness in social situations. However, empirical support for the androgyny model has been inconsistent (Morawski, 1987); at the same time, data suggesting preeminence of masculinity as a predictor of mental health have given rise to a "masculinity model" that has competed for support (Jones, Chernovetz, & Hansson, 1978; Whitley, 1983).

How can the results of this study be integrated into current thinking regarding gender identity and psychological well-being? Although the present effort is largely exploratory and its findings preliminary, some speculations are possible. First, to the extent that perceived need in adult relationships can be considered an indicator of adjustment, the androgyny model appears to have limited support for the male perpetrators but not for the females. The data suggest that the experience and social meaning of androgyny is quite different for these two groups. Indeed, this finding has far-reaching implications for the study of psychological gender identity.

Perhaps androgyny actually intensifies experiences of alienation and dissatisfaction in the adult partnerships of at least some women. A situation can be envisioned, for example, in which both feminine and masculine traits meet with antagonism in a woman's adult intimate relationship. A woman in such a situation might find that self-definitions and behavior consistent with a normative concept of femininity are tantamount to acquiescence to her partner's dominance or aggression; at the same time, a stereotypically masculine approach on the woman's part could provoke confrontation and anxiety.
Possible outcomes for a woman in such a double bind might be anger, diminished self-efficacy, and a sense of isolation. It is conceivable that an androgynous man, on the other hand, would be less likely to experience such a bind because of greater cultural acceptability of androgynous traits in men. This reasoning suggests the importance of studying partner characteristics and relationship dynamics in order to increase understanding of the psychosocial context and functioning of offenders.

The differences between undifferentiated male and female perpetrators in their SPRI-S and SPRI-IE scores are not as large as those between the androgynous men and women. However, these differences tend to support the thesis that "balanced" masculinity and femininity may contribute to behavioral and cognitive ambivalence in female molesters' relationships with adult partners.

What explanation can be made concerning the lack of statistically significant gender differences, in both sexual need and emotional need scores, within the masculine- and feminine-typed categories? Neither of these categories have mean scores that are significantly different from those of any other category, and this is true for males and females. Because no systematic effect emerges for masculinity per se, the masculinity model of adjustment does not provide a useful explanation for the patterns in the present data. Instead, it appears in this instance that, among offenders, gender-typed men and women experience greater satisfaction of their relationship needs than do women of the "balanced" types. Perhaps there is less ambiguity in the self definitions and
behaviors of masculine- and feminine-typed individuals, permitting greater relationship complementarity.

In addition to the substantive and theoretical implications of the present research, methodological implications for future work can also be noted. First, with regard to sampling, it is apparent that expensive and time-consuming difficulties may be encountered, especially in obtaining larger samples of female offenders. Barriers such as geographic mobility of prospective respondents necessitate planning that ensures adequate resources for locating such individuals. A procedure that may enable more efficient use of resources in future research is telephone interviewing.

A final note regarding the analytical procedures of this study has to do with the use of the median split of the combined male and female groups on the Bem scales. In the present effort, this technique resulted in uniformly sized gender identity types for both the males and females. Although this facilitates analysis of variance, other classification procedures might also be used profitably in future research. Examples of such procedures were mentioned in Chapter II and include the t-ratio/median split procedure (Orloffsky, Aslin, & Ginsburg, 1977), additive approach (Roe & Prange, 1982), and treatment of the masculinity and femininity scales as continuous variables in multiple regression (Strahan, 1982).

Conclusion

The present research is largely exploratory, merely a step into a virtually unknown area of knowledge. Many important concepts and
theoretical linkages among these concepts remain to be explicated in future efforts. Nevertheless, findings from the present investigation suggest important benchmarks for theory, research, and practice.
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APPENDIX A.

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES (DHS)

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE INVESTIGATIVE GUIDELINES
DIAGRAM III: FOUND REPORTS (Cont.)

SEXUAL ABUSE

Offense: Sexual Abuse in the First Degree Inw Code Chapter 709

Factor 1: Commission of a sex act. Credible evidence may include one of the following:

- Information provided by credible perpetrator or victim. Information obtained should include a precise description of the type of activity in which the participants engaged.
- Observation of sex act by credible person. Information obtained should include precise description of the activity which occurred.
- Diagnosis or verification by competent medical practitioner of the presence of genital injuries or disease which could not have occurred in the absence of a sex act.
- Verification by competent professional of the presence of perpetrator's sperm in the child's anus, mouth, vagina, or genital area.
- Verification by competent professional of the presence of body tissue of perpetrator on child or body tissue of child on perpetrator which could not have occurred in absence of sex act.

Factor 2: Person is seriously injured. Credible evidence includes all of the following:

- Credible evidence from credible person that serious injury occurred. For purposes of this offense, serious injury means disabling mental illness, or bodily injury which creates a substantial risk of death or which causes permanent disfigurement, or protracted loss or impairment of the function of any bodily member or organ.
- Credible evidence from credible person that injury occurred to any person during the commission of the sex act.
Sexual Abuse in the First Degree

Factor 3: Must have credible evidence from credible person of the following:

- That victim is under age 18.

Factor 4: Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:

- That the person who committed the sex act is a person responsible for the care of the child.
- That sex act could not have occurred without omission of responsible caretaker. Omission is failure to exercise that supervision that a reasonable person would in a similar situation.

Offense: Sexual Abuse in the Second Degree Iowa Code Chapter 709

Factor 1: Commission of sex act. Credible evidence may include one of the following:

- Information provided by credible perpetrator or victim. Information obtained should include a precise description of the type of activity in which the participants engaged.

- Observation of sex act by a credible person. Information obtained should include precise description of the activity which occurred.

- Diagnosis or verification by competent medical practitioner of the presence of genital injuries or disease which could not have occurred in the absence of a sex act.

- Verification by competent professional of the presence of perpetrator's sperm in the child's anus, mouth, vagina, or genital area.

- Verification by competent professional of the presence of body tissue of perpetrator on child or body tissue of child on perpetrator which could not have occurred in absence of sex act.
SEXUAL ABUSE IN THE SECOND DEGREE (Cont.)

- Verification by competent professional of the presence of perpetrator's sperm in the child's anus, mouth, vagina, or genital area.
- Verification by competent professional of the presence of body tissue of perpetrator on child or body tissue of child on perpetrator which could not have occurred in absence of sex act.

Factor 2: Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:

- Perpetrator displayed a deadly weapon threateningly during commission of the sex act.
- Perpetrator uses or threatens force which creates risk of health or serious injury.
- Victim is under age 12.
- Perpetrator is aided or abetted by others in committing sex act and sex act is committed by force or against will of victim.

Factor 3: Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:

- That victim is under age 18 and that the sex act is done by force or against victim's will.
- That victim is under age 18 and that a competent mental health professional has determined that:
  a) the victim suffers mental defect or incapacity which precludes giving consent, or
  b) the victim lacks mental capacity to know right from wrong in conduct of sexual matters.
- That victim is under age 14.
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Offense: Sexual Abuse in the Third Degree Iowa Code Chapter 709

Factor 1: Commission of sex act. Credible evidence may include one of the following:

- Information provided by credible perpetrator or victim. Information obtained should include a precise description of the type of activity in which the participants engaged.
- Observation of sex act by a credible person. Information obtained should include precise description of the activity which occurred.
- Diagnosis or verification by competent medical practitioner of the presence of genital injuries or diseases which could not have occurred in the absence of a sex act.
- Verification by competent professional of the presence of perpetrator's sperm in the child's anus, mouth, vagina, or genital area.
- Verification by competent professional of the presence of body tissue of perpetrator on child or body tissue of child on perpetrator which could not have occurred in the absence of sex act.

Factor 2: Must have credible evidence from credible person that the perpetrator and victim are not cohabitating as husband and wife.

Factor 3: Must have credible evidence from credible person of the following:

- Victim is under age 18.

Factor 4: Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:

- That the person who committed the sex act is a person responsible for care of the child.
- That sex act could not have occurred without omission of responsible caretaker. Omission is failure to exercise that supervision that a reasonable person would in a similar situation.
DIAGRAM III: FOUNDING REPORTS (Cont.)

SEXUAL ABUSE (Cont.)

Offense: Detention in a Brothel Iowa Code Chapter 709

Factor 1: Must have credible evidence from credible person of each of the following:

- Intent of perpetrator to engage victim in prostitution.
- That perpetrator does either of the following:
  - entices a nonprostitute victim to become an inmate of a brothel so as to engage victim in prostitution.
  - detains any person in a brothel against the person's will so as to engage the person in prostitution.

Factor 2: Must have credible evidence from credible person that victim is under age 18.

Factor 3: Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:

- That the person who committed the offense is a person responsible for care of the child.
- That offense could not have occurred without omission of responsible caretaker. Omission is failure to exercise that supervision that a reasonable person would in a similar situation.
Offense: Lascivious Acts with a Child Iowa Code Chapter 709

Factor 1: Must show intent of perpetrator to arouse or satisfy sexual desires of perpetrator or victim and must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:

- Perpetrator fondles or touches victim's genitals or pubes.
- Perpetrator permits or causes victim to fondle or touch perpetrator's genitals or pubes.
- Perpetrator solicits victim to engage in sex act.
- Perpetrator inflicts pain or discomfort on victim or allows victim to inflict pain or discomfort on perpetrator.

Factor 2: Must have credible evidence from credible person of each of the following:

- Victim is under age 18.
- Perpetrator is over age 18 or older.
- Victim and perpetrator are not married to each other.

Factor 3: Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:

- That the person who committed the offense is a person responsible for care of the child.
- That offense could not have occurred without omission of responsible caretaker. Omission is failure to exercise that supervision that a reasonable person would in a similar situation.
Offense: **Indecent Exposure** Iowa Code Chapter 709

**Factor 1:** Must show intent of perpetrator to arouse or satisfy sexual desires of perpetrator or victim and that perpetrator knows or should have known act was offensive to viewer and must have credible evidence from credible person that one of the following acts occurred:

- Perpetrator exposes pubes or genitals to victim.
- Perpetrator commits sex act in view of victim.

**Factor 2:** Must have credible evidence from credible person or both of the following:

- Victim is under age 18.
- Victim and perpetrator are not married to each other.

**Factor 3:** Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:

- That the person who committed the offense is a person responsible for care of the child.
- That offense could not have occurred without omission of responsible caretaker. Omission is failure to exercise that supervision that a reasonable person would in a similar situation.
DIAGRAM III: FOUND REPORTS (Cont.)

SEXUAL ABUSE (Cont.)

Offense: Assault with Intent to Commit Sexual Abuse Iowa Code Chapter 709

Factor 1: Must show perpetrator's intent to commit sexual abuse and must have credible evidence from credible person that one of the following acts occurred (in the absence of noncriminal sport or social activity) without justification:

- Any act which is intended to cause pain or injury to, or which is intended to result in physical contact which will be insulting or offensive to another, coupled with the apparent ability to execute the act.
- Any act which is intended to place another in fear of immediate physical contact which will be painful, injurious, insulting, or offensive, coupled with the apparent ability to execute the act.
- Intentionally points any firearm toward another, or displays in a threatening manner any dangerous weapon toward another.

Factor 2: Must have credible evidence from credible person that victim is under age 18.

Factor 3: Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:

- That the person who committed the offense is a person responsible for care of the child.
- That offense could not have occurred without omission of responsible caretaker. Omissions is failure to exercise that supervision that a reasonable person would in a similar situation.

Offense: Indecent Contact with a Child Iowa Code Chapter 709

Factor 1: Must show intent of perpetrator to arouse or satisfy sexual desires of perpetrator or victim and must have credible evidence from credible person that one of the following acts occurred:

- Perpetrator fondles or touches genitals, pubes, inner thigh, groin, buttock, anus, or breast of victim or clothing covering same body parts.
SEXUAL ABUSE (Cont.)

Indecent Contact with a Child (Cont.)

• Perpetrator permits or causes victim to fondle or touch perpetrator’s genitals, pubes, inner thigh, groin, buttock, anus, or breast.

• Perpetrator solicits the victim to allow the perpetrator to inflict pain or discomfort on the victim.

• Perpetrator solicits the victim to inflict pain or discomfort on the perpetrator.

Factor 2: Must have credible evidence from credible person of each of the following:

• Victim is under age 18.

• Victim and perpetrator are not married to each other.

• Perpetrator is age 18 or older.

Factor 3: Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:

• That the person who committed the offense is a person responsible for care of the child.

• That offense could not have occurred without omission of responsible caretaker. Omission is failure to exercise that supervision that a reasonable person would in a similar situation.

Offense: **Incest** Iowa Code Chapter 726

Factor 1: Commission of a sex act. Credible evidence may include one of the following:

• Information provided by credible perpetrator or victim. Information obtained should include a precise description of the type of activity in which the participants engaged.

• Observation of a sex act by a credible person. Information obtained should include precise description of the activity which occurred.
DIAGRAM III: FOUND REPORTS (Cont.)

SEXUAL ABUSE (Cont.)

Incest (Cont.)

* Diagnosis or verification by competent medical practitioner of the presence of genital injuries or disease which could not have occurred in the absence of a sex act.

* Verification by competent professional of the presence of perpetrator's sperm in the child's anus, mouth, vagina or genital area.

* Verification by competent professional of the presence of body tissue of perpetrator on child or body tissue of child on perpetrator which could not have occurred in absence of a sex act.

Factor 2: Must have credible evidence from credible person that:

* Perpetrator knows that victim is related, legitimately or illegitimately, as an ancestor, descendant, brother or sister of the whole or half blood, aunt, uncle, niece, or nephew.

* Perpetrator is age 14 or older.

* Victim is under age 18.

Factor 3: Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:

* That the person who committed the offense is a person responsible for care of the child.

* That offense could not have occurred without omission of responsible caretaker. Omissions is failure to exercise that supervision that a reasonable person would in a similar situation.

Offense: Sexual Exploitation of Children Iowa Code Chapter 728

Factor 1: Must show intent of perpetrator to employ, use, persuade, induce, entice, coerce, knowingly permit, or cause a child to engage in a prohibited sexual act, and must have credible evidence that one of the following occurred:
Sexual Exploitation of Children (Cont.)

- Perpetrator allows child to engage in a prohibited sexual act.
- Perpetrator intends or knows that the sexual act or simulated act is being recorded on film or in print.

Factor 2: Must have credible evidence from credible person that the victim is under 18.

Factor 3: Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:
- That the person who committed the offense is a person responsible for care of the child.
- That the offense could not have occurred without omission of the responsible caretaker. Omission is failure to exercise that supervision that a reasonable person would in a similar situation.

Offense: Prostitution Iowa Code Chapter 725

Factor 1: Must show intent of perpetrator to permit or purchase or offer for purchase the sale of sexual services from a child.

Factor 2: Must have credible evidence from credible person that the victim is under 18.

Factor 3: Must have credible evidence from credible person of one of the following:
- That the person who committed the offense is a person responsible for care of the child.
- That offense could not have occurred without omission of responsible caretaker. Omission is failure to exercise that supervision that a reasonable person would in a similar situation.
APPENDIX B.

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES (DHS)

LETTER TO PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANTS
The Department of Human Services is sending you this letter on behalf of Iowa State University. The university is conducting a study with people who have been involved in investigations of sexual abuse of children. The purpose of this project is to help professional workers learn to deal more sensitively with people involved in such situations. We have agreed to send you this letter asking you to take part in this project.

Your participation in this project is entirely voluntary. If you agree, an interviewer will make arrangements to come and see you at a convenient location. You will be asked about your reactions to the investigation as well as other experiences and feelings.

The interview will take approximately two hours, and you will be paid $50 for your help. Iowa State University will keep responses to all questions asked strictly confidential. They will not be given to the Department of Human Services or anyone else at anytime.

Please return the enclosed card indicating whether you are interested in participating in this project. If you will consider being interviewed, check the "Yes" box on the postcard, fill in the information requested, and return the card. A project staff member from Iowa State University will then call you to answer any questions you may have about the project. If you do not wish to participate check the "No" box and return the card. No stamp is needed.

Your participation is very important to the success of this research study. If you have any questions about it, please feel free to call Craig Allen, the project leader, at 515-294-6317.

Sincerely,

Tim Barber-Lindstrom
Program Manager
Child Protective Services

Enclosure
Informed Consent for Family Relationships Study

I understand that Iowa State University is conducting a study with people who have been involved in investigations of sexual abuse of children. I hereby consent to participate in this research by providing information requested from me during a personal interview.

I understand that all information I provide in response to the questions will be treated with total confidentiality and my name will not be used in connection with any answers I give and will not be released to anyone.

I also understand that my participation is voluntary and I may refuse to answer any questions I do not like. I understand, however, that I will receive the $50 stipend only if I complete the interview.

Participant's signature

Date

Interviewer's signature
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SHORT FORM BEM SEX-ROLE INVENTORY (SBSRI)
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

128–129, Appendix D
131–132, Appendix E
APPENDIX E.
SHORT FORM PARTNER RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY (SPRI)
FORM IIB
APPENDIX F.

HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW COMMITTEE CERTIFICATION
INFORMATION ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
(Please follow the accompanying instructions for completing this form.)

1. Title of project (please type): A Comparative Analysis of Women Who Sexually Abused Children

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are properly protected. Additions to or changes in procedures affecting the subjects after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review.

   Craig M. Allen Aug. 11, 1986

   Typed Name of Principal Investigator Date Signature of Principal Investigator

   54 LeBram Hall
   Campus Address
   6-6317
   Campus Telephone

3. Signatures of others (if any) Date Relationship to Principal Investigator

4. ATTACH an additional page(s) (A) describing your proposed research and (B) the subjects to be used (C) indicating any risks or discomforts to the subjects, and (D) covering any topics checked below. CHECK all boxes applicable.

   - Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
   - Samples (blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
   - Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
   - Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
   - Deception of subjects
   - Subjects under 14 years of age and/or Subjects 14-17 years of age
   - Subjects in Institutions
   - Research must be approved by another institution or agency

5. ATTACH an example of the material to be used to obtain informed consent and CHECK which type will be used.

   - Signed informed consent will be obtained.
   - Modified informed consent will be obtained.

6. Anticipated date on which subjects will be first contacted: Month Day Year
   Anticipated date for last contact with subjects: Month Day Year

7. If Applicable: Anticipated date on which audio or visual tapes will be erased and/or identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments: Month Day Year

8. Signature of Head or Chairperson Date Department or Administrative Unit

9. Decision of the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research:

   - Project Approved
   - Project not approved
   - No action required

   George G. Karas Date
   Name of Committee Chairperson Signature of Committee Chairperson