

Roger Williams University

DOCS@RWU

Psychology Theses

Arts and Sciences Theses

5-15-2012

Relationship Between Exposure to Familial Violence and Rapists' Offense Level of Force

Courtney A. Meyer

Roger Williams University, cmeyer834@g.rwu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://docs.rwu.edu/psych_thesis



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Meyer, Courtney A., "Relationship Between Exposure to Familial Violence and Rapists' Offense Level of Force" (2012). *Psychology Theses*. 11.

https://docs.rwu.edu/psych_thesis/11

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Arts and Sciences Theses at DOCS@RWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology Theses by an authorized administrator of DOCS@RWU. For more information, please contact mwu@rwu.edu.

Relationship Between Exposure to Familial Violence and Rapists' Offense Level of Force

Courtney A. Meyer

Master of Arts

Forensic Psychology

Feinstein College of Arts and Science

Roger Williams University

May 2012

ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY
 MASTER'S PROGRAM IN FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY
 THESIS PROJECT FORM

Date: 3-30-11
0745693

Approval is given to: Courtney A Meyer
 Student's Name

a candidate for degree of Master of Arts in FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGY, to conduct the following research project:

Relationship between exposure to familial violence and rapists' offense level of force
 Title of Research Project

1. Composition of Master's Thesis Committee:

MATT ZAITCHIK [Signature] 3/30/11
 Committee Member [Print Name] Signature Date

JUNTA KATANIA [Signature] 7.5.2011
 Committee Member [Print Name] Signature Date

Alejandro Leguizamo [Signature] 3.30.11
 Thesis Chair [Print Name] Signature Date

2. Successful Defense of Master's Thesis Proposal:

JUNTA KATANIA [Signature] 2.10.2012
 Committee Member [Print Name] Signature Date

MATT C. ZAITCHIK [Signature] 2-10-12
 Committee Member [Print Name] Signature Date

Alejandro Leguizamo [Signature] 2.10.12
 Thesis Chair [Print Name] Signature Date

3. Successful Defense of Master's Thesis Project:

JUNTA KATANIA [Signature] 5.7.2012
 Committee Member [Print Name] Signature Date

MATT C. ZAITCHIK [Signature] 5/4/12
 Committee Member [Print Name] Signature Date

Alejandro Leguizamo [Signature] 5/4/12
 Thesis Chair [Print Name] Signature Date

MATT C. ZAITCHIK [Signature] 5/10/12
 Graduate Program Director [Print Name] Signature Date

Laura Turner [Signature] 5.9.12
 Chair, Psychology Department [Print Name] Signature Date

Lorrie Gurshuk [Signature] 5/14/12
 Dean, College of Arts and Sciences [Print Name] Signature Date

Abstract

There has been substantial research on the effects of familial violence on rapists and factors which lead a person to rape (Connolly & Woollons, 2008; Jaffe, Wilson, & Wolfe, 1986; Kitzman, Gaylord, Holt, & Kenny, 2003; Lee, Jackson, Pattison, & Ward, 2002). However, there has been no research in identifying the factors which link rapists' offense level of force and exposure to familial violence. In the present study we investigated how offenders exposed to domestic violence differ from those not exposed in the following factors: rates of physical abuse, rates of sexual victimization by both men and women, rates of alcohol use, and level of force in their offense. In the present study we tested a model to ascertain what factors predict level of force in the rapist's offense. The results partially confirmed both of our hypotheses.

Keywords: rapists, familial violence, and offense level of force.

Relationship Between Exposure to Familial Violence and Rapists' Offense Level of Force

The origins of sexual offending have long been studied by many (Marshall & Barbaree, 1990; Marshall & Marshall, 2000; Smallbone & McCabe, 2003). Common findings include sex offenders having poor parental attachments, being sexually abused as children, using sex as a coping strategy, being physically abused as a child, and alcohol abuse, to name a few (Kraanen & Emmelkamp, 2011; Lee et al., 2002; Marshall & Marshall, 2000). This developmental process of sex offenders has been studied in order to guide treatment (Lang & Langevin, 1991; Marshall, Serran, & Cortoni, 2000; Simons, Wurtele, & Durham, 2008).

Therefore, in order to understand the full breadth of the topic at hand, the etiological theories of sexual offending will be discussed first to provide a better understanding of the evolution of sex offender research. Next, the rapists' experience of childhood abuse will be explained to show how childhood abuse can be a factor in the rapists' offense. Rapists' exposure to domestic violence as a child and their family environment will be discussed to demonstrate how these factors can be influential in the rapists' offense. Next, the level of force in sexual offenses will be explained to understand which factors may predict the level of force used by the rapists' in the offense. Lastly, the role of substances will be discussed to determine how alcohol use influences the rapists' offense.

Etiological Theories of Sexual Offending

Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1969) suggests that a person who observes certain behaviors exhibited by others, learns the reactions of others and consequences to the behaviors observed, and later mimics those behaviors observed in order to gain the observed results. This theory has been used to explain criminal and sexually deviant behaviors as well. There are two primary social learning theory hypotheses for sexual offending: abused-abuser hypothesis

(Garland & Dougher, 1990; Groth & Burgess, 1977) and sexually violent pornography and social learning (Itzin, 2002; Materson, 1984).

The abused-abuser hypothesis is when a child is sexually abused, that child will go onto abuse others as an older adolescent or adult. There are three stages to the abused-abuser hypothesis. The first stage is the sexual abuse and the child's cognitive thoughts after being victimized. The child could have thoughts such as "This must be normal," "This isn't harmful because someone I trust is doing it to me," and "This is pleasurable in some way (Briggs & Hawkins, 1996; Burton, Miller, & Schill, 2002; Hummel, Thomke, Oldenberger, & Specht, 2000; Stinson, Sales, & Becker, 2008)."

The second stage contains many factors relevant to the social learning theory of sexually deviant behavior, such as age of the victim, relationship between the victim and the offender, type of sexual act and amount of force used, sex of the perpetrator, duration of the abuse, and number of perpetrators (Stinson et al., 2008). The younger the victim, he or she is more susceptible and likely to mimic observed behaviors. When the perpetrator is a known and trusted individual of the victim, the victim is more likely to act out the abusive behavior later. The force and inhumanity of the abusive behavior influences the victim in a way that causes the victim to react strongly to forceful situations (Stinson et al., 2008). When the perpetrator is male, the victim is more likely to adopt sexually deviant interests or behaviors. When the abuse occurs frequently over a longer period of time, the victim has more time to learn the abusive behaviors. Lastly, the number of perpetrators influences the victim to model the behavior based on the belief that the experience is normal or that he or she was "asking for it (Stinson et al., 2008, p. 83)".

The last stage is the first response of the victim and of those who the victim tells. The child may not tell anyone because he or she may be afraid to tell others, does not think anyone will help, or the child is already affected by the abuse by cognitions telling him or her that he or she deserved the abuse. However, if the child does tell someone about the abuse, the responder could have an indifferent reaction. The child could also feel that he or she overreacted to the abuse and begin to normalize the abuse, which could then lead to socially learned deviant behavior. Another response would be if the child saw the perpetrator receive punishment for his actions, in which the child would not display socially learned deviant behavior (Stinson et al., 2008).

The second hypothesis derived from social learning argues a connection between pornography and rape (Stinson et al., 2008). It is based on how watching pornography may be a model for some people and can serve as encouragement to act out the behaviors the person has watched. This leads to the internalization of deviant sexual roles or deviant attitudes about women from watching pornography (Itzin, 2002; Materson, 1984). The two types of pornography specifically linked to sexual deviance are sexually violent or rape pornography and child pornography. Sexually violent or rape pornography are where women are shown as being humiliated or degraded in forced or coerced sexual situations. Based on social learning theory, a person who views this type of pornography may change their attitudes towards women and rape myths, and even show an increased acceptance of sexually aggressive behaviors (Cramer et al., 1998). Moreover, those who view child pornography would internalize models of sexually abusing children as an acceptable sexual interaction (Stinson et al., 2008). On the other hand, others have found a connection between sexualized violent stimuli (not sexually explicit) and aggression against women, including sexual (Flowers, 1998; Vega & Malamuth, 2007). The

U.S. Department of Justice (1985) found a positive correlation between pornography, sexual violence, and aggression against women. Donnerstein and Berkowitz (1981) found that both positive and negative reactions of the victim in the aggressive pornographic film increased aggression against women in their male subjects. In terms of how aggression against women influences rape myths, Malamuth and Check (1981) found an increased acceptance of aggression against women and male's endorsement of rape myths amongst their male subjects who viewed movies depicting aggression against women which had positive consequences. Burt (1980) also found that the more accepting her subjects were of interpersonal violence increased the subjects' acceptance of rape myths. Overall, pornography, stimuli showing aggression towards women, and rape is the second way the social learning theory demonstrates how rape can be modeled. This can influence men's acceptance of aggression against women and rape myths (Flowers, 1998; Malamuth & Check, 1981; Stinson et al., 2008).

Thornhill and Palmer (2000) explored an evolutionary theory of rape. They hypothesized that rape is a consequence of mating strategies which increased males' reproduction. They further hypothesized that rape could have been selected either directly or indirectly. When rape is selected directly, this means that methods utilized to force fornication would increase males' reproductive success. However, when rape is selected indirectly, this means that rape directly emerged from another trait which was selected for sexual adaptation. Therefore, Thornhill and Palmer (2000) contend that rape is always about sex.

Hall and Hirschman (1991) developed the quadripartite model of sexual aggression to explain rape which encompasses four factors: physiological sexual arousal, cognitive distortions, affective dyscontrol, and personality problems based on developmental experiences. They discussed how physiological sexual arousal by itself is not enough to explain sexual aggression

for all sexual offenders. Therefore, Hall and Hirschman's (1991) model hypothesized that there is a primary motivating factor which encourages offending by pushing a person past their inhibitory threshold. They further hypothesized that there are certain inhibitors which hinder sexual aggression. However, these inhibitors can be conquered through the primary factor interacting with the remaining three factors. For example, a person with cognitive distortions about women as the primary motivational factor could have high levels of physiological arousal, affective dyscontrol, and personality problems before the cognitive distortion which is the final motivator in acting sexually aggressive. Therefore, Hall & Hirschman's (1991) model is just one example of a multi-factor model of sexual aggression.

Malamuth, Heavy, and Litz's (1993) hypothesized that there are two interacting pathways leading to sexual aggression: hostile masculinity and sexual promiscuity, this is known as The Confluence Model. Hostile masculinity is based on the individual's exposure to hostile home environments and linked to the development of many attitudes and personality characteristics that increase coercive behavior. Sexual promiscuity is based on the excessive use of sexuality as a self-esteem boost, which increases the use of coercive strategies in achieving sex. Overall, Malamuth et al.'s (1993) model has demonstrated how early developmental experiences, like parental violence as well as physical and sexual abuse, can influence the development of a skewed perspective on male-female relationships.

Rapists' Experience of Childhood Abuse

Childhood abuse has been linked to sexual offending based on popular theories such as the victim/offender (Burgess et al., 1988) and social learning (Bandura, 1969; Smallbone & Dadds, 2000). The victim/offender theory hypothesizes that a young person who is sexually abused could evolve into an adult offender (Connolly & Woollons, 2008). The child learns to

become sexual based on their own histories of victimization and their exposure to disturbed parental (or adult) relationships (Bandura, 1978; Felson & Lane, 2009; Ganem & Agnew, 2007; Widom 1995). However, not all criminals who have histories of victimization sexually offend (Murrell, Christoff, & Henning, 2007).

Sexual Abuse. Twenty five to seventy percent of rapists and child molesters have been sexually victimized as children (Hindman & Peters, 1999). Both the victim/offender and social learning theories have consistently shown sexual offenders reporting being the victims of sexual abuse themselves (Burton, 2008; Connolly & Woollons, 2008; Fagan & Wexler, 1988). Simons et al. (2008) found that rapists who were sexually victimized as children were more likely to have female perpetrators, either as an acquaintance (27%) or family member (14%). On the other hand, in Spaccarelli et al.'s (1997) juvenile sample, those self-reported juvenile sex offenders were sexually victimized by more females (58%) than males (3.8%), while arrested juvenile sex offenders were sexually victimized more equally by females (21%) and males (16.7%). Connolly and Wollons (2008) found that rapists were higher in every abuse category compared to the other two groups with 71% reporting sexual abuse. Simons et al. (2008) also found among rapists that 43% experienced sexual abuse. Therefore, researchers' have concluded that sex offenders are more likely to have experienced sexual abuse compared to other criminal offenders and that the experience of sexual abuse influenced their sexual offending behavior (Burton 2008; Connolly & Woollons, 2008; Simons et al. 2008).

Physical Abuse. Reports of physical abuse have been found high in the psychosocial histories of sexual offenders among both theories (Burton, 2008; Connolly & Woollons, 2008; Ryan & Lane, 1991). Results found that boys who were physically abused are more likely to be arrested for sexual crimes as adults (Widom & Ames, 1994). Simons et al. (2008) found that

rapists reported more physical abuse (68%) compared to child sexual abusers. Spaccarelli et al. (1997) found that the sexually aggressive delinquents in their sample reported significantly more exposure to serious physical abuse and domestic violence with weapons than the controls. Connolly and Wollons (2008) found that rapists were higher in every abuse category compared to the other two groups with 50% reporting physical abuse. Overall, the researchers' concluded that sex offenders were more likely to be physically abused compared to other criminal offenders and, the sexual offenses committed by rapists were influenced by their experiences of violence in the home as children (Connolly & Woollons, 2008; Simons et al. 2008; Spaccarelli et al. 1997).

Neglect. The experience of neglect during childhood has also been reported higher in sexual offenders among both theories (Burton 2008; Connolly & Woollons, 2008). Craisatti & Beech's (2004) rapists reported experiencing emotional abuse/neglect (54%) as children. Connolly and Wollons (2008) found that rapists were higher in every abuse category compared to the other two groups with 79% reporting neglect. Even though the research involving neglect and sexual offenders is limited (Burton, 2008), the researchers' concluded that childhood neglect is still influential in sex offenders' offenses (Connolly & Woollons, 2008; Craisatti & Beech, 2004). Overall, these childhood adverse experiences produce child antisocial behavior which can lead to an increased risk of the child committing rape as an adult (Knight, Prentky, Schneider, & Rosenberg, 1983; Marshall & Barbaree, 1990; Robins, 1966).

Family Environment of Sex Offenders

There are currently several family environmental factors related to sexual offending such as divorce or family dysfunction (Righthand & Welch, 2005). Among juvenile sex offender samples, the following factors were found in their family environments: family instability, substance abuse, psychopathology, criminality, and violence (Miner, Siekert, & Ackland, 1997;

Morenz & Becker, 1995). Kimball and Guarino-Ghezzi (1996) found high rates of continuous family conflict in their juvenile sample who sexually abused children younger than them. There are minimal studies showing juveniles coming from intact families (Kahn & Chambers, 1991), but even those juveniles who come from intact families describe the parents as emotionally inaccessible and disengaged from them (Miner & Crimmins, 1995). Overall, the families of juvenile sex offenders have been described in the literature as either rigid and enmeshed or chaotic (Bischof, Stith, & Whitney, 1995).

Then among adult sex offender samples, Prentky and Carter (1984) investigated the triad (enuresis, fire-setting, and cruelty to animals) in relation to family (e.g. drug abuse, family instability), childhood (e.g. running away, Youth Service Board), juvenile (e.g. number and amount of time in psychiatric facilities, number and amount of time in medical facilities), and criminal (e.g. number of adult and juvenile serious sexual, nonsexual victims involved, degree of violence in most violent offense) variables. They found that the triad and similar behavior such as vandalism, truancy, and fighting demonstrated an unspecific maladaptive response to an abusive home environment. For example, over four times as many sex offenders of drug-abusing mothers and three times as many sex offenders with criminal fathers displayed triad behaviors compared to those sex offenders without drug-abusing mothers or criminal fathers. In sum, Prentky and Carter (1984) concluded that their findings were more childhood-specific and poor prognostic signs that antisocial behavior during childhood would lead to antisocial behavior in adulthood.

Exposure to Domestic Violence

Domestic violence can increase acceptance of aggression against women and rape myths in our society (Burt, 1980; Malamuth & Check, 1981). Approximately 1.3 million women are

physically assaulted by an intimate partner each year (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2003). Children who witness domestic violence are at risk of engaging in such as adults (Kitzman et al., 2003). A child who witnesses domestic violence can endure a range of negative consequences such as having psychological, emotional, behavioral, social, and academic problems (Fantuzzo & Lindquist, 1989; Jaffe et al., 1990; Kolbo, Blakely, & Engleman, 1996; Margolin & Gordis, 2000; Wolak & Finkelhor, 1998). Exposure to domestic violence as a child is also a factor in a variety of crimes committed in adulthood (Murrell et al., 2007), including sexual offenses (Caputo, Frick, & Brodsky, 1999; Hunter, 2004).

Currently, there are no studies of adult offenders that explore their exposure to domestic violence as children. However, the literature has focused on sex offender's perpetration of domestic violence (Johnson & Knight 2000; Lisak & Milner, 2002; Stalans, Hacker, & Talbot, 2010). In the case of juvenile sex offenders, Caputo et al. (1999) found that three times as many in the juvenile sex offender and violent offender groups were exposed to severe domestic violence as were the group of juveniles who committed status offenses. They also found that juvenile sex offenders and violent offenders self-reported more domestic violence directed at their mother. Interestingly, Caputo et al. (1999) found no differences among the participants for poor impulse control or sexist attitudes toward women. Skuse et al. (1998) found that juvenile boys were at a higher risk of being sexually abusive when they experienced intrafamilial violence, witnessed intrafamilial violence, and their caregivers discontinued care. Malamuth (1991) concluded that juvenile sex offender's parent-parent and parent-child interactions involving physical and sexual abuse played a role in the developmental process of them perpetrating violence against women. Overall, many other studies have found that juvenile sex

offenders' aggressive and assaultive behavior has been influenced by witnessing or experiencing violence in their home (Lewis, Shankok, & Pincus, 1979; Pynoos & Nader, 1988; Smith, 1988).

The Role of Substances

The relationship between offenders' intoxication, level of force in the offense, and level of victim injuries has been demonstrated (Ullman & Najdowski, 2010). Male adult sex offenders commonly report high rates of alcohol misuse and intoxication at the time of the offense (Kraanen & Emmelkamp, 2011). Perpetrators of sexual violence who consumed alcohol before the offense made more use of a weapon, force, and threats than those perpetrators who did not do so (Brecklin & Ullman, 2010). The likelihood of victim injury also increases when the perpetrator has consumed alcohol before the offense (Abbey, Clinton, McAuslan, Zawaski, & Buck, 2002a; Abbey, Clinton-Sherrod, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2003; Brecklin & Ullman, 2010; Martin & Bachman, 1998). Moreover, when the perpetrators' consumption of alcohol increases, so does the severity of the rape (Abbey et al., 2002b; Abbey et al., 2003). Overall, the perpetrators use of alcohol before a sexual assault increases the physical injuries endured by the victim, threats to harm/kill the victim, and the completion of intercourse/penetration (Busch-Armendariz, DiNitto, Bell, & Bohman, 2010).

Level of Force in Sexual Offenses

Knight & Prentky (1990) developed one of the most commonly utilized typologies of rapists based on the level of force utilized in the offense. First, the opportunistic type is unplanned and the main goal is sex with no signs of force to achieve the goal. Second, the pervasively-angry type involves undifferentiated anger where the rapist uses force and inflicts physical injury on the victim which sometimes leads to death. Third, the sadistic type has difficulty separating sexual and aggressive drives, specifically the overt sadistic type; the

aggression is directly influenced by physically injuring the victim during the sexual assault. Lastly, the vindictive type is where the rapists' anger is centrally focused on women, where the sexual assault involves physical injuries, degradation, and humiliation endured by the victim.

An earlier typology of rapists developed by Groth and Birnbaum (1979) identified three types of rapists. The first was the power rapists who only utilize the force necessary to fulfill their sexual fantasies to achieve sex and control. Second, anger rapists are known to hurt, humiliate, or punish their victims. Lastly, sadistic rapists are the most violent of the three because they are sexually aroused by their victim's mental and physical suffering. McCabe and Wauchope (2005) comprised a checklist of behavioral characteristics based on the typologies of Douglas and Olshaker (1998), Groth et al. (1977), Hazelwood and Burgess (1987), and Knight and Prentky (1990). In the checklist, the anger rapist was characterized as having a forced entry, using force during sex, using force on resistance from the victim, and using immediate force. The power-exploitative rapist was listed as using immediate force, moderate force, and some anger. Lastly, the power-reassurance rapist used minimal force, while the sadistic rapist used blindfolds, excessive restraints, force during sex, force on resistance from the victim, immediate force, brought restraints to the scene, and displayed overwhelming anger.

Researchers have found support for *modus operandi* based on the typologies described previously. Ouimet, Guay, and Proulx (2000) found that offenders who were angry before the crime used expressive violence and inflicted higher levels of injuries on their victims. Proulx, St-Yves, Guay, & Ouimet (1999) discovered how rapes by the anger rapist type was characterized by higher levels of injury on the victim, higher levels of force, and using expressive violence. Fedora et al. (1992) found that the sadistic and nonsadistic aggressors do not differ in dangerousness for the physical harm inflicted on the victim or number of victim

deaths. Quinsey and Chaplin (1982) split a group of rapists into most dangerous and less dangerous based on the injury they inflicted on their victims. They found a correlation between the victim injury score and penile circumference response to nonsexual violence narratives but not sexual violence narratives. In sum, researchers have found support for rapists' excessive and brutal use of force during the rape (Groth & Birnbaum, 1978; Safarik, Jarvis, & Nussbaum, 2002).

The levels of violence utilized during the attack have been categorized into a Typology of Violence: ultimate, limited, moderate, intimidation, nonviolence, and not sure (Stevens, 1997). Ultimate violence was described as the offender lacking control in destroying others, using unnecessary violence to gain a god-like power over victim, uncontrollable rage, and the main goal was to destroy the victim. Limited violence was limited physical abuse utilized to meet the offender's goals. Moderate violent offenders only used enough force to gain their victim's attention such as a blow, push, slap, or threat of using a weapon to achieve their objectives. Intimidation offenders' goal was sexual intimacy with the victim; therefore they utilized threats to shock their victim into submission. Findings showed that 13% utilized ultimate violence, 20% limited violence, 20% moderate violence, 16% intimidation, 13% nonviolence, and 18% were not sure (Stevens, 1997).

In sum, the rapists' experience of childhood abuse has been determined as a predictive factor in their sexual offending (Connolly & Wollons, 2008). It is also clear that domestic violence is an influential factor for the sexual offenses of both juvenile and adult sex offenders (Caputo et al., 1999; Stalans et al., 2010). The level of force used in the offense has shown its merit in contributing to sexual offenses based on many typologies (Douglas & Olshaker, 1998; Knight & Prentky, 1990). Lastly, alcohol use before the offense has demonstrated an increased

use of force during the offense (Brecklin & Ullman, 2010). Overall, alcohol has been found to trigger expectations related to male sexuality and aggression in rapists who have experienced childhood abuse and been exposed to domestic violence (Abbey, 1991; Bushman & Cooper, 1990; Crowe & George, 1989; Gustafon, 1993; Norris & Kerr, 1993; Rosenberg, Knight, Prentky, & Lee, 1988). Therefore, the current study is necessary because there has been no study known to date that has investigated how exposure to domestic violence as a child affected an adult sex offender's utilization of force during the offense.

Hypotheses

In the present study, we predict that offenders exposed to domestic violence will differ from those not exposed in the following factors: percent of physical abuse, percent of sexual victimization by both men and women, level of force, and percent of alcohol use. The second hypothesis aims to test a model to ascertain what factors predict level of force in the rapist's offense. The factors to be tested are history of physical abuse and sexual abuse by both genders, exposure to domestic violence, and alcohol use at the time of offense.

Method

Sample

The sample for this study will consist of 357 assessment reports of incarcerated rapists who were admitted for treatment at the Sex Offender Treatment Program of the Massachusetts Treatment Center (MTC) between 2002 and 2010. Inmates transferred to the MTC undergo an initial evaluation where psychosocial, criminal, and offense-related information is gathered. In addition, they undergo some psychological testing. Findings are documented in reports (Intake Assessments). Of the overall sample, 84 (24.3%) reported having witnessed domestic violence

and 262 (75.7%) reported not witnessing domestic violence while growing up. The mean age of the offenders for both groups was 40 years old at the time of evaluation, with an age range of 19-68 years old for those who witnessed domestic violence and 18-78 years old for those who did not witness domestic violence.

The socioeconomic status of the offenders who witnessed domestic violence were: low class (38.8%), low-middle class (11.8%), middle class (15.3%), and upper-middle/upper class (3.5%), while those who did not witness domestic violence were: low class (20.2%), low-middle class (16.2%), middle (22.1%), and upper-middle (3.3%). A chi-square test for independence indicated an overall significant difference between those who reported being exposed to domestic violence or not and their socioeconomic status while growing up, $\chi^2(3, n=227) = 10.17, p = .02$ (See Table 1).

The average high school grade completed by both groups was 9th, with the grade completed ranging from 5th to 12th grades for those who witnessed domestic violence and 2nd to 12th grades for those who did not witness domestic violence. The highest level of education achieved by both of the offender groups was an associate's degree, 1.2% for those who witnessed domestic violence and 4.4% for those who did not witness domestic violence. Those who witnessed domestic violence achieved masters degrees (1.2%), while those who had not witnessed domestic violence obtained more bachelors degrees (4.8%) than those who witnessed domestic violence (2.4%). Less than half of those who witnessed domestic violence (44.7%) and less than half of those who did not witness domestic violence (26.8%) received their GED. A chi-square analysis was conducted to determine if those who reported being exposed to domestic violence as a child reported receiving their GED. A chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) indicated a significant difference between those who reported being

exposed to domestic violence or not and whether they reported receiving a GED, $\chi^2(1, n=356) = 8.71, p = .003$ (See Table 1). Approximately one-third of men in both groups attended college (34.8% for those who reported having witnessed domestic violence vs. 30.8% for those who did not).

Materials

MTC 2009 coding form. A coding form designed for a larger project (Leguizamo, Carrasco, & Peltzman, 2008) was used to collect the information (demographical, historical, criminal, and sexual offense specific) contained in the Intake Assessments into variables that are appropriate for use in statistical analyses. This form is included in Appendix A.

Procedure

Data collection. Intake assessment reports were obtained from the MTC. Reports were stripped of identifying information and given a subject number as part of a larger research project (Leguizamo et al., 2008). The Modified Intake Reports were coded by trained masters and doctoral students, as well as MTC assessment staff, using the MTC 2009 Coding Form and variable values were entered into an SPSS database.

Results

In our first hypothesis, we predicted that offenders exposed to domestic violence would differ from those not exposed in the following factors: percent of physical abuse, percent of sexual victimization by both men and women, level of force, and percent of alcohol use. We used chi-square analyses to explore this hypothesis. Our second hypothesis aimed to test a model to ascertain what factors predicted level of force in the rapist's offense. The factors tested by hierarchical regression analyses were history of physical abuse and sexual abuse by both genders, exposure to domestic violence, and alcohol use at the time of offense.

Hypothesis One

Chi-Square Analyses. Chi-square analyses were conducted to determine if those who reported being exposed to domestic violence as a child reported a higher percentage of physical abuse, alcohol use during the offense, and sexual abuse by perpetrator from both genders. A chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) indicated a significant difference between those who reported being exposed to domestic violence or not and physically abused as a child, $\chi^2(1, n= 357) = 32.56, p = .001$ (See Table 2). A chi-square test for independence indicated no significance between those who reported being exposed to domestic violence or not as a child and the perpetrator's gender of reported sexual abuse, $\chi^2(1, n= 97)= 4.71, p = .095$ (See Table 2). A chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) indicated significant differences between exposure to domestic violence or not as a child and percentage of alcohol use during the offense, $\chi^2(1, n= 357)= 6.38, p = .012$ (See Table 2).

Chi-square analyses were also conducted to determine if those who reported exposure to domestic violence or not as a child is significant to the different levels of force used in the offense. The levels of force comprised five categories labeled from zero to four. The first was no level of force (0), where the offender only uses tactics such as grooming, manipulation, and bribing to achieve victim compliance. Second, level of force using a threat (1) was where the offender threatened physical or emotional harm to the victim or family or death to the victim or family. The third was level of force by holding the victim down (2), where the offender either held the victim down by his or her hands or restrained the victim with an object, such as tape or rope. Fourth, level of force using assault (3) was where the offender hit the victim with his hand or an object, used other physical abuse, or had others assault the victim. Lastly, the fifth was

level of force with a weapon used or death (4), where the offender used a weapon on the victim or used lethal force causing the victim's death. Findings for the chi-square analyses are presented in Table 3.

A final chi-square analysis was conducted to determine if those who reported being exposed to domestic violence or not as a child reported higher percentages of sexual abuse as a child. A chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) yielded a significant difference between those who reported being exposed to domestic violence or not as a child and those who reported sexual abuse as a child, $\chi^2(1, n= 357)= 18.24, p = .001$ (See Table 4).

Hypothesis Two

Hierarchical Regression Analysis. A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to determine the ability of victim's age at the time of offense and inmate's age at the time of offense to predict level of force used in the offense, after controlling for the influence of exposure to domestic violence as a child, alcohol use at the time of offense, sexual victimization by both genders, and nonsexual crimes committed. Exposure to domestic violence as a child, alcohol use at the time of offense, sexual victimization by both genders, and nonsexual crimes committed were entered at Step 1, explaining 13.3% of the variance in level of force used in the offense. Only nonsexual crimes committed was the strongest predictor at this step. After entry of victim's age at the time of offense and inmate's age at the time of offense at Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 28.1%, $F(6, 144) = 9.00, p < .001$, for level of force used in the offense. In the final model, only victim's age at the time of offense and inmate's age at the time of offense were the strongest predictors (See Table 5).

Secondary Analysis. An additional hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to understand the significance of victim's age at the time of offense and inmate's age at the time of offense in the previous model. Exposure to domestic violence as a child, alcohol use at the time of offense, sexual victimization by both genders, nonsexual crimes committed, victim's age at the time of the offense, and inmate's age at the time of the offense were entered at Step 1. The model explained 25.7%, $F(4, 145) = 12.17, p < .001$, of level of force used in the offense. The factors which represented the strongest predictors for level of force used in the offense were victim's age at the time of the offense and inmate's age at the time of the offense (See Table 6).

Discussion

Based on previous research, we had two hypotheses based on the psychosocial and offense histories of adult sexual offenders. For the first hypothesis, we predicted that offenders exposed to domestic violence would differ from those not exposed in the following factors: percent of physical abuse, percent of sexual victimization by both men and women, level of force, and percent of alcohol use. Our second hypothesis aimed to test a model to ascertain what factors predicted level of force in the rapist's offense. The factors tested were history of physical abuse and sexual abuse by both genders, exposure to domestic violence, and alcohol use at the time of offense. The results partially confirmed both of our hypotheses. Those who were exposed to domestic violence and reported physical abuse was higher than those who were exposed to domestic violence and did not report physical abuse, while there was no significant differences between being exposed to domestic violence as child or not and offense level of force.

Our findings were mostly inconsistent with previous studies. We had more reports of exposure to domestic violence and physical abuse compared to reports of exposure to domestic

violence and no physical abuse. This finding supports Spaccarelli et al. (1997) whose sexually aggressive delinquents reported significantly more exposure to serious physical abuse and domestic violence with weapons than the controls. This finding also supports Connolly and Wollons (2008) and Simons et al. (2008) whose sex offenders reported high rates of physical abuse. Our finding that the sexual abuse of both genders was not significantly different between those exposed to domestic violence or not was inconsistent with Simmons et al. (2008) and Spaccarelli's et al. (1997) findings of their participants having mostly female perpetrators. This finding suggests that the importance of the gender of the perpetrator of childhood sexual abuse may vary with each rapist on a case-by-case basis.

We found that those exposed to domestic violence and reported alcohol use during the offense was higher compared to those who were exposed to domestic violence and did not report alcohol use during the offense. This finding was supported by Kraanen and Emmelkamp's (2011) male adult sex offenders who commonly reported high rates of alcohol misuse and intoxication at the time of the offense. Also, we found that those who reported both not being sexually abused and exposed to domestic violence was higher than those who reported not being exposed to domestic violence and reported being sexually abused, while those who were exposed to domestic violence and did not report sexual abuse was higher than those who reported both being sexually abused and exposed to domestic violence. This finding was not supported by Connolly & Wollon's (2008) victim/offender theory that hypothesized a young person who is sexually abused could evolve into an adult offender. Therefore, our finding suggests that rapists' experience of childhood sexual abuse is not related to being exposed to domestic violence or not.

Lastly, in relation to our first hypothesis, we found no significant relationship between the level of force used during the offense and exposure to domestic violence or not. This finding

contradicted Caputo et al., (1999), Hunter (2004), Lewis et al., (1979), Murrell et al., (2007), Pynoos and Nader (1988), and Smith (1988) who consistently found that juvenile sex offenders' aggressive and assaultive behavior had been influenced by witnessing or experiencing violence in their home. Our finding indicates that aggressive behavior exhibited during childhood may just be childhood-specific and not transfer into adulthood (Prentky & Carter, 1984).

Our findings regarding our model to determine what factors predict level of force in the rapist's offense indicated that exposure to domestic violence, victim's age at the time of offense, and inmate's age at the time of offense were the strongest predictors. These findings suggest that exposure to domestic violence may actually have predictive value of the level of force used during the offense. The predictive values of the victim and inmate ages at the time of offense were unexpected findings, where the older the victim, the younger the inmate. These findings suggest that the younger the inmate was at the time of the offense could influence the level of force utilized on an older victim. Therefore, future research should investigate how the rapist's age influences the level of force utilized based on the age of the victim.

The victim's age could also influence the level of resistance used by the victim, which could determine the level of force used by the rapist. Ullman and Knight (1992) found that adult rape victims (16 years old and older) actively resisted, such as fighting back, when the rapist utilized violence. Kuznestov, Pierson, and Harry (1992) findings suggest that, as the victim age increases, there is a higher likelihood of the rapist using a weapon, general violence, and injuring the victim. Therefore, future research should also explore how the victim's level of resistance plays a role in the rapist's level of force utilized during the offense and exposure to domestic violence as a child.

Overall, the theory which best fits our findings is the Confluence Model (Malamuth et al., 1993). This is where developmental experiences such as exposure to domestic violence, physical abuse, and sexual abuse can influence males' perceptions of male-female relationships. In conjunction with this model is how our culture influences perceptions about sex. Many feminists (Brownmiller, 1975; Clark, 1980; Russell, 1980) stress how rape is based on traditional sex roles, rape myths, and misogynous forces in society. Therefore, societal factors can influence many men to be sexually aggressive against women. In particular, the mass media plays a crucial role in perceptions and attitudes toward rape, including how men interpret the meaning and consequences of rape (Malamuth, 1981). Malamuth and Check (1981) found their male subjects had an increased acceptance of rape after watching sexually violent feature-length films with positive consequences. In sum, models regarding rapists' developmental and cultural experiences are most supportive of this study.

There were several limitations in our study. The first limitation was our exclusive use of self-reported assessment reports from MTC. By relying solely on self-report, we run across several problems, such as not knowing if the participants are telling the truth and the participants may not remember everything to provide an accurate account of past behaviors. Therefore, self-report measures can never truly be consistent or accurate. The second limitation was we had a small sample which decreased the power of our study. Our final limitation was that we had to rely on archival data from the MTC because some information may be unavailable and it is completely descriptive. Therefore, we could only find trends or correlations and not causal relationships.

Despite these limitations, our findings may be helpful to future researchers wanting to investigate how rapists' level of force used during the offense is related to the rapists' experience

of childhood adversities, age of the victim at the time of offense, age of the rapist at the time of offense, level of resistance used by the victim during the offense, and more. We know that aggression can be utilized during sexual assaults (McCabe & Wauchope, 2005); however the extent of this aggression in relation to the previous factors listed is still unknown. Therefore, future researchers should focus on whether the level of resistance used by the victim during the offense predicts the level of force used by the rapist and how the age of both may influence the prediction. In sum, the rapists' level of force utilized during the offense is a growing body of literature which is contributing more to our knowledge and understanding of rape.

References

- Abbey, A. (1991). Acquaintance and alcohol consumption on college campuses: How are they linked? *Journal of American College Health, 39*, 165-169
- Abbey, A., Clinton, A. M., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., & Buck, P. O. (2002a). Alcohol-involved rapes: Are they more violent? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*, 99-109.
- Abbey, A., Zawacki, T., Buck, P. O., Testa, M., Parks, K., Norris, J., Martin, S. E., Livingston, J. A., McAuslan, P., Clinton, A. M., Kennedy, C. L., George, W. H., Davis, K. C., & Martell, J. (2002b). How does alcohol contribute to sexual assault? Explanations from laboratory and survey data. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 26*, 575-581.
- Abbey, A., Clinton-Sherrod, M. A. McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., & Buck, P. O. (2003). The relationship between the quantity of alcohol consumed and the severity of sexual assaults committed by college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 813-833.
- Bandura, A. (1969). Social learning theory of moral judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11*, 275-279.
- Bandura, A. (1978). Social learning theory of aggression. *Journal of Communication, 28*, 12-29.
- Bischof, G. P., Stith, S. M., & Whitney, M. L. (1995). Family environments of adolescent sex

offenders and other juvenile delinquents. *Adolescence*, 30(117), pp.157-170.

Brecklin, L. R., & Ullman, S. E. (2010). The roles of victim and offender substance use in sexual assault outcomes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 1503-1522.

Briggs, F., & Hawkins, R. M. F. (1996). A comparison of the childhood experiences of convicted male child molesters and men who were sexually abused in childhood and claimed to be non-offenders. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 20, 221-233.

Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women, and rape*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Burgess, A. W., Hartman, C. R., & McCormack, A. (1988). Abused to abuser: Antecedents of socially deviant behaviours. In S. Chess, A. Thomas, & M. Hertzog (Eds.). *Annual Progress in Child Psychiatry and Child Development: A selection of the year's outstanding contributions to the understanding and treatment of the normal and disturbed child* (pp. 601-614). New York: Psychology Press.

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

Burton, D. L., Miller, D. L., & Schill, C. T. (2002). A social learning theory comparison of the sexual victimization of adolescent sexual offenders and nonsexual male delinquents.

Child Abuse & Neglect, 26, 893-907.

Busch-Armendariz, N. B., DiNitto, D. M., Bell, H., & Bohman, T. (2010). Sexual assault perpetrators' alcohol and drug use: The likelihood of concurrent violence and post-sexual assault outcomes for women victims. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 42, 393-399.

Bushman, B. J., & Cooper, H. M. (1990). The effects of alcohol on human aggression: An integrative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 341-354.

Caputo, A. A., Frick, P. J., & Brodsky, S. L. (1999). Family violence and juvenile sex offending: The potential mediating role of psychopathic traits and negative attitudes toward women. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 26, 338-356.

Clark, L. (1980). Pornography's challenge to liberal ideology. *Canadian Forum*, 3, 9-12.

Connolly, M., & Woollons, R. (2008). Childhood sexual experience and adult offending: An exploratory comparison of three criminal groups. *Child Abuse Review*, 17, 119-132.

Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States. (2003). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Centers for Injury Prevention and Control. Atlanta, GA.

Craisatti, J., & Beech, A. (2004). The characteristics of a geographical sample of convicted

rapists: Sexual victimization and compliance in comparison to child molesters. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*, 371-388.

Cramer, E., McFarlane, J., Parker, B., Soeken, K., Silva, C., & Reel, S. (1998). Violent pornography and abuse of women: Theory to practice. *Violence & Victims, 13*, 319-332.

Crowe, L. C., & George, W. H. (1989). Alcohol and sexuality: Review and integration. *Psychological Bulletin, 105*, 374-376.

Donnerstein, E., & Berkowitz, L. (1981). Victim reactions in aggressive erotic films as a factor in violence against women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*, 710-724.

Douglas, J., & Olshaker, M. (1998). *Obsession*. Sydney: Pocket Books.

Fagan, J., & Wexler, S. (1988). Explanations of sexual assault among violent delinquents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 3*, 363-385.

Fantuzzo, J. W., & Lindquist, C. U. (1989). The effects of observing conjugal violence on children: A review and analysis of research methodology. *Journal of Family Violence, 4*, 77-94.

Fedora, O., Reddon, J. R., Morrison, J. W., Fedora, S. K., Pascoe, H., & Yeudall, L. T. (1992). Sadism and other paraphilias in normal controls and aggressive and nonaggressive sex offenders. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 21*, 1-15.

Flowers, R. B. (1998). *The prostitution of women and girls*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.

Ganem, N. M., & Agnew, R. (2007). Parenthood and adult criminal offending: The importance of relationship quality. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 630-643.

Garland, R., & Dougher, M. (1990). The abused/abuser hypothesis of child abuse: A critical review of theory and research. In Feierman, J. R. (Ed.), *Pedophilia: Biosocial dimensions* (pp.488-509). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Groth, A. N., & Birnbaum, H. J. (1978). Adult orientation and attraction to underage persons. *Archive of Sexual Behavior*, 7, 175-181.

Groth, N., & Birnbaum, H. (1979). *Men who rape*. New York: Plenum.

Groth, A. N., & Burgess, A. W. (1977). Motivational intent in the sexual assault on children. *Criminal Justice Behavior*, 4, 253-264.

Groth, A. N., Burgess, A. W., & Holmstrom, L. L. (1977). Rape, power, anger, and sexuality. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 134, 1239-1243.

Gustafson, R. (1993). What do experimental paradigms tell us about alcohol-related aggressive responding? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 11, 20-29.

Hall, G. C. N., & Hirschman, R. (1991). Toward a theory of sexual aggression: A quadripartite model. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59, 662-669.

- Hazelwood, R., & Burgess, A. (1987). *Practical aspects of rape investigation: A multidisciplinary approach*. New York: Elsevier.
- Hindman, J., & Peters, J. M. (1999). *Uncovering the true histories of youthful sex offenders*. Unpublished manuscript. Alexandria Associates, Baker City, OR.
- Hummel, P., Thomke, V., Oldenburger, H. A., & Specht, F. (2000). Male adolescent sex offenders against children: Similarities and differences between those offenders with and those without a history of sexual abuse. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 305-317.
- Hunter, J. A. (2004). Developmental Pathways in Youth Sexual Aggression and Delinquency: Risk factors and mediators. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19, 233-242.
- Itzin, C. (2002). Pornography and the construction of misogyny. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 8, 4-42.
- Jaffe, P., Wilson, S., & Wolfe, D. A. (1986). Promoting changes in attitudes and understanding of conflict among child witnesses of family violence. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 18, 357-366.
- Johnson, G. M., & Knight, R. A. (2000). Developmental antecedents of sexual coercion in juvenile sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse Journal of Research and Treatment*, 12, 165-178.

Kahn, T. J., & Chambers, H. J. (1991). Assessing re-offense risk with juvenile sexual offenders.

Child Welfare: Journal of Policy, Practice, and Program, 70, 333-345.

Kimball, L. M., & Guarino-Ghezzi, S. (1996). *Sex offender treatment: An assessment of sex*

offender treatment within the Massachusetts department of youth services (Juvenile

Justice Series Report: No. 10). Boston: Northeastern University, Privatized Research

Management Initiative.

Kitzman, K. M., Gaylord, N. K., Holt, A. R., & Kenny, E. D. (2003). Child witnesses to

domestic violence: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical*

Psychology, 71, 339-352.

Knight, R., & Prentky, R. (1990). Classifying sexual offenders: The development and

corroboration of taxonomic models. In W. Marshall, D. Laws, & H. Barbaree (Eds.),

The handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender (pp.23-

52). New York: Plenum.

Knight, R., Prentky, R., Schneider, B., & Rosenberg, R. (1983). Linear causal modeling of

adaptation and criminal history in sex offenders. In K. Van Dusen & S. Mednick (Eds.),

Prospective studies of crime and delinquency (pp. 303-341). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

Kolbo, J. R., Blakely, E. H., & Engleman, D. (1996). Children who witness domestic violence:

A review of empirical literature. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11*, 281-293.

Kraanen, F. L., & Emmelkamp, P. M. G., (2011). Substance misuse and substance use disorders in sex offenders: A review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 31*, 478-489.

Kuznestov, A., Pierson, T. A., & Harry, B. (1992). Victim age as a basis for profiling sex offenders. *Federal Probation, 56*, 34-39.

Lang, R. A., & Langevin, R. (1991). Parent-child relations in offenders who commit violent sexual crimes against children. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 9*, 61-71.

Lee, J. K. P., Jackson, H. J., Pattison, P., & Ward, T. (2002). Developmental risk factors for sexual offending. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 26*, 73-92.

Leguizamo, A., Carrasco, N., & Peltzman, B. (2008). MTC 2009 Coding Form. Unpublished Coding Scheme.

Lewis, D. O., Shankok, S. S., & Pincus, J. H. (1979). Juvenile male sexual assaulters. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 136*, 1194-1196.

Lisak, D., & Miller, P. M. (2002). Repeat rape and multiple offending among undetected rapists. *Violence and victims, 17*, 73-84.

Malamuth, N. (1981). Rape proclivity among males. *Journal of Social Issues, 37*, 138-157.

Malamuth, N. M., & Check, J. V. P. (1981). The effects of mass media exposure on acceptance

of violence against women: A field experiment. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 15, 436-446.

Malamuth, N. M., Heavey, C. L., & Linz, D. (1993). Predicting men's antisocial behavior against women: The interaction model of sexual aggression. In G. C. N. Hall, R. Hirschman, J. R. Graham, & M. S. Zaragoza (Eds.), *Sexual aggression: Issues in etiology, assessment, and treatment* (pp.63-97). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.

Malamuth, N. M., Sockloskie, R. J., Koss, M. P., & Tanaka, J. S. (1991). Characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59, 670-681.

Margolin, G., & Gordis, E. B. (2000). The effects of family and community violence on children. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 445-479.

Marshall, W. L., & Barbaree, H. E. (1990). An integrated theory of the etiology of sexual offending. In W. L. Marshall, D. R. Laws, & H. E. Barbaree (Eds.), *Handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories, and treatment of the offender* (pp.257-275). New York: Plenum.

Marshall, W. L., & Marshall, L. E. (2000). The origins of sexual offending. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, 1, 250-263.

Marshall, W. L., Serran, G. S., & Cortoni, F. A. (2000). Childhood attachments, sexual abuse,

and their relationship to adult coping in child molesters. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of*

Research and Treatment, 12, 17-26.

Martin, S. E., & Bachman, R. (1998). The contribution of alcohol to the likelihood of

completion and severity of injury in rape incidents. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 694-

712.

Materson, J. (1984). The effects of erotica and pornography on attitudes and behavior: A

review. *Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, 37*, 249-252.

McCabe, M. P., & Wauchope, M. (2005). Behavioral characteristics of men accused of rape:

Evidence for different types of rapists. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 34*, 241-253.

Miner, M. H., & Crimmins, C. L. S. (1995). Adolescent sex offenders: Issues of etiology and

risk factors. In B. K. Schwartz & H. K. Cellini (Eds.). *The sex offender: Vol 1.*

Corrections, treatment, and legal practice (pp. 9.1-9.15). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research

Institute.

Miner, M. H., Siekert, G. P., & Ackland, M. A. (1997). *Evaluation: Juvenile sex offender*

treatment program, Minnesota Correctional Facility- Sauk Centre (Final report-

Biennium 1995-1997). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Department of

Family Practice and Community Health, Program in Human Sexuality.

Morenz, B., & Becker, J. V. (1995). The treatment of youthful sexual offenders. *Applied & Preventive Psychology, 4*, 247-256.

Murrell, A. R., Christoff, K. A., & Henning, K. R. (2007). Characteristics of domestic violence offenders: Associations with childhood exposure to violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*, 523-532.

Norris, J., & Kerr, K. L. (1993). Alcohol and violent pornography: Responses to permissive and nonpermissive cues. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 11*, 118-127.

Ouimet, M., Guay, J. P., & Proulx, J. (2000). Analyse de la gravite des agressions sexuelles de femmes adultes et de ses determinants. *Revue Internationale de Criminologie et de Police Technique et Scientifique, 2*, 157-172.

Prentky, R. A., & Carter, D. L. (1984). The predictive value of the triad for sex offenders. *Behavioral Science and the Law, 2*, 341-354.

Proulx, J., St-Yves, M., Guay, J. P., & Ouimet, M. (1999). Les agresseurs sexuels de femmes: Scenarios delictuels et troubles de la personnalite. In J. Proulx, M. Cusson, & M. Ouimet (Eds.), *Les violences criminelles* (pp.157-185). Saint-Nicholas, QC: Les Presses de l'Universite Laval.

Proulx, J., St-Yves, M., & McKibben, A. (1994). *CQSA: Computerised Questionnaire for Sexual Aggressor*. Unpublished manuscript.

Pynoos, R. S., & Nader, K. (1988). Children who witness the sexual assaults of their mothers. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 27*, 567-572.

Quinsey, V. L., & Chaplin, T. C. (1982). Penile responses to nonsexual violence among rapists. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 9*, 372-381.

Righthand, S., & Welch, C. (2005). Characteristics of Youth Who Sexually Offend. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 13*, 15-32.

Robins, L. N. (1966). *Deviant children grown up*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

Rosenberg, R., Knight, R. A., Prentky, R. A., & Lee, A. (1988). Validating the components of a taxonomic system for rapists: A path analytic approach. *Bulletin of American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 16*, 169-185.

Ryan, G., & Lane, S. (1991). *Juvenile sexual offending: Causes, consequences, and correction*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Safarik, M. E., Jarvis, J. P., & Nussbaum, K. E. (2002). Sexual homicide of elderly females: Linking offender characteristics to victim and crime scene attributes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 500-525.

- Seghorn, T. K., Prentky, R. A., & Boucher, R. J. (1987). Child abuse in the lives of sexually aggressive offenders. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 26*, 262-267.
- Simons, D. A., Wurtele, S. K., & Durham, R. L. (2008). Developmental experiences of child sexual abusers and rapists. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 32*, 549-560.
- Skuse, D., Bentovim, A., Hodges, J., Stevenson, J., Andreou, C., Lanyado, M., New, M., Williams, B., & McMillan, D. (1998). Risk factors for development of sexually abusive behavior in sexually victimized adolescent boys: Cross sectional study. *British Medical Journal, 317*, 175-179.
- Smallbone, S. W., & Dadds, M. R. (2000). Attachment and coercive sexual behavior. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 12*, 3-9.
- Smallbone, S. W., & McCabe, B. A. (2003). Childhood attachment, childhood sexual abuse, and onset of masturbation among adult sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 15*, 1-10.
- Smith, W. R. (1988). Delinquency and abuse among juvenile sexual offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 3*, 400-413.
- Spaccarelli, S., Bowden, B., Coatsworth, J. D., & Kim, S. (1997). Psychosocial correlates of

male sexual aggression in a chronic delinquent sample. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 24, 71-95.

Stalans, L. J., Hacker, R., & Talbot, M. E. (2010). Comparing nonviolent, other-violent, and domestic batterer sex offenders: Predictive accuracy of risk assessments on sexual recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37, 613-628.

Stevens, D. J. (1997). Violence and serial rape. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 12, 39-47.

Stinson, J. D., Sales, B. D., & Becker, J. V. (2008). *Sex offending: Casual theories to inform research, prevention, and treatment*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Thornhill, R., & Palmer, C. T. (2000). *A natural history of rape: Biological bases of sexual coercion*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ullman, S. E., & Knight, R. A. (1992). Fighting back: Women's resistance to rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7, 31-43.

Ullman, S. E., & Najdowski, C. J. (2010). Understanding alcohol-related sexual assaults: Characteristics and consequences. *Violence and Victims*, 25, 29-44.

U.S. Department of Justice. (1986) *Attorney General's Commission on Pornography: Final*

Report, Vol 1, pp.324-25. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Vega, V., & Malamuth, N. M. (2007). Predicting sexual aggression: The role of pornography in the context of general and specific risk factors. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33, 104-117.

Widom, C. S., & Ames, M. A. (1994). Criminal consequences of childhood sexual victimization. *Childhood Abuse and Neglect*, 18, 303-318.

Widom, C. S. (1995). Victims of childhood sexual abuse: Later criminal consequences. *National Institution of Justice: Research in Brief*, 1-8.

Wolak, J., & Finkelhor, D. (1998). Children exposed to partner violence. In J. L. Jasinski & L. M. Williams (Eds.), *Partner violence: A comprehensive review of 20 years of research* (pp. 73-111). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zawacki, T., Abbey, A., Buck, P. O., McAuslan, P., Clinton-Sherrod, A. M. (2003). Perpetrators of alcohol-involved sexual assaults: How do they differ from other sexual assault perpetrators and nonperpetrators? *Aggressive Behavior*, 29, 366-380.

Table 1

Comparing Exposure to Domestic Violence with GED and SES

	DV N (%)	No DV N (%)	χ^2
Received GED	38 (44.7) <i>z</i> = 2.2	73 (26.9) <i>z</i> = -1.3	8.71*
No GED	47 (55.3) <i>z</i> = -1.5	198 (73.1) <i>z</i> = .8	
Low SES	33 (55.9) <i>z</i> = 2.1	55 (32.7) <i>z</i> = -1.3	
Low-Middle SES	10 (16.9) <i>z</i> = -1.1	44 (26.2) <i>z</i> = .6	10.17*
Middle SES	13 (22) <i>z</i> = -1.4	60 (35.7) <i>z</i> = .8	
Upper Middle/Upper SES	3 (5.1) <i>z</i> = -.1	9 (5.4) <i>z</i> = .0	

Note. **p* < .05.

Table 2

Comparing Exposure to Domestic Violence Amongst Variables

	DV N (%)	No DV N (%)	χ^2
Physical Abuse	53 (62.4) z = 4.1	75 (27.6) z = -2.3	32.56*
Sex Abuse Perp Male	16 (42.1)	35 (59.3)	4.71*
Sex Abuse Perp Female	17 (44.7)	14 (23.7)	
Alcohol	79 (92.9) z = 1.0	219 (80.5) z = -.05	6.38*
No Alcohol	6 (7.1) z = -2.1	53 (19.5) z = 1.2	

Note. * = $p < .05$.

Table 3

Comparison of Exposure to Domestic Violence and Levels of Force

	DV N (%)	No DV N (%)	χ^2
Level of Force (0)	52 (61.9)	186 (71)	2.04
Threat of Force (1)	42 (50)	128 (48.9)	.003
Hold (2)	33 (39.3)	97 (37)	.059
Assault (3)	30 (35.7)	67 (25.6)	2.76
Weapon/Death (4)	10 (11.9)	21 (8)	.751

Table 4

Comparing Exposure to Domestic Violence to Sexual Abuse

	DV N (%)	No DV N (%)	χ^2
Sexual Abuse	42 (49.4)* z = 3.2	66 (24.3) z = -1.8	18.24*
No Sexual Abuse	43 (50.6)* z = -2.1	206 (75.7) z = 1.2	

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 5

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Level of Force Models 1 and 2

Variables	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	r^2	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	r^2
Constant	.515	.255			1.24	.415		
DV	.373	.203	.147		.284	.188	.112	
Alcohol	.232	.246	.079		-.018	.236	-.006	
SA Gender	.056	.133	.034		-.004	.123	-.002	
Nonsex-Cr	1.02	.300	.284*	.07	.411	.301	.114	
Vic Age					.049	.011	.350*	.10
Inmate Age					-.029	.008	-.270*	.06
R ²		.133				.281		
<i>F</i>		5.36*				9.00*		

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 6

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Levels of Force Model 3

Variables	Model 3			r^2
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	
Constant	1.46	.379		
DV	.283	.186	.111	
SA Gender	-.017	.123	-.010	
Vic Age	.054	.010	.383*	.143
Inmate Age	-.031	.008	-.291*	.083
R^2		.364		
<i>F</i>		8.87*		

Note. * $p < .05$.

Appendix A

MTC 2009-SEX OFFENDER PROJECT

CODING FORM

Intake Evaluation Transfer Evaluation (Check one)

I. Historical Information

Use '999' for missing values - CODIFIED ANSWER

Subject ID		ID	
Age at the time of report		age	
Marital status at time of evaluation		mstatuse	
1 = single, 2 = married, 3 = separated, 4 = divorced, 5= widowed, 6= engaged			
Ethnicity (Dr. L will code)		Ethn	
1 = Caucasian, 2 = African-American, 3 = Latino			
Governing offense(s), please list (to be coded later)			Coded later
Charge(s)	# of Counts		

<p>If governing charges above are not of a sexual nature because the subject is at the MTC for a previous sexual offense, list the charges involved in that sexual offense here</p>	<p># of counts</p>		
<p>Place of Birth</p> <p>0=U.S. 1=Elsewhere</p>		<p>pbirth</p>	
<p>Grew up with:</p> <p>1 = both parents, 2 = single parent, 3 = parent and stepparent, 4 = relative, 5 = foster parent, 6 = multiple households, 7 = residential institution, 8 = other, 9 = parent(s) and relatives in same household</p>		<p>forigin</p>	
<p>Total number of siblings noted (bio, step, half, foster)</p>		<p>tsibs</p>	
<p>Socio Economic Status while growing up</p> <p>1 = low 2 = low middle 3 = middle 4 = upper middle/upper</p>		<p>seschild</p>	
<p>History of abuse as a child: code: 0 = No, 1 = Yes</p> <p>Neglect By whom? _____</p> <p>1=bioparent(s), 2= step-parent(s), 3=foster parent(s), 4=other, 5=multiple _____</p> <p>Perpetrator(s) were 1=male, 2=female, 3=both _____</p>			

Emotional abuse By whom?	emabuse	_____
1=bioparent(s), 2= step-parent(s), 3=foster parent(s), 4=other 5= multiple	emaperp	_____
Perpetrator(s) were 1=male, 2=female, 3=both	emapsx	_____
Physical Abuse By whom?	pabuse	_____
1=bioparent(s), 2= step-parent(s), 3=foster parent(s), 4=sibling 5=relative, 6=known person outside of family, 7= multiple	pabperp	_____
Perpetrator(s) were 1=male, 2=female, 3=both	pabpsx	_____
Sexual Abuse sxabuse		_____
By whom?	sabperp	_____
1=bioparent(s), 2= step-parent(s), 3=foster parent(s), 4=sibling, 5=relative, 6=teen sitter, 7=known adult outside of family, 8=stranger 9=teen outside the family, but not a sitter, 10= multiples		_____
Perpetrator(s) were 1=male, 2=female, 3=both	sabpsx	_____
Exposure to Domestic Violence (between parental figures)	expdv	_____
Highest level of education completed up to HS (0 to 12)	educhs	_____
Did the subject receive a GED? 0 = no, 1 = yes	ged	_____

Attended college? 0 = no, 1 = yes	college	
Obtained college degree? 0 = no 1 = Bachelors 2 = Masters 3 = Doctorate 4 = Associates	degree	
Number of suspensions in grade school:	edsusgs	
Number of suspensions in middle/high school:	edsusmhs	
Number of times held back a grade:	edhbck	
Received special education services: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	sped	
Military history: 0 = No 1 = Yes milhx Type of discharge: 1 = Honorable 2 = Dishonorable 3 = Other than honorable 4 = Medical 5 = Other	mdisch	<hr/> <hr/>
Work History (highest level)	wkhx	

History of medical problems 0 = No, 1 = Yes	medprob	
History of psychiatric problems 0 = No, 1 = Yes	mhprob	
Psychiatric diagnoses: please write	psydx	
Psychiatric medications used, please write	psymeds	
Substance use history noted: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	subshx	_____
If yes:		
Marijuana: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	submj	_____
Alcohol: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	subeto	_____
Cocaine: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	subcok	_____
Crack cocaine: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	subcrk	_____
Heroin: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	subher	_____
Prescription medications: 0 = No, 1 = Yes (only if non prescribed)	subrx	_____
Other (note _____) 0 = No, 1 = Yes	subothr	_____

History of paraphilias (from the history, not the offenses. These items will be in the inmate's history, but not in very old reports, code 999 if not found in history 0=No, 1=yes		
Exposed self to others	hxexp	_____
		—
Peeped on others	hxpeep	_____
		—
Masturbated on public or where could be seen	hxmast	_____
		—
Physically forced someone to be sexual against will	hxfsx	_____
		—
Bribed, tricked, or manipulated someone into sex	hxman	_____
		—
Made obscene phone calls	hxobsc	_____
		—
Called sex lines	hxsxlns	_____
		—
Had sexual contact with animals	hxbest	_____
		—
Dressed in women's clothing	hxcrsd	_____
		—
Used shoes, lingerie, or other clothing during masturbation	hxfetish	_____
		—
Urinated on, or was urinated on, for sexual pleasure	hxgshw	_____

Defecated on, or was defecated on, for sexual pleasure	hxscat	<input type="checkbox"/>
Had sex with more than one person at the time	hxgroup	<input type="checkbox"/>
Been sexually stimulated by rubbing self onto others	hxfrout	<input type="checkbox"/>
Used handcuffs or tied someone up while having sex	hxbond	<input type="checkbox"/>
Had someone tie him or restrain while having sex	hxbtie	<input type="checkbox"/>
Used hot wax, needles, or other sources of pain during sex	hxpain	<input type="checkbox"/>
Had sex with a dead body	hxnecro	<input type="checkbox"/>
Videotaped or photographed sex partner	hxrec	<input type="checkbox"/>
Been excited by setting a fire or watching a fire	hxfire	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have choked self, other, or self by other during sex	hxsofo	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other: _____		<input type="checkbox"/>

		— — — — — —
Sexual orientation (info will be noted in some reports, if not 999)	sexor	
1=heterosexual 2=heterosexual but has had homosexual experiences 3=homosexual 4=homosexual but has had heterosexual experiences 5=bisexual 6=transgender		
Age of first arraignment:	agefarr	
Age of last arraignment:	agelarr	
Total number of <i>arraignment</i> (number of dates, not charges)	tarrgmt	
Total number of <i>charges</i>	tchgs	
Total number of <i>convictions</i>	tconv	

(Include any type of sentence, including probation, guilty filed)	
Total number of <i>charges</i> for property crimes (e.g., b and e, destruction of property, arson, thefts, larceny, etc.)	tcaprop
Total number of <i>convictions</i> for property crimes (e.g., b and e, destruction of property, arson, thefts, larceny, etc.)	tccprop
Total number of <i>charges</i> for motor vehicle crimes (e.g. m/v theft, reckless driving, etc. do not include DUIs)	tcamv
Total number of <i>convictions</i> for motor vehicle crimes (e.g. m/v theft, reckless driving, etc. do not include DUIs)	tccmv
Total number of <i>charges</i> for alcohol/drug crimes (e.g. Possession, distribution, public consumption, DUIs)	tcasubs
Total number of <i>convictions</i> for alcohol/drug crimes (e.g. Possession, distribution, public consumption, DUIs)	tccsubs
Total number of <i>charges</i> for person – non sexual crimes (e.g. a and b, violation 209A, assault, murder)	tcapr

<p>Total number of <i>convictions</i> for person – non sexual crimes (e.g. a and b, violation 209A, assault, murder)</p>	<p>tccpr</p>
<p>Total number of <i>charges</i> for sexual crimes (e.g. rape, indecent a and b, child pornography, indecent exposure, contributing to the delinquency of a minor – if charged in conjunction to sex offense)</p>	<p>tcasx</p>
<p>Total number of <i>convictions</i> for sexual crimes (e.g. rape, indecent a and b, child pornography, indecent exposure, contributing to the delinquency of a minor – if charged in conjunction to sex offense)</p>	<p>tccsx</p>
<p>Total number of sex offenses on record (number of dates of arraignments, regardless of number of charges)</p>	<p>tnasx</p>
<p>Total number of convictions for sex offenses (number of dates of arraignments, regardless of number of charges)</p>	<p>tncsx</p>
<p>Total number of <i>charges</i> for other crimes List charge(s):</p>	<p>tcaothr</p>
<p>Total number of <i>convictions</i> for other crimes</p>	<p>tccothr</p>

List charge(s)	
Number of disciplinary problems while incarcerated (OBRs)	nobrs

II. Governing Offense Information

Number of victims for which inmate was charged (all sexual offenses)	numvics
Number of male victims (0 if none)	vicmale
Number of female victims (0 if none) vicfmle	
Number of child victims (0 if none) <i>Note, if same victim was abused across age ranges (e.g., as a child And as a teenager), answer for all that apply to that victim)</i>	vicchld
Number of adolescent victims (0 if none)	victeens
Number of adult victims (0 if none)	vicadult
Did the offense involve possession/use of child pornography exclusively? 0 = No, 1 = Yes (using media created by others; if yes, skip next sections regarding victims)	chpex

1. Victim #1

Gender of Victim 0 = male, 1 = female	viclsex	
Victim's age at time of the (last) offense (score 999 if not noted)	viclage	
If victim's age not noted, but discernable (if age known, code 999): 1 = Infant/toddler, 2 = child under 12, 3 = adolescent, 4 = adult, 5 = senior (65+)	viclaest	
Inmate's age at the time of the offense	inagevl	
Inmate's marital status at time of offense mstat1 1 = single, 2 = married, 3 = separated, 4 = divorced, 5= widowed, 6= engaged/had girlfriend		
Victim's ethnicity: 1 = Caucasian, 2 = African-American, 3 = Latino/a, 4 = other, 5 = not noted	vlrace	
If victim was an adult, he/she was in relation to subject: 1 = Unknown adult 2 = Known adult (but not family member; known for more than 24 hrs) 3 = Blood Relative 4 = Ex – significant other/ex – spouse 5 = Significant other/spouse at the time of the offense 6= Non-blood relative (e.g., step-child, in-law, etc.)	vlarel	
If victim was an child/adolescent, he/she was in relation to subject 1 = Unknown child	v1crel	

2 = Known child (but not family member; known for more than 24 hrs)	
3 = Relative	
4 = Babysat victim	
5 = Foster child	
6 = Step child	
7 = Biological child	
8 = Non- blood relative (step grandchild, etc.)	

Offense characteristics in regards to Victim 1

Number of Codefendants:	v1cd	
Substance abuse/intoxication during offense? 0=no, 1=yes:	v1subs	_____
Marijuana: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1mj	_____
Alcohol: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1etoh	_____
Cocaine: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1coke	_____
Crack cocaine: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1crack	_____
Heroin: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1hero	_____
Prescription medications: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1rx	_____

Other (note _____)	0 = No, 1 = Yes	vloth	_____
<p>Please indicate all elements that were present in the offense (continues on next page. If codefendants involved, only score behaviors attributed to the inmate. If abuse took place over time, indicate behaviors exhibit throughout the period of offending) Scoring guide: 0 = No, 1 = Yes</p>			
<p>Participated in offense with codefendants, but did not engage in any offense behaviors: ...code 999 if offense committed alone..... oflnone 0 if had codefendants AND participated (even holding) 1 if had codefs and DID NOT participate at all</p>			_____
<p>Number of times subject abused victim..... ofltms 1 = once, 2 = under 10 times, 3 = under 20 times, 4 = 20+times</p>			_____
<p>Length of abuse of victim: _____ ofllng 1=once, 2=w/in a week, 3=w/in a month, 4=w/in a year, 5=under 5 years 6= for more than 5 years</p>			_____
<p>Stalking: oflstalk</p>			_____
<p>Peeping: oflpeep</p>			_____
<p>Exposure: oflexp</p>			_____
<p>Exposure while masturbating oflexpms</p>			_____

Kissing:	ofl kiss	_____
Biting	ofl bite	_____
Licking non-genital areas:	ofl lick	_____
Sucking non-genital areas:	ofl suck	_____
Fondling victim:	ofl fond	_____
Forcing victim to fondle him:	ofl frvfd	_____
Masturbating victim:	ofl mast	_____
Forcing victim to masturbate him:	ofl frvms	_____
Simulated intercourse (humping):	ofl simsx	_____
Forcing victim to strip themselves for him:.....	ofl frstrp	_____
Rubbing penis against victim:	ofl rub	_____
Fellatio of victim:	ofl fellv	_____
Cunnilingus of victim:	ofl cunv	_____

Attempted digital vaginal penetration:	ofl	
Attempted digital anal penetration:	ofladapn	_____
Attempted oral penetration:	oflaopn	_____
Attempted vaginal penetration:	oflavpn	_____
Attempted anal penetration:	oflaapn	_____
Attempted object insertion:	oflaobin	_____
Digital vaginal penetration:	ofldvpn	_____
Digital anal penetration:	ofldapn	_____
Oral penetration:	oflopn	_____
Vaginal penetration:.....	oflvpn	_____
Anal penetration:.....	oflapn	_____
Object insertion (vagina):	oflobinv	_____
Object insertion (anal):	oflobina	_____

Forcing victim to insert object in him:of1frin	_____
Forcing victim to insert object in him/herself: of1frins	_____
Intentional ejaculation on the victim (on body/face/mouth):of1ejac	_____
Forced victim to watch othersof1wtch	_____
Forced victim to engage in sexual contact with others:of1fsoth	_____
Photographing/Video taping:..... of1phv	_____
Use of pornography prior to/during the offense:..... of1pa	_____
Exposing the victim to pornography:..... of1expp	_____
Other: _____of1other	_____
Method(s) used to acquire compliance (continues on next page):	
Scoring guide: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	
Grooming (befriending):mo1groom	_____

Manipulation:mo1man	<hr/>
Bribing (inc. with substances):mo1brib	<hr/>
Victim sleeping: mo1slp	<hr/>
Intoxicating/Drugging (or victim already intoxicated/drugged):.....mo1drg	<hr/>
Fear: victim reported being afraid, in absence of actual threatmo1fear	<hr/>
Threat of physical/emotional harm to victim or family : mo1thhrm	<hr/>
Threat of death to victim or family : mo1thdth	<hr/>
Holding with hands: mo1holdh	<hr/>
Restraining with object (tape, rope, etc.):mo1tie	<hr/>
Hitting with hand:.....mo1hith	<hr/>
Hitting with object:.....mo1hito	<hr/>
Other physical abuse: mo1othpa	<hr/>
Had others assault victim: mo1hcda	<hr/>

Weapon present:mo1wpn	
Weapon used: mo1wpu	_____
Lethal force used (victim died): mo1lethal	_____
Other: _____ mo1otr	_____
Other: _____ mo1otr	_____
Other: _____ mo1otr	_____
Other: _____ mo1otr	_____
<hr/>	
Place were assault(s) took place: No = 0, Yes = 1	
Victim's home: st1vhm	_____
Offender's home: st1offhm	_____
Other's home: st1othhm	_____
Vehicle:st1mv	_____
Public building:st1pblgdg	_____
Park: st1park	_____

Wooded area: st1woods	_____
Other: (specify): _____ st1other	_____
Did subject resist arrest? No = 0, Yes = 1	resist1
Did subject admit to offense to police/investigators? No = 0, Yes = 1	admit1
Inmates' description of the offense regarding victim 1:	
Denies offense, 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1den
Claims sexual contact was consensual, 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1con
Blames victim (claims was seduced/set up) 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1blmd
Blames external factors (stress, spouse, family, etc.)..... 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1blext
Blames substances (alcohol or drugs) 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1bldrg
Admits but minimizes offense (describes as mistake, error, etc.) 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1min
Takes responsibility but does not seem contrite 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v1part

Takes responsibility and seems contrite 0 = No, 1 = Yes v1full	<hr/> <hr/>
----------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------

2. Victim #2

Gender of Victim	vic2sex	
Victim's age at time of the offense (score 99 if unavailable)	vic2age	
If victim's age not noted, but discernable: 1 = Infant/toddler, 2 = child under 12, 3 = adolescent, 4 = adult, 5 = senior (65+)	vic2aest	
Inmate's age at the time of the offense	inagev2	
Marital status at time of offense 1 = single, 2 = married, 3 = separated, 4 = divorced, 5 = widowed, 6 = engaged/had girlfriend	mstat2	
Victim's ethnicity: 1 = Caucasian, 2 = African-American, 3 = Latino/a, 4 = other, 5 = not noted	v2race	

<p>If victim was an adult, describe his/her characteristics/relationship to the inmate:</p> <p>1 = Unknown adult 2 = Known adult (but not family member; known for more than 24 hrs) 3 = Relative 4 = Ex – significant other/ex – spouse 5 = Significant other/spouse at the time of the offense 6= Non-blood relative (e.g., step-child, in-law, etc.)</p>	<p>v2arel</p>
<p>If victim was an child/adolescent, describe his/her characteristics/relationship to the inmate:</p> <p>1 = Unknown child 2 = Known child (but not family member; known for more than 24 hrs) 3 = Relative 4 = Babysat victim 5 = Foster child 6 = Step child 7 = Biological child 8 = Non- blood relative (step grandchild, etc.)</p>	<p>v2crel</p>

Offense characteristics in regards to Victim 2

<p>Number of Codefendants:</p>	<p>v2cd</p>
<p>Substance abuse/intoxication during offense: 0 = No, 1 = Yes</p> <p>If yes:</p> <p>Marijuana: 0 = No, 1 = Yes</p>	<p>v2subs</p> <p>v2mj</p>

Alcohol:	0 = No, 1 = Yes	v2etoh	_____
Cocaine:	0 = No, 1 = Yes	v2coke	_____
Crack cocaine:	0 = No, 1 = Yes	v2crack	_____
Heroin:	0 = No, 1 = Yes	v2hero	_____
Prescription medications:	0 = No, 1 = Yes	v2rx	_____
Other (note _____)	0 = No, 1 = Yes	v2oth	_____
<p>Please indicate all elements that were present in the offense (continues on next page. If codefendants involved, only score behaviors attributed to the inmate. If abuse took place over time, indicate behaviors exhibit throughout the period of offending) Scoring guide: 0 = No, 2 = Yes</p>			
<p>Participated in offense with codefendants, but did not engage in any offense behaviors: ...code 999 if offense committed alone..... of 1 none 0 if had codefendants AND participated (even holding) 1 if had codefs and DID NOT participate at all</p>			
<p>Number of times subject abused victim..... of 2tms 1 = once, 2 = under 10 times, 3 = under 20 times, 4 = 20+times</p>			

Length of abuse of victim:	of2lng	
1=once, 2=w/in a week, 3=w/in a month, 4=w/in a year, 5=under 5 years 6= for more than 5 years		
Stalking:	of2stalk	
Peeping:	of2peep	
Exposure:	of2exp	
Exposure while masturbating	of2expms	
Kissing:	of2kiss	
Biting	of2bite	
Licking non-genital areas:	of2lick	
Sucking non-genital areas:	of2suck	
Fondling victim:	of2fond	
Forcing victim to fondle him:	of2frvfd	

Masturbating victim:	of2mast	_____
Forcing victim to masturbate him:	of2frvms	_____
Simulated intercourse (humping):	of2simsx	_____
Forcing victim to strip themselves for him:	of2frstrip	_____
Rubbing penis against victim:	of2rub	_____
Fellatio of victim:	of2fellv	_____
Cunnilingus of victim:	of2cunv	_____
Attempted digital vaginal penetration:	of2advpn	_____
Attempted digital anal penetration:	of2adapn	_____
Attempted oral penetration:	of2aopn	_____
Attempted vaginal penetration:	of2avpn	_____
Attempted anal penetration:	of2aapn	_____
Attempted object insertion:	of2aobin	_____

Digital vaginal penetration: of2dvpn	_____
Digital anal penetration: of2dapn	_____
Oral penetration:of2opn	_____
Vaginal penetration:.....of2vpn	_____
Anal penetration:..... of2apn	_____
Object insertion (vagina):of2obinv	_____
Object insertion (anal): of12bina	_____
Forcing victim to insert object in him:of2frin	_____
Forcing victim to insert object in him/herself:of2frins	_____
Intentional ejaculation on the victim (on body/face/mouth):of2ejac	_____
Forced victim to watch othersof2wtch	_____
Forced victim to engage in sexual contact with others:of2fsoth	_____

<p>Photographing/Video taping:..... of2phv</p> <p>Use of pornography prior to/during the offense:..... of2pa</p> <p>Exposing the victim to pornography:..... of2expp</p> <p>Other: _____.....of2other</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>Method(s) used to acquire compliance (continues on next page):</p> <p>Scoring guide: 0 = No, 1 = Yes</p> <p>Grooming (befriending):mo2groom</p> <p>Manipulation:mo2man</p> <p>Bribing (inc. with substances):mo2brib</p> <p>Victim sleeping:mo2slp</p> <p>Intoxicating/Drugging, or victim already intox'd mo2drg</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>

Fear: victim reported being afraid, in absence of actual threatmo2fear	_____
Threat of physical/emotional harm to victim or family : mo2thhrm	_____
Threat of death to victim or family : mo2thdth	_____
Holding with hands: mo2holdh	_____
Restraining with object (tape, rope, etc.):..... mo21tie	_____
Hitting with hand:..... mo2hith	_____
Hitting with object:.....mo2hito	_____
Other physical abuse: mo2othpa	_____
Had others assault victim: mo2hcda	_____
Weapon present:mo2wpm	_____
Weapon used: mo2wpnu	_____
Lethal force used (victim died):mo2lethal	_____

Other: _____ mo2othr	_____
Place were assault(s) took place: No = 0, Yes = 1	
Victim's home: st2vhm	_____
Offender's home: st2offhm	_____
Other's home: st2othhm	_____
Vehicle:st2mv	_____
Public building: st2pbldg	_____
Park: st2park	_____
Wooded area: st2woods	_____
Other: (specify): _____ st2other	_____
Did subject resist arrest? No = 0, Yes = 1	resist2
Did subject admit to offense to police/investigators? No = 0, Yes = 1	admit2

Inmates' description of the offense regarding victim 2:	
Denies offense, 0 = No, 1 = Yesv2den	_____
Claims sexual contact was consensual, 0 = No, 1 = Yesv2con	_____
Blames victim (claims was seduced/set up) 0 = No, 1 = Yes v2blmd	_____
Blames external factors (stress, spouse, family, etc.)v2blext 0 = No, 1 = Yes	_____
Blames substances (alcohol or drugs) 0 = No, 1 = Yesv2blrg	_____
Admits but minimizes offense (describes as mistake, error, etc.) v2min 0 = No, 1 = Yes	_____
Takes responsibility but does not seem contrite 0 = No, 1 = Yesv2part	_____
Takes responsibility and seems contrite 0 = No, 1 = Yes v2full	_____

3. Victim #3

Gender of Victim	vic3sex	
------------------	---------	--

Victim's age at time of the offense (score 99 if unavailable)	vic3age	
If victim's age not noted, but discernable: 1 = Infant/toddler, 2 = child under 12, 3 = adolescent, 4 = adult, 5 = senior (65+)	vic3aest	
Inmate's age at the time of the offense	inagev3	
Marital status at time of offense 1 = single, 2 = married, 3 = separated, 4 = divorced, 5= widowed, 6= engaged/had girlfriend	mstat3	
Victim's ethnicity: 1 = Caucasian, 2 = African-American, 3 = Latino/a, 4 = other, 5 = not noted	v3race	
If victim was an adult, describe his/her characteristics/relationship to the inmate: 1 = Unknown adult 2 = Known adult (but not family member; known for more than 24 hrs) 3 = Relative 4 = Ex – significant other/ex – spouse 5 = Significant other/spouse at the time of the offense 6= Non-blood relative (e.g., step-child, in-law, etc.)	v3arel	
If victim was an child/adolescent, describe his/her characteristics/relationship to the inmate: 1 = Unknown child 2 = Known child (but not family member; known for more than 24 hrs) 3 = Relative 4 = Babysat victim 5 = Foster child	v3crel	

6 = Step child 7 = Biological child 8 = Non- blood relative (step grandchild, etc.)	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Offense characteristics in regards to Victim 3

Number of Codefendants:	v3cd	
Substance abuse/intoxication during offense: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v3subs	_____
If yes:		
Marijuana: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v3mj	_____
Alcohol: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v3etoh	_____
Cocaine: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v3coke	_____
Crack cocaine: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v3crack	_____
Heroin: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v3hero	_____
Prescription medications: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v3rx	_____
Other (note _____) 0 = No, 1 = Yes	v3oth	_____

<p>Please indicate all elements that were present in the offense (continues on next page. If codefendants involved, only score behaviors attributed to the inmate. If abuse took place over time, indicate behaviors exhibit throughout the period of offending) Scoring guide: 0 = No, 1 = Yes</p>	
<p>Participated in offense with codefendants, but did not engage in any offense behaviors: ...code 999 if offense committed alone..... of1none 0 if had codefendants AND participated (even holding) 1 if had codefs and DID NOT participate at all</p>	<hr/>
<p>Number of times subject abused victim.....of3tms 1 = once, 2 = under 10 times, 3 = under 20 times, 4 = 20+times</p>	<hr/>
<p>Length of abuse of victim: of3lng 1=once, 2=w/in a week, 3=w/in a month, 4=w/in a year, 5=under 5 years 6= for more than 5 years</p>	<hr/>
<p>Stalking: of3stalk</p>	<hr/>
<p>Peeping: of3peep</p>	<hr/>
<p>Exposure: of3exp</p>	<hr/>

Exposure while masturbating	of3expms	_____
Kissing:	of3kiss	_____
Biting	of3bite	_____
Licking non-genital areas:	of3lick	_____
Sucking non-genital areas:	of3suck	_____
Fondling victim:	of3fond	_____
Forcing victim to fondle him:	of3frvfd	_____
Masturbating victim:	of3mast	_____
Forcing victim to masturbate him:	of3frvms	_____
Simulated intercourse (humping):	of3simsx	_____
Forcing victim to strip themselves for him:	of3frstrp	_____
Rubbing penis against victim:	of3rub	_____
Fellatio of victim:	of3fellv	_____

Cunnilingus of victim: of3cunv	
Attempted digital vaginal penetration:of3advpn	
Attempted digital anal penetration: of3adapn	
Attempted oral penetration: of3aopn	
Attempted vaginal penetration: of3avpn	
Attempted anal penetration: of3aapn	
Attempted object insertion: of3aobin	
Digital vaginal penetration: of3dvpn	
Digital anal penetration: of3dapn	
Oral penetration:of3opn	
Vaginal penetration:.....of3vpn	
Anal penetration:..... of3apn	
Object insertion (vagina):of3obinv	

Object insertion (anal): of3obina	_____
Forcing victim to insert object in him: of3frin	_____
Forcing victim to insert object in him/herself: of3frins	_____
Intentional ejaculation on the victim (on body/face/mouth):..... of3ejac	_____
Forced victim to watch others of3wtch	_____
Forced victim to engage in sexual contact with others: of3fsoth	_____
Photographing/Video taping: of3phv	_____
Use of pornography prior to/during the offense:..... of3pa	_____
Exposing the victim to pornography:..... of3expp	_____
Other: _____ of3other	_____
Method(s) used to acquire compliance (continues on next page): Scoring guide: 0 = No, 1 = Yes	

Grooming (befriending):mo3groom	
Manipulation:mo3man	
Bribing (inc. with substances):mo3brib	
Victim sleeping: mo3slp	
Intoxicating/Drugging, or victim already intox'd: mo3drg	
Fear: victim reported being afraid, in absence of actual threat.....mo3fear	
Threat of physical/emotional harm to victim or family : mo3thhrm	
Threat of death to victim or family : mo3thdth	
Holding with hands: mo3holdh	
Restraining with object (tape, rope, etc.):mo3tie	
Hitting with hand:..... mo3hith	
Hitting with object:.....mo3hito	
Other physical abuse: mo3othpa	

Had others assault victim: mo3hcda	_____
Weapon present:mo3wpm	_____
Weapon used: mo3wpnu	_____
Lethal force used (victim died):mo3lethal	_____
Other: _____ mo3othr	_____
Place were assault(s) took place: No = 0, Yes = 1	
Victim's home: st3vhm	_____
Offender's home: st3offhm	_____
Other's home: st3othhm	_____
Vehicle: st3mv	_____
Public building: st3pbldg	_____
Park: st3park	_____

Wooded area: st3woods	_____
Other: (specify): st3other	_____
Did subject resist arrest? No = 0, Yes = 1 resist3	
Did subject admit to offense to police/investigators? No = 0, Yes = 1 admit3	
Inmates' description of the offense regarding victim 3:	
Denies offense, 0 = No, 1 = Yes v3den	_____
Claims sexual contact was consensual, 0 = No, 1 = Yesv3con	_____
Blames victim (claims was seduced/set up) 0 = No, 1 = Yes v3blmd	_____
Blames external factors (stress, spouse, family, etc.)v3blext 0 = No, 1 = Yes	_____
Blames substances (alcohol or drugs) 0 = No, 1 = Yes v3bldr	_____
Admits but minimizes offense (describes as mistake, error, etc.) v3min 0 = No, 1 = Yes	_____
Takes responsibility but does not seem contrite 0 = No, 1 = Yesv3part	_____

Takes responsibility and seems contrite 0 = No, 1 = Yes v3full	
----------------------------------------------------------------------	--