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ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this project was to examine some of the factors which lead child molesters to sexually abuse their victims. To understand why these sexual activities occurred, molesters' own past histories of abuse were considered. To determine how molesters sexually abused children, their approach to selecting, seducing, and silencing the children was examined. The secondary purpose of this project was to evaluate the child molesters' strategies on ethical reasoning tasks after being involved in a sexual relationship with a child. Subjects included twenty convicted male offenders who volunteered to participate while residing at a medium security prison: ten were convicted of extra-familial offences, while the rest were convicted of intra-familial offences. During unstructured interviews, these offenders provided descriptions of their previous sexual experiences, including the sexual activities that occurred with their victims. The semi-structured interviews consisted of meta-ethical tasks measuring the offender's sense of personal continuity over time and skeptical doubt tasks measuring the offender's ability to resolve conflicting issues. These meta-ethical tasks were followed by normative ethical tasks involving three hypothetical dilemmas to measure moral competence and a personal dilemma to measure moral behavior. The results for the unstructured interview supported Marshall's (1989)
theory that sex offenders select children that will meet their needs, thus avoiding loneliness. Child molesters reported selecting more non-vulnerable than vulnerable children. Frequently they admitted seducing children through acts of comforting. Not only did they comfort the child, the child would comfort the molester. The majority of child molesters reported they knew the child would remain silent about the events that had occurred. The results for the meta-ethical task, personal continuum, indicated that child molesters who received the most treatment used higher levels of reasoning. They also used more flexible strategies on the skeptical doubt tasks. For the normative ethical tasks, performance by child molesters on the hypothetical dilemmas was more advanced than performance on the personal dilemmas. For the personal dilemmas, the intra-familial offenders in the high-treatment group demonstrated less advanced levels of reasoning than the intra-familial offenders in the low-treatment group. Further research is needed to clarify these results from a theoretical, empirical and practical level.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this project was to understand child molesters' activities presently occurring within North American society. Mohr, Turner, and Jerry (1964) emphasized the importance of restricting research on this topic to a specific place and time. Even though other societies, such as the Philippines, tolerate these activities to some extent our society enforces social and legal consequences for engaging in sexual activities with children. Likewise, at different times in history, such as in Ancient Rome, men were given varying degrees of latitude to engage children in sexual acts (Schultz, 1982; Brongersma, 1984). In our society no such range exists. Therefore, it is appropriate to restrict the topic to "the nature and consequences of sexual behavior with children in our society today" (Mohr, Turner, & Jerry, 1964, p. 11).

Despite the social and legal consequences, child molesters continue to engage in sexual activities with children. Various theories, such as those reviewed by Lanyon (1991), speculated as to why these men choose children as their sexual partners. In 1984 Abel and colleagues suggested that child molesters change their own perceptions of their sexual activities by using cognitive distortions. A common distortion is "A child who does not physically resist my sexual advances really wants to have sex with me" (p. 47). However, even with these internal
cognitive distortions, the child molester must be continuously aware of his external environment.

To avoid unpleasant social and legal consequences, the child molester modifies how he engages in sexual activities with children. He must be cautious when selecting and seducing a child. Also he must maintain the child’s silence over time. Even the sexual act can be modified by restricting the frequency or type (i.e., fondling to penetration) of behaviors to appease the child. Since child molesters must be aware of their relationships within a societal context, they undoubtedly possess the most knowledge about the events that occurred.

In this project, child molesters were interviewed to obtain information about their previous sexual activities, including the sexual acts that occurred with their victims. Background information regarding both the offender and victim is essential for a complete account of why and how they committed the offence. Furthermore, child molesters’ subsequent reasoning on ethical issues was examined to understand the cognitive processes affecting their behaviors.

Child Molesters

Three definitions

Understanding child molesters requires an overview of knowledge from three disciplines: forensic and developmental psychology, along with clinical psychiatry.
Each discipline defines and emphasizes different aspects of the offender's lifestyle.

Forensic psychology considers adult sexual experiences with children in relationship to the criminal justice system. In Canada, *Martin's Annual Criminal Code* (Greenspan, 1992) considered only the sexual acts committed, not sexual fantasies or urges. To be charged with a sexual offense against a child under the Criminal Code, the victim must be under 18 years of age. The sexual act is considered an offense regardless of whether or not "consent" was obtained from the victim. The designated age of the offender can vary according to their relationship to the victim. For example, offenses 151 (Sexual Interference), 152 (Invitation to Sexual Touching), and 173(2) (Indecent Acts/Exposure) stipulated that the person charged should not be under 12 or 13 years of age, unless they were in a "position of trust or authority." In the case of intra-familiar offences, the relationship between the victim and offender is of primary importance. Section 155 (Incest) stated, "Everyone commits incest who, knowing that another person is by blood relationship his or her parent, child, brother, sister, grandparent or grandchild, as the case may be, has sexual intercourse with that person" (p. 211). For incest cases, the age of the victim is taken into consideration under legislation for related offences. For instance, section 171 (Householder Permitting Sexual Activity) stated that anyone who knowingly allows their
premise to be used for illegal sexual activities can be charged. The maximum sentence is five years imprisonment, if the victim is under 14. If the victim is over 14 but under 18, the maximum sentence is two years. An offense against a child may result in various consequences ranging from an indecent act punishable by a summary conviction, to charges of indecent and sexual assaults, resulting in an indeterminate period of incarceration (Supreme Court of B.C., 1986). The legal term used to describe adults who engage in sexual offenses against a minor is "child molester" (or simply "child sex offender").

According to Groth, child molesters may be classified into sub-categories as either "fixated" or "regressed offenders" (Groth, Burgess, Birnbaum, & Gary, 1978). The fixated offender's sexual orientation is primarily directed towards children, while the regressed offender would prefer a sexual relationship with an adult but has turned to a child while under stress. Like regressed offenders, intra-familial offenders are usually oriented towards female adults (Langevin & Lang, 1988). Fixated offenders, or extra-familial offenders, are oriented towards children (Marshall, 1989). Lanning (1987) noted that these categories frequently overlap. Fixated offenders have been known to marry simply to obtain access to their spouse's children, while the regressed offender may offend against his own and other people's children.
There is a distinction between a "child rapist" and a "child molester." Sgroi (1978) stated, "most people imagine that sexual assault of a child by an adult will be a brutal and violent act involving physical trauma to the child by forcible penetration of the vagina, rectum, or mouth. [Even the legal term "incest" stipulates that intercourse was committed.] Although these acts may occur, and occasionally do occur, most often the sexual assault will be nonviolent and without forcible penetration" (p. 131). This statement has continued to receive support (Groth, Hobson, & Gary, 1982). For instance, Langevin and Lang (1988) found that only one in eight incest offenders are violent. The non-violent child molester comprises the majority of child sex offenders who also seek an emotional relationship. The child rapist can be viewed as a physical threat to the child, whereas the child molester is a psychological threat (Groth, Hobson, & Gary, 1982).

Clinical psychiatry considers child molesters according to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III-R) compiled by the American Psychiatric Association (1987). They classified child molesters only if they exhibit pedophilic tendencies--reoccurring (i.e., for a minimum of 6 months) sexual fantasies, urges, or activities that involve a prepubescent child. Usually, the age of the patient (pedophile) is at least 16 years, with the child's age less than 13 years. The minimum age interval frequently used to distinguish the patient from the child is 5 years.
The *DSM-III-R Training Guide* (Reid & Wise, 1989) stressed that "the separate diagnosis of Pedophilia should not be made unless children are clearly the preferred victims" (p. 166). Lanning (1987) contrasted the psychiatric term "pedophile" with the legal term "child molester." He clarified that all pedophiles are not child molesters, because an adult may prefer to fantasize about a child, but not act upon these fantasies. As well, a child molester might not be a pedophile, if their sexual preference is adults, not children.

For developmental psychopathologists the precise definition of terms is not a problem because this discipline does not classify psychopathologies. Instead developmental psychologists "learn more about the normal functioning of an organism by studying its pathology and, likewise, more about its pathology by studying its normal condition" (Cicchetti, 1984, p. 1). To examine normal sexual development, Wolman and Money (1980) edited a handbook categorizing the stages of sexuality throughout the life span. As well, Goldman and Goldman's book (1988) entitled *Show Me Yours!* described normal sexual development based on current research. Descriptions of normal sexual behaviors in comparison to the child molesters' sexual behaviors are required by developmental psychopathologists to address why and how children are sexually abused.
The child molesters' behaviors

Compulsive or repetitious sexual activities

Child molesters engaging in extra-familial offences against children have been reported to be compulsive or repetitious.

Lanning (1986) pointed out that they may victimize "dozens, hundreds or even thousands of children in a lifetime" (p. 37). One extra-familial offender, Clarence Osborne (Wilson, 1981) maintained records on 2,500 boys he molested over a twenty-year period. Although Osborne is an extreme case, the sexual activities of the average child molester appear repetitious. Abel, Mittelman, and Becker (1985) asked incarcerated child molesters to state the number of attempted and completed molestations they committed on children under 14 years of age. On average each molester attempted 238.2 molestations and completed 166.9. Each molester had an average of 75.8 victims. This large number of victims cannot be explained by the fact that child molesters are attracted only to children within a narrow age range. It is possible children mature beyond this age range making them less attractive to the offender, thus he seeks another younger victim. However, this would only account for a small number of victims.

After Conte (1991) reviewed Abel, Becker, Mittelman, Cunningham-Rathner, Rouleau, and Murphy's (1987) data, he concluded that even though extra-familial offenders had numerous victims, intra-familial offenders engaged in more
sexual acts with each victim. This conclusion is supported by clinical research on father-daughter incest. Herman and Hirschman (1977) found that the majority of women reporting sexual abuse by their fathers endured the abuse over a three-year period. Thus, both intra-familial and extra-familial offenders appear to engage in compulsive and repetitive sexual activities.

Recidivism.

The expectation would be that recidivism rates for child sex offenders would be high if these activities are compulsive. Romero and Williams (1985) compared the recidivism rates of three groups of sex offenders: exhibitionists, pedophiles (i.e., extra-familial or intra-familial offenders) and those who had committed a sexual assault. A ten-year follow-up study revealed that exhibitionists and pedophiles had not engaged in as many nonsexual crimes as the sexual assaulters. However, the authors discovered that exhibitionists (41%) and pedophiles (33%) had been involved in more sexual crimes than the sexual assaulters (23%). Overall the best predictor of recidivism for exhibitionists, pedophiles and those who had committed a sexual assault was the number of times they had been previously arrested. There was a positive relationship between previous arrests and recidivism. "That is, past criminal behavior was the best predictor of future criminal behavior (as measured by arrest)" (Romero and Williams, 1984, p. 62).
Erickson, Walbek, and Seely (1987) classified child sex offenders into subgroups of fathers, stepfathers, and extra-familial offenders. There were no significant differences between groups in their nonsexual criminal records, however the fathers had fewer previous sexual offences than stepfathers and extra-familial offenders. Therefore, with the exception of fathers, it appears that recidivism rates for child molesters appear high for sexual offences, yet do not generalize to nonsexual offences.

In conclusion, it is apparent that both intra-familial and extra-familial offenders engage in compulsive, repetitious activities. These problems are manifested in high recidivism rates for sexual, rather than non-sexual offences. To obtain a broader depiction of the situation, in addition to emphasizing the need for more research in this area, let us consider the extent of the problem for the victim.

**Extent of the problem**

**National rates of sexual abuse**

A recent survey by Finkelhor, Hotaling, Lewis, and Smith (1990) was the first undertaken nationally in the United States. They asked adults about any prior history of sexual abuse. To discourage under-reporting four questions were left "partially undefined" (p. 20). For example, "When you were a child, can you remember any kind of experience that you would now consider sexual abuse involving someone touching you, or grabbing you, or kissing you, or rubbing up
against your body either in a public place or private—anything like that?" (p. 20). These phone interviews included 1,145 men and 1,481 women. Results indicated that 27% of the women reported having been sexually abused, while 16% of the men reported being sexually abused. For both men and women the likelihood of being abused increased if they were from unhappy homes, or if the majority of their childhood had been with only one of their biological parents. Living in the western regions was an additional risk factor for both sexes. For men, having English or Scandinavian ancestors was a risk factor. For women, having "an inadequate sex education" was a risk factor (p. 24). Even though most of these findings can be supported by past research, Finkelhor et al. expected that the current statistics are underestimated, because some victims never disclose sexual abuse.

Specific information describing intra-familial and extra-familial offences against children is available from The Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (Statistics Canada, 1991). They reported that 41% of sexual assault cases involving children were committed by their parents (24%) or other family members (17%). Female children were more frequently assaulted within the family unit (48%) than males (33%). Male children were more frequently assaulted by acquaintances (45%) than females (35%). A stranger was the offender in only 8% of the cases for females and 14% of the cases for males. (In the remaining cases the offender’s
relationship to the victim was unknown.) For other sexual
offences, such as invitation to sexual touching, there were
no statistical differences in the relationship of the
offender to the victim between male and female children.
After collapsing groups, twenty-nine percent of the
offenders were parents (13%) or family members (16%).

Defining victimization

Since high rates of child sexual abuse have been
reported, it is important to understand the effects of this
abuse on the victim. However, there are various ways of
defining who is a victim (Finkelhor, 1979): the consent
standard, feeling victimized, and the community standard.

The consent standard cannot be appropriately applied to
children, since they are incapable of comprehending the
meaning or consequences of engaging in sexual activities
(Finkelhor, 1979). According to DeMott (1980), the child
cannot know "when his or her normal process of sexual
awakening and development are tampered with" (p. 16).

The second way victimization can be defined is to
determine whether the child feels he or she is a victim.
The advantage of this approach is that the child decides
whether or not they are a victim at the time of the activity
or later. The disadvantage to this approach is that the
label "victimization" could be applied inconsistently.
Ultimately, Finkelhor rejects this definition,
"victimization can take place even if the victim does not
necessarily feel victimized and damaged, if and when
conditions of genuine consent are not possible at the outset" (p. 52).

The third definition of victimization involves community standards. Finkelhor used the age of the child and the age of the adult to define victimization in child sexual abuse cases. This approach is consistent with other research, as well as with many legal systems.

a. Short-term effects

Wachtel (1988) described four factors that could affect the child’s initial reaction to being sexually abused. The first factor considers specific aspects of the abusive situation. For instance, past research indicated that the effects of abuse are more traumatic to the child if repeated over an extended period of time. The effects are intensified if the offender is the child’s father or stepfather. In addition, forcing the child to engage in sexual acts increased trauma. The second factor considers other stresses in the child’s life, such as psychological or physical abuse. This idea was explored by Deblinger, McLeer, Atkins, Ralphe, and Foa’s (1989). They found that of 29 children who were sexually abused, 20 were physically abused. The third factor focused on the personal characteristics of the child including age, gender, temperament, intelligence, coping style, etc. The last factor considers both the positive and negative aspects of the child’s current environment. For instance, when disclosure of the abusive situation occurred, were the
child's statements believed and supported, or denied and rejected? Wachtel maintained that each of these four factors should be evaluated, because the effects of sexual abuse can interfere with the child's normal development.

Beitchman, Zucker, Hood, DaCosta, and Akman (1991) reviewed forty-two studies on the initial effects of sexual abuse from a developmental perspective. Unfortunately, many of these studies were methodologically flawed, thus increasing the number of inconsistent results. Methodological flaws were discovered when studies on preschoolers were reviewed: it was unclear whether sexualized behavior (e.g., sexual play with dolls, seductive behaviors, masturbation) was a consequence of sexual abuse. The findings varied according to the type of assessment procedure used. For school-age children of both sexes, it was easier to assess inappropriate sexual behaviors. Sexually abused children engaged in more inappropriate sexual behaviors than physically abused children (Deblinger, McLeer, Atkins, Ralph, & Foa, 1989). In addition, sexually abused children had more problems with school, as well as emotional and behavior problems. But it has been suggested that many of "these children had a pre-abuse history of psychiatric and/or developmental difficulties" (Beitchman, et al., 1991, p. 543). Due to these confounding factors, preschoolers or school-age children who have been sexually abused do not have symptoms that can be labelled as a specific pathology.
Sgroi, Porter, and Blick (1978) suggested twenty warning signs that may indicate a child has been sexually abused, including:

1. Overly compliant behavior.
2. Acting-out, aggressive behavior.
3. Pseudomature behavior.
4. Hints about sexual activity.
5. Persistent and inappropriate sexual play with peers or toys or with themselves, or sexually aggressive behavior with others.
6. Detailed and age-inappropriate understanding of sexual behavior (especially by young children).
7. Arriving early at school and leaving late with few, if any, absences.
8. Poor peer relationships or inability to make friends.
9. Lack of trust, particularly with significant others.
10. Nonparticipation in school and social activities.
11. Inability to concentrate in school.
12. Sudden drop in school performance.
13. Extraordinary fears of males (in cases of male perpetrator and female victim).
14. Seductive behavior with males (in cases of male perpetrator and female victim).
15. Running away from home.
16. Sleep disturbances.
17. Regressive behavior.
18. Withdrawal.
19. Clinical depression.
20. Suicidal feelings.

Some of these behaviors point to specific problems. For instance, cases of incest can result in an "overly compliant" child. As the authors explained, these children have lost control over their lives, even over their bodies. At the other extreme, children who are "actor-outers" have probably spoken out about the sexual abuse with little success. As a result, their behavior deteriorates. All children who have been sexually abused may act pseudomature.
Many have taken on the role of a parent or spouse, but underneath they are "a frightened, guilt-ridden, lonely child" (Sgroi et al., 1978, p. 42).

b. Long-term effects

Over time these short-term effects appear even more serious and a wide range of long-term effects have been reported. The most frequently reported problem by adults who have been abused as children is sexual dysfunction (Beitchman et al., 1991). Women from clinical samples frequently reported low levels of sexual desire, flashbacks of the abuse during sexual relations, as well as acts of promiscuity. Males in a non-clinical sample reported sexual problems, such as difficulty attaining or maintaining an erection, and premature ejaculation (Fromuth & Burkhart, 1989). These sexual dysfunctions were the main negative consequences reported by this undergraduate sample of men. However, this sample is not representative of other male populations. For instance, the majority of offenders who abused these undergraduate men were females, rather than males. Their experiences were described as interesting and pleasurable.

These findings contrast drastically with Vander Mey's (1988) review of 23 studies on the sexual abuse of males. They experienced a wide range of maladjustment (e.g., substance abuse to sexual dysfunctions) and lower sense of self-esteem (e.g., lack of control or power). As adults they were at a greater risk of becoming an abuser, than
males who had not been abused as children. For incest cases, the consequences are even more serious. Vander Mey referred to a study undertaken in Texas by Justice and Justice (1979). The consequences of father-son incest were:

- homosexuality (not as a choice, but as a forced lifestyle), drug abuse, loss of contact with reality, the intergenerational transmission of male sexual victimization, and an unfulfilled desire to experience the gratification of typical childhood needs (Briere, & Runtz, 1988, p. 67).

Likewise, the long-term consequences were severe for two mother-son incest cases. The sons were reported to distrust others, felt guilty, displayed a low self-image, and lacked social skills.

A prevalent problem for women who have been sexually abused as children is revictimization (Beitchman et al., 1991). These women experienced increased acts of sexual assault as adolescents and adults, compared to other women. In adulthood they were more apt to experience other types of abuse, such as battering within their marital relationships. The consequence of being repeatedly abused was apparent by the various emotional symptoms displayed.

Females in a non-clinical sample displayed numerous symptoms including "higher levels of acute and chronic dissociation and somatization, along with greater anxiety and depression" (Briere & Runtz, 1988, p. 54). These symptoms were positively related to the type of sexual abuse that had occurred (e.g., number of abusers, parental incest, use of force, intercourse, and an extended period of abuse).
Primary purpose of this project

Despite the short- and long-term effects on the victim, child molesters continued to initiate these sexual activities. Lanyon (1991) reviewed various theories speculating as to why children are chosen as sexual partners. Psychodynamic theories were frequently used to understand these behaviors. For instance, Groth believed that sexual offences are not motivated by sexual needs, but are a consequence of "unresolved life issues" (p. 44). Marshall's (1989) theory is an expansion of Groth's approach, and based on a developmental perspective. He believed that the unstable personal histories of offenders interfere with their ability to form secure attachments to their primary caregivers. As children, these insecure attachments affect their ability to form peer relationships. They are unable to relate affectionately or experience empathy for another person. As men, they do not know how to maintain interpersonal relationships: they seek intimacy through sexual encounters. However, these sexual encounters lack the intimacy they desire, thus forcing them into other relationships or "persistent promiscuity" and frustration. According to Marshall, both intra-familial and extra-familial offenders turn to children for intimacy to avoid loneliness. Unfortunately, research on sex offenders' relationships during childhood is limited. Tingle, Barnard, Robbins, Newman, and Hutchinson (1986) compared the childhood experiences of 43 child molesters and 21 rapists.
They found that 83% of the child molesters described their relationship with their mother as close or very close (rapists 55%). However, 23.3% of the child molesters found it difficult to discuss their plans or problems with their mothers (rapists 19.1%). The authors suggested that this "greater attachment to the mother" indicates "early dependency conflicts" (p. 115). Neither group of sex offenders felt close to their fathers (child molesters 48.6%; rapists 57.9%). This may be due to their father's abuse of alcohol (child molesters 25.6%; rapists, 57.1%).

Confounding these problems, during childhood 55.8% of the child molesters and 38.1% of the rapists had been sexually abused. The abuse began earlier for the child molesters (8.5 years, SD=4.93) than the rapists (9.2 years, SD=3.54).

Langevin, Wright, and Handy (1989) compared the backgrounds of sex offenders who had been abused (201) during childhood to sex offenders who were never abused (261). The abused offenders viewed their fathers as more aggressive than non-abused offenders. The offenders' mothers were aggressive in response to their husbands, but not to their children. Generally, the abused offender's homelife was marked by aggression and disorganization.

In neither of these studies were intra-familial offenders examined independently. Williams and Finkelhor (1988) reviewed ten years of studies on incestuous fathers. During the incestuous fathers' own childhood, he had been frequently abused or neglected. Physical abuse occurred
more frequently than sexual abuse with either of their parents equally likely to be responsible. Neglect, or rejection, was more common by their fathers than mothers. Replication, as well as an extension of these findings, is required. In contrast to the research supporting psychodynamic theories, the physiological theories were not considered by Lanyon (1991) to be sufficient explanations for engaging in child sexual abuse. Empirical theories, he felt, provided more convincing explanations. As mentioned previously, in 1984 Abel and colleagues theorized that child molesters change their own perceptions of their sexual activities by using cognitive distortions (e.g., "A child who does not physically resist my sexual advances really wants to have sex with me.") (p. 47). However, when using these internal cognitive distortions, the child molester must be aware of his external environment to avoid social and legal consequences. Additional information is needed to determine not only why, but how offenders sexually abuse children. Specifically, this project focuses on how child molesters select, seduce, and silence the children?

Selection Process

Early research by Gebhard, Gagnon, Pomeroy, and Christenson (1965) considered the age of the victim during the selection process. They found that heterosexual extra-familial pedophiles chose slightly younger victims than did incest, aggressive, or extra-familial homosexual pedophiles. However, the age range was small: a half-year difference in
median ages (8.0–9.6 years) for all groups. The relationship of the offender to the victim was classified as either stranger, acquaintance, friend, or relative. While intra-familial pedophiles by definition are relatives, heterosexual (41%) and homosexual (49%) extra-familial pedophiles were most often considered "friends" of the victim. After collapsing categories 60.1% of the heterosexual pedophiles and 67.6% of the homosexual pedophiles were known to their victims. The only exception was when offenders aggressively assaulted female children. In these cases, the offenders were usually a stranger (69.2%). Duncan and Hern's research (1980) support these early conclusions. They found that heterosexual child molesters chose younger victims. Half of the victims knew the offender.

A re-occurring assumption throughout the literature is that victims are selected because of their vulnerability. For example, Lanning (1986) suggested that male children may be particularly susceptible when they are from broken, problem-ridden, neglectful, or low income families. Basta and Peterson (1990) compared family functioning for intra-familial victims (i.e., by a family member) and extra-familial victims (i.e., by a teacher) of sexual offences and a control group. There was no difference in family functioning between the two molested groups, although victims' families from both abused groups functioned lower than the control group. It is unknown whether this lower
level of functioning occurred before or after disclosure of the abuse. The authors believed it was more likely that problems were present before disclosure. They suggested that family problems encourage vulnerable children to initiate non-sexual contact with a pedophile (Sandfort, 1984; Virkkunen, 1975). These children may exchange a need for affection for sexual favors (Lanning, 1986). However, some children who are sexually abused cannot be classified as vulnerable (Wilson, 1981). Therefore, Marshal's theory (1989) offered an alternative explanation for why children are sexually abused by focusing on the offender's, rather than the child's needs. Perhaps, the offender seeks a victim to satisfy his needs for an intimate relationship—an open, affectionate, loving child. At present this issue has not been resolved.

Seduction Process

Based on the idea of victim vulnerability, Virkkunen (1975) looked at the child's reactions towards the extrafamilial offender. Out of 64 cases, 31 victims were labelled "subjects" and 33 victims were labelled "controls." The 31 subjects "repeatedly, on his/her own initiative, visited the offender notwithstanding the fact that the latter committed unchaste acts and/or the victim displayed some kind of initiative in the offence itself" (p. 176). The 33 controls displayed "resistance" or a "passive attitude" (p. 176). The question to be addressed is, "Why did the subjects maintain contact with the offender?"
authors discovered that the offenders used bribery even before the sexual activities occurred. These acts of bribery (e.g., giving the child candy or money) were a more prevalent gesture directed towards subjects (74.2%) than controls (30.3%). This gesture was even more prevalent with males (55%) than females (33.3%) (Duncan & Hern, 1980). Caplan (1982) described these initial gestures as part of courting the child. This courtship progresses in the same way as adult males pursue adult females. The example is given of one suspect who "began his courtship with dinners, ballgames, trips to an amusement arcade, and two expensive gifts, a pinball machine and a stereo set" (p. 50). This approach is typical of extra-familial offenders who frequently buy the child gifts, or use other forms of bribery (Erickson, Walbek, & Seely, 1988). In addition, the offender may slowly lower the child's inhibitions by arranging a situation where the child must change their clothes (Lanning, 1986), or by presenting the child with pornographic materials (Erickson, Walbek, & Seely, 1988). In such cases, the offender usually strives for the child's love—to be their friend. In contrast to the process of courting, Sandfort (1984) discovered that the sexual aspect may be introduced early in the relationship, in some cases even during the first social contact with the child. The boy is usually older, "13 or 14 years old, is at a park or playground and is offered money or recreational rewards for his co-operation" (Duncan & Hern, 1980, p. 13). Although
these two seduction processes have some support in the literature, there is insufficient information relating these two processes to age, or other events. For either approach, the power dynamics may change after the sexual activities occur. "The young child, particularly one who has been passed from adult to adult, learns that he or she possesses great powers" (Caplan, 1982, p. 50). They can manipulate the adult (e.g., for gifts or recreational activities), since the adult is now obsessed with obtaining sexual favors from the child.

The seduction process for intra-familial offenders is less extensive, as the offender is in a powerful position of trust and authority over the child. Children may even seek answers from a father who is sexually abusing them. For example one incest survivor stated, "My father came into my room and I would think that I was dreaming. And the next day when asked about it, he said, 'It was a dream.'" Slowly the child realized what was happening to her. "At first I'd wake up just as he'd be leaving the room, and later on I felt him fondling me, touching my breasts and my genitals. There was no intercourse at that time" (Delin, 1978, p. 121). During this initial phase, the victim reported feeling special, as she was receiving extra attention from her father. Unfortunately, she came to realize the attention, affection and caring only occurred within a sexual context.
Lang and Frenzel (1988) compared the techniques used by 52 intra-familial offenders (incest) to the techniques used by 50 extra-familial offenders (pedophilic) to seduce female children into sexual activities. Maneuvers, such as sexually assaulting the child when asleep, were used by 41% of the intra-familial and 17% of the extra-familial offenders. Other maneuvers involved attempts to keep the child unaware of what was happening. For instance, "accidentally touching" the child (intra-familial 75%; extra-familial 56%), or presenting sex as a game (intra-familial 56%; extra-familial 44%) were the most common maneuvers used by both groups to diminish awareness in the child. Intra-familial offenders tried to cuddle their child (55%). Extra-familial offenders offered to baby-sit (42%) children. For both groups the offences would frequently occur within the victim's or offender's home. To continue to elicit the child's cooperation both groups used techniques, such as "the misuses of moral standards (e.g., "It's ok. Everybody does it.") or provided misinformation (i.e., telling the child precocious sex play was good for them, would somehow make them better "lovers" in later life, or would allow them to develop mature bodies sooner)" (p. 310). In this study, aggression in the form of frightening the child was used by two-thirds of the offenders, while physical force was used by one-third of the offenders. As Conte pointed out, the "severity of the abuse
can be defined in many ways" (1991, p. 21). As well, these finding may be applicable only to female victims.

**Silencing Process**

In addition, the process of silencing children is not understood. Lang and Frenzel's (1988) research on female victims compared and contrasted the silencing techniques of extra-familial and intra-familial offenders. Both types of offenders (extra-familial 40%; intra-familial 85%) told their victims that this was our "special secret" (p. 311). This made the children feel special, "but in a bewildering way" (p. 312). Other statements that served to silence the child included "I love you" (extra-familial 6%; intra-familial 68%), as well as, "Daddy's girl" or the "Your special approach" (extra-familial 16%; intra-familial 28%). Non-verbal techniques for maintaining the child's silence included doing favors for the child (extra-familial 4%; intra-familial 23%), or portraying a fatherly image (extra-familial 16%; intra-familial 17%). For intra-familial cases only, the fathers threatened that the family would split up (43%). Such techniques place a tremendous responsibility on the child, as the following quote from an incest survivor demonstrates:

> Since I didn't try to change anything for so long, I felt responsible. The trouble must be with me and not my father. I also thought that if I told my mother she would have another nervous break down and that probably my dad would be so angry I'd have to leave home (Delin, 1978, p. 122).
Survivors, like this woman, were questioned to determine why they maintained silence over time.

Lister (1982) studied survivors of "war neurosis," as well as rape and child sexual abuse. Explanations given for maintaining silence ranged from fear of retaliation to wanting to help the offender. Some survivors engaged in "magical thinking." They believed that if they did not talk about the incident, then it never happened. As well, survivors were concerned about other people's reactions. If they told, would they be believed? If believed, would they be rejected?

Santoro-Tomlin (1991) concluded that a stigma against incest victims is common. This stigma "is a mixture of contempt and compassion which leads to both exaggerated kindness and avoidance" (p. 558). For instance, female victims may be avoided when they are blamed for the sexual activities that occurred. Male victims may be avoided for going against masculine stereotypes. For instance, if the offender was a male, it is feared that the victim will be a homosexual. In Sandfort's study (1984), some of the boys remained silent believing their friends would think they were "gay" or "queer." On the other hand, if the offender was a female, the masculine stereotype implies that the boy should have enjoyed the experience. Therefore, it is not surprising that most disclosures of sexual abuse by males and females are accidental, rather than purposeful (Sorensen & Snow, 1991).
Sorensen and Snow (1991) studied 116 cases involving the disclosure of sexual abuse. Sixty-two percent were females, and 38% were males. These cases were confirmed by confessions (80%), convictions (14%), or medical evidence (6%). The authors found that 74% of the disclosures were accidental, particularly for preschoolers, although adolescents frequently disclosed on purpose. Considering the stigma attached to disclosing, the adolescent findings appear contradictory to expectations. However, 24% of the purposeful disclosers occurred after being involved in educational programs, another 24% acted out of anger. Other factors that help overcome stigmatization need to be examined in conjunction with the offender's techniques for silencing.

Need for knowledge

Information on why and how child molesters engage in sexual activities with children could be used to provide programs for both victims and offenders.

Preventative programs

Berliner and Conte (1990) discussed how verbal and non-verbal behaviors by the child molester prior to the abuse can be implemented into prevention programs. Non-verbal behaviors that might be warning signs were expressed in the following statements by the child, "He'd look at me funny, pat me on the rear and wrestle" or "He'd give me lots of backrubs and play footsies" (p. 33). The verbal behaviors described by the children were, "He'd tell me that I had
beautiful legs" or "He said I had a nice body and ought to show it off" (p. 33). Other warning signs involved being treated specially or in an age-inappropriate manner. Further research is required on how child molesters approach children, to adequately inform children of the events leading to sexual abuse.

Prevention programs are also designed to identify offenders within the school system. An Enquiry in the Sexual Abuse of Children by School Board Employees in the Province of British Columbia (Sullivan & Williams, 1986) gave a number of suggestions for identifying extra-familial offenders including extensive screening and criminal record checks. An anonymous child molester (Cook, 1989) recommended that educational staff be aware of inappropriate activities exhibited by teachers. Psychologically, this may be evidenced by an overinvolvement with a particular child. Behaviorally, this might be demonstrated when a teacher uses the same washrooms, changing rooms, or showers as the children. By being aware of these early warning signs, inappropriate behaviors might be detected and terminated before evolving into illegal offences.

For intra-familial cases, a dysfunctional family may be a warning sign of potential child sexual abuse. For instance, one warning sign reported by Langevin and Lang (1988) is violence. One in eight intra-familial offenders are considered violent. These violent tendencies are directed towards friends and family. Another warning sign
is the offender's mental state. Approximately half of these men are depressed, while a quarter are "disturbed, confused, and suspicious" (p. 7). However, the majority of intra-familial offenders are not mentally ill, but undergoing stressful circumstances. It is unknown what aspects of family life contribute to their stressful states (e.g., the marital relationship, employment), or is it known how these stressful circumstances led up to committing an offence. Additional information is needed to alert family members to potential problems.

Training

If sexual abuse has been reported, specialists must determine whether the abuse actually occurred. Information describing child sexual abuse is needed to train police officers, child protection workers, and other specialists in the field. For instance, descriptions of specific acts, progression of acts (i.e., fondling to oral, digital to anal sex), and acts within interactions (i.e., intimate to group sex) could be of assistance when determining the credibility of statements.

Assessment/Treatment

After it has been determined that sexual abuse has occurred, the child will require treatment. Information describing the dynamics of the abusive situation would benefit psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, and therapists who are involved in the treatment of sexually abused children. Abused children may be unable to explain
their experiences because of stress, embarrassment, or a lack of verbal skills. With more information, professionals may be better able to understand the child's experiences, and thereby interact more effectively with the child in a therapeutic setting.

As well, the child molester will require assessment and treatment. The assessment of offenders frequently involves the use of physiological (Abel, Becker, Blanchard, & Djenderedjian, 1978), psychological (Hall, Maiuro, Vitaliano, & Proctor, 1986) or projective (Mohr, Turner, & Jerry, 1964) techniques. Information about the sexual events that occurred between the adult and child could be used to improve these assessment techniques. For example, the stimuli (i.e., videotapes, audio-tapes, or slides) used with the penial plethysmograph could be more representative of the actual sexual activities that occurred. This assessment technique can be used for an initial assessment, or repeatedly administered throughout treatment to evaluate progress.

There are various forms of treatment for offenders, including orgasmic reconditioning, aversion techniques, and group treatment. Group treatments are considered a standard procedure (Beltrami, Ravart, & Jacob, 1988). According to La Torre (Underwood, 1989, p. 59), "Group therapy is more effective and efficient, because sex offenders tend to deny and minimize what they do and no one knows a sex offender better than another sex offender." By understanding why and
how intra-familial and extra-familial offenders commit illegal sexual activities, other forms of therapy could become more effective.

Sources of information

Information describing child sexual abuse could be obtained from the two people witnessing the event: the child or molester.

Children

Under two conditions children may be able to provide information about their experiences of being sexually abused. First, they need to possess adequate verbal skills. Second, they must be willing and able to speak about this emotional event logically. Berliner and Conte (1990) interviewed children between the ages of 10 and 18, who had been abused more than once. They had been in therapy at the Sexual Assault Centre in Seattle. The children responded to three areas of the process: the "sexualization of the relationship," the "justification of the sexual contact," and the "maintenance of the child's cooperation" (p. 37). Although the children provided important information, the authors recognized the limitations of their contributions. The children could not see the sexual abuse as an intentional process carried-out by the offender. The authors stated, "Interestingly many professionals are as resistant as the victims to characterizing offender behavior as intentional sexual exploitation. This contrasts with what the offenders themselves say about their own conduct"
(p. 38). Consequentially, it is necessary to understand these events from the child molester's perspective (see Table 1).

**Child Molesters**

Only a few studies have involved interviewing child molesters to obtain their perspective on engaging in sexual activities with children. Subjects in these studies were "successful" patients from treatment programs (Conte, Wolf, & Smith, 1989; Barnard, Fuller, Robbins, & Shaw, 1989), or from a pedophilic organization (Wilson & Cox, 1983). The Conte et al. study was unique, as it described offenders' sexual activities with children. Unfortunately, the sample size was small and only the "trends in the offenders' responses" were reported (p. 295). Additional information describing why and how convicted child molesters sexually abuse children is needed.

**Reasons this information is unavailable**

This information is not only lacking from the psychological and sociological literature, but it is difficult to obtain in any written form. The reason for this void is a consequence of the direct and indirect implications for the investigators of child sexual abuse. For instance, in December 1977-January 1978 a Toronto based magazine, *Body Politic*, advocating the rights of homosexuals, published an article on sexual relationships with children (The Collective, 1977-1978). The article entitled "Men Loving Boys Loving Men" described the sexual
experiences of three men who admitted to having sexual relationships with children (Hannon, 1977-1978). After distribution of the issue containing this article, the publisher, two editors, and the author were charged under section 164 of the Canadian Criminal Code for mailing either "obscene," "immoral," "indecent," or "scurrilous" materials (Adelman, 1981). From the resulting provincial court case, Regina v. Pink Triangle Press et al. (Canadian Criminal Cases, 1979), a number of precedents were set. To begin, the judge distinguished between describing an act and engaging in an act:

Almost daily one can read the most detailed descriptions of criminal acts of rape, child abuse, murder and the like. The painstaking criminal can find how-to-do-it articles in almost every newspaper and magazine. Are these journals indecent or immoral because they write in explicit detail about indecent or immoral acts? I think not (p. 405).

Next, the judge stressed the importance of understanding criminality:

It is my opinion that the right of the public to be informed—that right which is the cornerstone of freedom of the press—includes the right to know about this type of behavior, the better to understand it, the better to deal with it (p. 406).

In this case the judge stressed the importance of understanding the sexual activities that occurred within adult-child relationships. The charges were dismissed. Since this trial, very few researchers have undertaken investigations in this area. Information from child
molesters describing their sexual activities with children is still needed.

**Secondary purpose of this project**

The secondary purpose of this project is to evaluate child molesters' reasoning on ethical issues after being involved in sexual relationships with children. The two approaches that were used to evaluate levels of ethical reasoning are well documented in the literature. The first approach, meta-ethics, considers whether knowledge (or facts) can be acquired (e.g., Are facts consistent with reality?). Assuming knowledge can be acquired, what methods should be used to obtain this information? Specifically, meta-ethical approaches involve "the resolution of conflicting factual and methodological issues" (Kurtines, Alvarez, & Azmitia, 1990, p. 286). In essence a meta-ethical approach is used to determine the truth. This approach is currently exemplified in the works of Broughton (1978), Kuhn, Pennington, and Leadbeater (1983), as well as Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986). The second approach, normative ethics, considers what is morally right (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987). A normative ethics approach involves "the resolution of conflicting norms, values, and principles" (Kurtines, Alvarez, & Azmitia, 1990, p. 286). As Kurtines, Alvarez, and Azmitia (1990) pointed out these two approaches appear separate, but at a meta-theoretical level these issues are interrelated. For instance, scientific facts should not be ignored when considering
moral issues, nor should moral standards be ignored in scientific research. At an individualistic level, these approaches need to be interrelated or integrated.

**Meta-ethics**

Meta-ethics involves a philosophical approach to the nature of existence. For instance, Broughton (1978) considered the basic nature of the "self," or self knowledge. He believed a person’s knowledge of themself developed through interactions with his or her environment. The more aware a person becomes of others in his or her environment, the more the person comes to understand and redefine ideas about the self (Damon, 1983). According to Reckless, Dinitz, and Kay (1957) positive concepts of the self and others can serve as "insulation" against an adverse environment. Negative concepts of self and others leave the individual unprotected internally. In Reckless et al.’s study, teachers were asked to choose boys from their sixth grade class who were most or least likely to come in conflict with the law. These boys were similar on relevant measures such as race and socioeconomic status. The 125 "insulated" boys, or least likely to come in conflict with the law, described themselves and others positively. In contrast, the 101 "uninsulated" boys, or most likely to come in conflict with the law, described themselves and others negatively. A four-year follow-up study was conducted by Reckless and Dinitz (1967). One hundred and three of the 125 insulated boys, and 70 of the 101 uninsulated boys were
located. They found that only 4% of the insulated boys, compared to 39% of the uninsulated boys had come in conflict with the law. The authors concluded that a good self-concept produces a "strong inner self," while a poor self concept results in "weak inner direction" (p. 517). Tannenbaum (1982) criticized the authors for not emphasizing the need to maintain the boys' self-concept over time through confirmation of these boys' beliefs by significant others. However, Tannenbaum does acknowledge that these early researchers addressed an important issue: why do only certain children raised in disadvantaged environments turn to criminal activities? The answer, according to these researchers, was that other children develop a positive self-concept that provides insulation from their environment.

Communication within an adolescent's home may be an important factor in developing a positive self-concept. Haddock and Sporakowski (1983) compared 22 status and 38 criminal offenders to 68 non-offending adolescents. Status offences, applicable only to a particular age range (i.e., 12 to 19), included incorrigibility, truancy, etc. Criminal offences, applicable to juveniles or adults, included misdemeanors and felonies. Results indicated that status offenders scored lower on the Parent-Adolescent Communication Inventory than the other two groups. However, both offending groups scored lower than the non-offending group on Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale.
An intense treatment program for status offenders in a group home was designed to change their self-concepts (Krueger & Hansen, 1987). The areas focused on during treatment were family, school and the community. Forty-six male and female adolescents participated in the program for twelve months. Using the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS) they found that males improved in all areas except "physical," while females only improved on the "physical," "self-satisfaction," and "family" scales. Males and females scores changed the most on the family subscales.

Another treatment program for adolescents found that acquiring interpersonal skills and accepting the moral standards of the peer group positively affected their self-concepts. The authors suggested that "self-concept may be . . . a running tally of success" (Wasmund & Brannon, 1987, p. 99). This idea was supported by a study of adult female offenders. The authors suggested that "self-concept varies directly with both education and perceived social role in the institution" (Culbertson & Fortune, 1986, p. 48).

Unfortunately, the literature on self-concept "rarely" considered the adult male offender (Holbert & Unnithan, 1990, p. 45). A program was designed to change the self-concept of 15 male offenders at a minimum-medium security prison over a ten-week period (Vicary & Good, 1983). The emphasis of the program was on family-related issues. The offenders were encouraged to discuss this information with their families through visits, phone calls, and letters.
When comparing pre- to post-test scores, there was an increase on the family subscale. Unfortunately, this increase in self esteem did not generalize into other areas.

In the present project, the first meta-ethical issue, personal continuity, involves the process of reasoning through a global concept of self for the past, present, and future. It was anticipated that child molesters would have difficulties resolving this issue, because of adverse life experiences. This might be particularly true for child molesters in a low-treatment group (i.e., those with the least amount of treatment), because they had fewer opportunities to discuss their experiences with others. They might not be able to exhibit a complex view of the self as "coherent" and "interpretable," instead viewing themselves in terms of "static" attributes (see Table 2). Unfortunately, the consequences of this disability range from a failure to take responsibility for one's actions to suicidal tendencies (Ball, 1988; Ball & Chandler, 1989).

Coherence is crucial within oneself and in viewing others.

The second meta-ethical issue, skeptical doubt, involves reasoning about the concept of knowledge based on our observations of others. As Perry (1970) explained, everyone constructs their own personal expectations of others depending upon how they were raised. But through exposure to divergent views, the limitations of this viewpoint becomes apparent (Perry, 1970; Banerjee, 1986; Kramer, 1987). Three reactions to this realization are
defended realism, dogmatism/skepticism, and post-skeptical rationalism. The defended realist's position is that knowledge is founded on "personal biases" or "vested interests." The dogmatist or skeptic believes knowledge is a matter of "personal opinion." Although the dogmatist looks for an extra-personal choice, the skeptic dismisses all rational criteria when making choices. The post-skeptical rationalist would state that even though knowledge is subjective, there are "rational bases" for knowledge (see Table 3). It was expected that child molesters from a low-treatment group would use less advanced strategies than molesters from a high-treatment group (i.e., those who received the most treatment).

Normative ethics

Normative ethics involves moral judgments or value statements about oneself and other people (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987). These values pertain to "rights and responsibilities, rather than value judgments of liking and preference" (p. 10). It is assumed that value statements become rules or principles that affect behaviors (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987).

Kohlberg (1981) described moral development as a progression in concepts pertaining to justice. These concepts are described within three levels: each level contains two stages (see Table 4). At the first level, "preconventional," an act is right or wrong based on the consequences. The act is right if an appropriate authority
designates the act as right. This belief is conveyed in Stage 1 where actions are encouraged by reinforcement or deterred by threats of punishment, or the use of power. This belief is also conveyed in Stage 2 where the expectation is that actions are reciprocated physically, or pragmatically. The second level of moral development, "conventional," de-emphasizes the consequences of actions, while emphasizing conformity to family, group, or social norms. In Stage 3, an individual's "intentions" appear more important than the acts committed. Additionally, there is a concern for what is considered "natural" behavior. At Stage 4, the focus on others enlarges to encompass society. It is believed that actions that maintain society are right. Thus, standardized practices, or fixed rules are appropriate when established by the proper authorities. Beginning at the "postconventional" level, the group consensus, whether in the form of rules or laws, can be freely reconstructed by individuals whose values are relative to the group. But the individual's rights and values are always recognized prior to any contractual agreements. A limitation of Stage 5 is that conflicts between contractual (or legal agreements) and moral principles are recognized, but difficult to resolve. This problem is overcome in the final stage where abstract principles are chosen according to one's conscience. These principles are logical, and consistent across cultures. "At heart, these are universal principles of justice, of the reciprocity and equality of human rights, and of respect for
the dignity of human beings as individuals" (Kohlberg, 1981, p. 19). These six stages of moral development are not only internally consistent, but form an invariant sequence (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987).

As well as defining the development of morality as a progression of concepts through stages, Kohlberg (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987) considered the possibility of orientations. These orientations were defined as four ways of viewing morality. The normative order orientation is based on rules and the utility consequences orientation is based on consequences for oneself or others. While the justice or fairness orientation is based on "liberty," "equality," "reciprocity," and "contract" and the ideal self or perfectionistic orientation is based on internal motives and virtues.

Moral orientations appear to distinguish between responses from specific populations. For example, in a study by Trevethan and Walker (1989) on young offenders, moral orientations distinguished those rated as normal and delinquent (i.e., psychopathic and nonpsychopathic). Both delinquent groups responded more frequently with a utilitarianism orientation. This orientation is considered less advanced, especially an egoistic utilitarianism orientation, which focuses on the self, rather than others.

It is of interest to note that Newberger and Newberger (1988) constructed three developmental moral orientations based on Kohlberg's work, to describe individual and
institutional responses to adults engaging in sexual relations with children. The first, or "egoistic" orientation ignores the needs of the child, in order to protect the child molester or institution. An example of this would be allowing a priest to continue his duties, by transferring him to another locality. The second orientation is termed "conventional." Within this orientation anyone believed to have committed an offense would receive the same legal consequences. These consequences implemented through policies and procedures would apply, regardless of the circumstances surrounding each case. A physician who molested a child, for instance, might be required to obtain therapy, even if he did not admit to engaging in sexual activities with the child. Within this idealistic framework, the physician may continue practicing, slowly drop-out of therapy, and avoid criminal charges. And third, an "individualized" orientation, takes into consideration each case from the perspective of the victim, offender, institution, and community. Specifically, the victim needs to be protected and treated, and the offender requires support while undergoing criminal procedures. It is especially important during this time to recognize that the victim or offender might be suicidal (Wild, 1988; Morrison, 1988). The institution must maintain public "trust and confidence" by maintaining a code of ethics; while the community standards require protection of
citizens, by deterring others by equal enforcement of the law.

A review of the literature on normative ethical issues revealed a consistent finding: criminals exhibit lower levels of moral reasoning (Thornton & Reid, 1982). To examine the possibility that different types of criminals use various levels of moral reasoning, the authors compared 20 adult male prisoners to 20 adult male controls. The offences were classified as either prudent (10) or imprudent (10). Prudent offences were low risk; imprudent offences were high risk crimes against persons without apparent advantages. Kohlberg's moral judgment interviews were administered to the three groups. Results indicated that males with prudent offences scored lower (Stage 2) than the males with imprudent offences and the control group (Stage 3). Males with prudent offences had more convictions, or were frequently imprisoned. This study was replicated using a different measure of moral reasoning (i.e., Rest's Defining Issues Test), and younger adult male prisoners. The results supported the first study: more prudent offenders scored at Stage 2, while more imprudent offenders scored at Stage 4.

A seven-month treatment program based on moral reasoning was established at minimum and medium security prisons (MacPhail, 1989). The program consisted of three modules. The first module dealt with moral problems through discussions, or role playing. The second phase demonstrated
counseling strategies, such as perspective taking, empathetic listening, and the use of reflective statements. The last phase used guest speakers to discuss real-life moral dilemmas. Fifty adult male offenders started the program (30 experimental, 20 controls), although only 27 completed the program (14 experimental, 13 controls). These groups were administered Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview and Loevinger's Sentence Completion Test. Eighty-six percent of the experimental groups changed their level of moral reasoning in a positive direction, usually from Stage 3 to Stage 3/4. Only 8% of the control groups changed their level of moral reasoning in a positive direction. They maintained a Stage 3 level of reasoning. Of particular interest was the finding that sex offenders who made the largest improvements in moral reasoning did not improve their ego development scores. The authors suggested that the "sex offender lacks the ability to act on what he knows" (p. 93). However, a lack of generalizability across developmental domains (i.e., moral to ego development) does not necessarily imply a lack of generalizability within the same domain (i.e., hypothetical dilemmas to real-life dilemmas). Generalizability within the moral domain is essential, since male offenders exhibiting high levels of moral reasoning were more apt to make restitution to their victims (Van Voorhis, 1985), and exhibited encouraging recidivism rates (Little & Robinson, 1989).
In this project, child molesters' moral reasoning was assessed using abstract, hypothetical dilemmas, and experientially-based personal dilemmas. Kohlberg preferred hypothetical dilemmas, as they eliminate preconceived ideas about a problem, but hypothetical dilemmas may lack generalizability (Walker, de Vries, & Trevethan, 1987). In addition, Walker (1988) suggested that hypothetical dilemmas measure moral competence, while personal dilemmas are a more accurate indicator of behavior. Therefore, both types of moral dilemmas were used in this project.

**Present study: hypotheses**

In the present study, the following hypotheses were evaluated:

First, when considering why sex offenders molested children their own attachment to primary caregivers as children was considered. The hypotheses in this project were that extra-familial offenders were insecurely attached (dependent) to their caregivers, while intra-familial offenders were unattached to their caregivers. This idea was derived from Groth's (1978) classification scheme for child molesters. When considering how intra-familial and extra-familial offenders select, seduce, and silence children over an extended period of time, distinctive patterns were anticipated over time. Child molesters' strategies were expected to change in the selection of children, relying on vulnerable children (e.g., from broken homes) only when inexperienced, but slowly approaching other
children as experience is gained. In a similar manner, child molesters were expected to initially seduce young children in an intimate manner, but become bolder with older children in their initiations of sexual relationships. The occupation of the offender was expected to reflect an interest in children. Attempts to silence children would involve only brief discussions, however, for different reasons depending on the type of abuse. For extra-familial relationships, these children would want to avoid getting their "friend" in trouble. With intra-familial abuse, the children would not want to get their "father" in trouble, or break-up the family. In either case, the children would feel responsible for participating in these activities. Many of these hypotheses were formulated from information provided by Cook (1989; 1989-1990).

Second, the meta-ethical issues involved two general hypotheses. When considering the personal continuum, the prediction was made that child molesters from a low-treatment group would demonstrate less effective strategies when considering how they changed or remained the same than offenders from a high-treatment group. This was anticipated because a complex strategy of defining the self allows for a more coherent and interpretable way of reasoning. When considering the child molesters' approach to deal with conflicting sources of information, skeptical doubt measures were expected to reveal that offenders in a low-treatment group would take a defended realism stance. While offenders
from a high-treatment group would either take a
dogmatic/skeptic, or a post-skeptic rationalist position.

In this study, measures of normative ethics were used
to detect differences in responses between offenders from a
low-treatment group, compared to offenders from a high-
treatment group. It was not necessarily predicted that
offenders with more treatment would score higher than
offenders with less treatment on the hypothetical dilemmas.
Although, for both groups of offenders the gap between stage
scores from the hypothetical and practical dilemmas would be
compared: this gap would be most evident for offenders with
less treatment. This could indicate that the low treatment
group was unable to apply their knowledge on issues relating
to morality.
METHOD

Subjects

Twenty male prisoners convicted of sexual offences against children volunteered to participate in this project. The child molesters ranged in age from 24.83 to 60.17 years, with the average age being 45.29 years (SD=10.84). Ten of these men were convicted of offences against children outside the family unit and categorized as "extra-familial offenders" (mean age=42.53, SD=13.30), while the other 10 men were convicted of offences against children within the family unit and categorized as "intra-familial offenders" (mean age=48.04, SD=7.38). The assignment of subjects to categories was based on information obtained from the offender, although eighty-five percent of the convictions were verified with additional information from official records. These twenty sex offenders were also categorized according to the length and type of therapy they had received: "high-treatment" (mean age=44.21, SD=10.94) versus "low-treatment" (mean age=46.61, SD=11.22) groups. The assignment of prisoners to these categories was based only on the information provided by the offender, as official records did not contain the necessary information. All of these men were held at a medium security prison (S3) (CSC, 1982), designated for sex offenders.

To encourage participation, meetings were arranged at the prison by the Correctional Services of Canada (CSC) psychologist with three groups of sex offenders. The
purpose of the project was discussed and consent forms were distributed. Questions relating to the project were answered in a direct and open manner. Eight extra-familial and seven intra-familial offenders volunteered to participate after hearing about the project through the groups, or members of the groups. Later, other sex offenders, not necessarily from these previously arranged groups, were contacted through the Nominal Role Listing (i.e., a list containing the names of three hundred offenders at the prison, including those on day parole and bail). Of the thirteen offenders who were contacted, five agreed (.38) to participate in this project.

An important issue for the offender and victim is confidentiality. It was emphasized that any information disclosed by the offender would be considered confidential. However, they were cautioned not to reveal identifying information about any particular victim. This was requested to maintain confidentiality for the victim and to protect the offender against further prosecution. Also, for the offender’s protection, transcripts were coded with an I.D. number in place of their name. A file relating their name to the I.D. number was kept separately, then destroyed upon completion of the project. In addition, the offenders were assured that information identifying a particular sex offender would not be published or released.

While twenty sex offenders participated in this project, a few offenders did not complete, or adequately
complete each session. Whereas everyone completed the unstructured interviews, less than twenty offenders adequately completed the semi-structured ethical interviews. For the meta-ethical measures, nineteen of the twenty offenders completed the Personal Continuum, while seventeen of the twenty offenders completed the Skeptical Doubt measure. For the normative ethical measures, nineteen out of twenty sex offenders participated in both the hypothetical and personal dilemmas. (Although an additional sex offender only completed the normative measures.) The major reason given for refusing to participate in the semi-structured ethical interviews was an aversion to psychological testing. The unsuccessfully completed interviews were a consequence of language problems.

Materials

Various approaches were used for the unstructured interview and semi-structured ethical interviews. The approach to the unstructured interview was based on the Step-Wise Interview Protocol (Yuille, Hunter, Joffe, & Zaparniuk, 1992). This protocol was modified from Steller, Raskin, Yuille, and Esplin’s Statement Validity Analysis (SVA) interview. The purpose of this approach is to maximize accuracies, while minimizing inaccuracies in the information obtained. For instance, the accuracy of the material can be maximized by audio-taping the sessions. In addition, accuracy can be improved by using memory retrieval strategies to elicit information. One technique involves
discussing the circumstances surrounding an event prior to any discussion of the event, or "context reinstatement." Inaccuracies are minimized by asking general, then specific questions, thus avoiding questions that mislead the interviewee. This interview protocol generated an extensive amount of information from the child molesters regarding why and how their crimes were committed.

The first part of the unstructured interview (see Appendix A) involved the collection of background information including: name, date of birth, parents, siblings, level of education, type of employment, and previous experience with the criminal justice system. The first question involved a description of the offender's typical day at the prison. The aim of this question was to establish rapport between the offender and interviewer, within the context of the unstructured interview. For questions 2-6 the offender was asked to describe his childhood and adolescence, including early sexual experiences. Questions 7, 8, and 16 inquired about legal sexual activities; while questions 9-15 inquired about illegal sexual activities. The effects these illegal sexual activities had on their lives was addressed in questions 17-18. Questions 19a and 19b asked the offenders whether they ever participated in treatment programs. If so, the type of programs were described. The last question, number 20, considered how they viewed their future. It was designed to end the interview on a positive note.
Initially the offender was allowed to respond to each question without interruptions, regardless of inconsistencies or contradictions. The term for this phase of the interview is "free narrative."

Generally, the open question phase and specific question phase followed the free narrative for each question. The exceptions to this procedure involved questions 10-12. In these cases, the opening question and the specific question phases were not brought up until after the free narrative for each of these questions had been answered. The reason for this change in procedure was to avoid influencing the information given during the free narrative for each following question, since the opening and specific questions were the same for questions 10-12.

The "opening question phase" provided the opportunity to gather more details about the information obtained from the offender in the free narrative phase. This was accomplished in two ways. First, by simply asking "Can you tell me more about..." (the issue in question). Second, by having the offender specify "who, when, where, and what." This approach was more formal, since the interviewer wrote down the offender's responses to questions 10-12. These questions pertained to sexual activities within specific relationships.

Finally, the "specific question phase" served two purposes. First, it allowed the offender "to clarify and extend previous answers." The researcher assisted by
providing mnemonic devices, such as "exhaust memory." With this technique the interviewee is encouraged to provide as much information as possible, even if it seems trivial. Second, it allowed the researcher to obtain specific information across subjects for each question. For example, question 3 asked them to describe their parents during childhood. Then they were asked specifically what they liked and disliked about each of their parents. For each question, approximately three or four pieces of information were requested, although this increased to fourteen pieces of information when discussing questions pertaining to specific incidents of sexual activities. At this time, any inconsistencies or contradictions within the offender's statements were clarified. This approach contributed to an "open" atmosphere, and provided for an accurate presentation of events from the offender's perspective.

The two types of meta-ethical measurements that were administered included the Personal Identity Interview procedure (see Appendix B) and Nascent Skeptical Doubt Interview procedure (see Appendix C). The Personal Identity Interview (i.e., personal continuum) procedure was originally developed by Chandler, Boyes, and Moran (1984) to assess the consistency of self-concept over time. For this project, the literary character Jean Valjean from Victor Hugo's writings was chosen to demonstrate this procedure. In the narrative Valjean is a notorious criminal who transforms his life by helping others. The questions after
the narrative relate to how Valjean has changed or remained the same throughout his life. Then, similar questions about the offender’s own life follow. This measure was used to evaluate the offender’s sense of continuity of self in the past, present, and future.

The second type of meta-ethical measures included a semi-structured Nascent Skeptical Doubt Interview procedure. This measure encouraged the offender to reason through hypothetical events when it became apparent that their own perspective was limited. The Nascent Skeptical Doubt Interview procedure presented two dilemmas containing conflicting pieces of information. The first dilemma, developed by Kuhn, Pennington, and Leadbeater (1983), described the same historical event from the vantage points of two countries in conflict. The second dilemma, developed for this population, described two tribes with conflicting views on the appropriate treatment of children. The content of the second dilemma was thought to be more personal. Both Skeptical Doubt dilemmas forced the offender to come to terms with conflicting "facts."

The normative ethics measures, designed to assess moral development, consisted of three hypothetical dilemmas and one personal dilemma. The hypothetical dilemmas, according to Colby and Kohlberg (1987), were constructed over a 20 year period with the assistance of collaborators. For this project Form B, Dilemma IV; Form B, Dilemma IV'; and Form A, Dilemma I were used (see Appendix D). Form B, Dilemma IV,
and Form B, Dilemma IV’ were chosen, so the content would
not be construed as relating to criminality. Therefore,
there would be no reason to answer the questions in a
socially acceptable manner. Form A, Dilemma I replaced Form
B, Dilemma II, so that male offenders could identify with
the characters (i.e., a dilemma describing a potential
conflict between father and son, rather than mother and
daughter), while maintaining the essential moral issues
(i.e., Life (Quality), Law/Life Preservation; Morality and
Conscience/Capital Punishment, Punishment/Capital
Punishment; and Contract, Authority). These hypothetical
dilemmas require abstract reasoning, rather than previous
experiences to arrive at a resolution. The ultimate purpose
of the hypothetical dilemmas is to assess moral competence.

In contrast, Lyons (1982) focused on previous
experiences, with Gilligan (Gilligan & Wiggins, 1987)
developing the personal dilemma interview. For this
project, the offender was encouraged to discuss a moral
dilemma he encountered at the prison. The topic was limited
to incidents in prison to avoid issues related to his crime.
The personal dilemmas assess reasoning about previous
behaviors, moral or immoral.

Procedure

The three sets of tasks were arranged to obtain the
maximum amount of information with a minimum amount of
resistance by the offender. The first procedure, the
unstructured interview, provided the opportunity to
establish rapport between the interviewer and interviewee, while leading into material of an increasingly personal nature. The next procedure involved the meta-ethical tasks. The Personal Identity Interview involved personal, then hypothetical questions, thus providing an easy transference to the hypothetical situations presented in the Nascent Skeptical Doubt task. The Nascent Skeptical Doubt task proceeded the normative ethical semi-structured interview to reduce the possibility of the respondent's viewing the Nascent Skeptical Doubt dilemmas as moral dilemmas. The normative ethical tasks, or moral dilemmas, included three hypothetical dilemmas and a personal dilemma. Thus the series of procedures began and ended with personal information—the type of material the offenders felt most comfortable discussing. A specific explanation of each procedure follows.

The instructions given to the sex offenders for the unstructured interview discouraged the use of identifying information, to maintain confidentiality (see previous section). The interviewer also explained that the purpose of the project was "to understand the various ways adults relate to children that could lead to sexual activities." The unstructured interview proceeded in a manner that could be described as Rogerian. The interviewer's objective was to "BE PATIENT," allowing the information to come from the offender. After the interview, if the offender had
additional comments, questions, or observations, he was encouraged to contribute this information.

The approach to the meta-ethical interviews was semi-structural. In the tradition of Perry (1970) the tasks were administered "in as open-ended a way as possible so as to avoid dictating the structure of the student's (subject's) thoughts by the structure of our questions." In this project the offender was encouraged to give as many answers as possible, since there are no right or wrong answers. The researcher continued to converse with the offender to obtain as complete of response as possible. This approach is more persistent than Perry's original style, but it was necessary to obtain scorable information. Usually the Personal Identity Interview and the Nascent Skeptical Doubt tasks were completed during the same session, although two sessions were occasionally required to adequately complete the tasks.

The procedures used for the normative ethical interview were similar to those used in the meta-ethical interview. Colby and Kohlberg (1987) described this interview as a "directed conversation." It is directive in terms of obtaining "critical" information to score. For instance, probes (e.g., "What do you mean by trust, justice, friendship, and so on?") were used under two conditions. The first condition occurred when the offender discussed his opinions, rather than reasons for his response. The second condition occurred when the offender's statements were
unclear. To rectify either of these situations, one of ten types of probes were suggested by Colby and Kohlberg (1987, pp. 153-58). Examples of probes include, using "Why?," or "What do you mean?," or encouraging the offender to tell what he "should," rather than "would" do in this situation. (Probing was necessary to obtain the best possible response.)
RESULTS

The unstructured interviews of 20 child molesters were on average 150.50 (SD=94.93) minutes long, and ranged from 54 to 452 minutes. The meta-ethical semi-structured interviews consisted of the Personal Continuum, and Skeptical Doubt tasks. The Personal Continuum tasks completed by 19 offenders took an average of 28.63 (SD=17.22) minutes, and ranged from 14 to 75 minutes. The Skeptical Doubt tasks, completed by 17 offenders took an average of 24.82 (SD=14.40) minutes to complete, and ranged from 7 to 60 minutes. The normative ethics tasks involved three hypothetical dilemmas and one personal dilemma. Nineteen offenders completed both types of dilemmas. The average normative ethical interview lasted 44.61 (SD=20.23) minutes, and ranged from 20 to 97 minutes.

The audio-taped unstructured interviews were transcribed, then coded. There were 250 pieces of information that were coded across all subjects, of which 48 pieces of information were used for this project. Reliabilities on twenty percent (4 cases) of the unstructured interviews (250 variables) averaged 83%: 78%, 91%, 85%, and 78%.

Considering the lack of research on why and how offenders sexually abuse children, this project can be viewed as exploratory research. For the unstructured interview only descriptive statistics were used:
proportions for different offenders group. Inferential statistics were used to evaluate the ethical measures.

**Unstructured interview**

**Background information**

**Parents**

The child molesters were asked to describe their parents during childhood. They described each parent's attributes in physiological (.22) and psychological (.78) terms. Most of the physiological terms were positive (.42) (neutral .33; negative .25). Regarding the psychological terms, extra-familial offenders frequently described their fathers negatively (.80) (positive .10; neutral .10). In half of these cases, what they disliked about their father was the lack of availability (i.e., "never spoke," or "distant"). In addition, half of these offenders described their mothers negatively (.50) (positive .20; neutral .30), as she too was considered unavailable (i.e., in .60 of these cases). In contrast, intra-familial offenders more frequently described their fathers (neutral .60; positive .20; negative .20), as well as their mothers (neutral .40; positive .30; negative .30) in neutral terms. ("Neutral" either referred to the fact they did not know their parents, or if known they described them with an equal number of positive and negative attributes to their parents.)

**Peers**

During childhood, extra-familial offenders not only described their parents negatively, they also described
their relationship with peers negatively (.80) (positive .10; neutral .10). Their reasons for having negative relationships ranged from being isolated to being teased. Some intra-familial offenders also described their peer relationships negatively (.50) (positive .30; neutral .20). In each of these cases, the reasons given for problems with peer relationships were being "withdrawn" or "lonely."

Self-descriptions as a child

Child molesters' self-descriptions as children consisted of relatively few physiological (.21), although many psychological terms (.79). Since most of the physiological terms were neutral (.80) (positive .00; negative .20), only the psychological terms will be considered (positive .25; neutral .30; and negative .45). Extra-familial offenders more frequently described themselves as children in negative (.50) terms (positive .40; neutral .10). The most common negative descriptions involved being lonely as children. Intra-familial offenders self-descriptions were usually neutral (.50) (negative .40; positive .10).

Childhood sexual experiences

The childhood sexual experiences that were described by child molesters ranged from sexual play with peers to severe sexual abuse by older children or adults. Regarding sexual play, .50 of the extra-familial offenders and .70 of the intra-familial offenders engaged in this type of activity as
children. Examples of sexual play provided by offenders appeared relatively normal:

We'd play house and we'd be all curious about each other,...it's kinda like I'll show you mine, if you'll show me yours.

Such play between peers developed into intimate sexual relationships for .20 of the extra-familial offenders and .30 of the intra-familial offenders.

At least one incident of abuse by an older child or adult was reported by .70 of the extra-familial and .50 of the intra-familial offenders. Ninety-two percent of the offenders who had reported abuse described multiple incidents of abuse (.67), or multiple abusers (.58). The abusers were usually described as male (.73), although there were descriptions of female abusers (.27). Overall these sexual experiences were viewed unfavorably (.83) by the offender (favorable .085; neutral .085): half were viewed as traumatic. The abusers in the intra-familial cases, were usually described as male (.82), rather than female (.18). Seventy-three percent of these experiences were viewed unfavorably (.09 favorable; .18 neutral), with over half described as traumatic.

Physical abuse

Another type of abuse frequently reported by sex offenders during childhood was physical abuse. This abuse was categorized as either mild, moderate, or severe. "Mild" physical abuse was defined as excessive discipline, "moderate" as serious or unwarranted beatings, while
"severe" abuse resulted in permanent physical injuries. Although more extra-familial (.80) than intra-familial (.70) offenders reported physical abuse, more intra-familial (.40) than extra-familial (.20) offenders reported being severely abused. Half of these intra-familial offenders reported being severely abused by their mothers, the other half by their fathers. In all cases, the physical abuse was inflicted by the child’s caregiver (e.g., parents, foster parents, institutional staff, etc.).

**Self descriptions as an adolescent**

Child molesters’ self descriptions during adolescence were in physiological (.20) and psychological (.80) terms. All of the physiological descriptions of themselves were negative (1.00), unlike their neutral (.80) self descriptions as children. Considering that adolescence is a time of rapid physiological growth, descriptions such as "gangly" or "funny" looking seemed appropriate. Turning to the psychological terms, extra-familial offenders continued to describe themselves negatively (.60) (positive .20; neutral .20). Like their descriptions of themselves as children, their most common description as adolescents was shy, or lonely. As well, intra-familial offenders continued to use more neutral (.50) (positive .10; negative .40) descriptions of themselves.

To further explore the child molesters’ sense of self during adolescence, they were asked about their political and religious beliefs during this time period. Only .10 of
the extra-familial and .30 of the intra-familial offenders reported any political beliefs as adolescents. In addition, two-thirds of these intra-familial offenders stated they were simply "anti-government" or "against the norm." The vast majority of offenders reported that they "didn't have any" or their political beliefs were "not strong" during adolescence. Regarding religious beliefs, only .20 of the extra-familial and .50 of the intra-familial offenders stated they had such beliefs during adolescence. However, occupational goals were of interest during adolescence, according to .70 of the extra-familial and .60 of the intra-familial offenders. Their desired occupations ranged from laborers to professionals.

**Sexual experiences as an adolescent**

When child molesters were asked to describe their sexual experiences during adolescence a wide range of responses were given. Thirty percent of the extra-familial and .30 of the intra-familial offenders reported virtually no sexual experiences with the opposite sex except fantasies while masturbating. Forty percent of the extra-familial and .20 of the intra-familial offenders reported having sexually deviant experiences (e.g., voyeurism, rape, etc.). Thirty percent of the extra-familial and .50 of the intra-familial offenders described relatively normal (i.e., legal) sexual activities.
Events leading to offence

Each offender was asked to describe the events leading up to their first, two intermediate, and last offences. Overall, extra-familial offenders acknowledged their own responsibility for committing the offence (.375), as well as focusing on others' responsibilities (.375) or external circumstances (.25). For instance, one pedophile acknowledged his need for a relationship led to offending, because he had a "hard time separating affection from sex."

Other offenders stated they had reacted to their own previous abuse as a child, or adolescent.

The intra-familial offenders more often focused on others' (.63) responsibilities regarding the offence, rather than their own (.28), or the external circumstances (.09). For example, they focused on the victim--claiming the child needed to be comforted, or that the child had problems--or they focused on their marriage, mentioning how isolated they felt (in a couple of marriages, their sex life had ceased to exist).

For both groups of offenders focusing on external circumstance referred to the availability of the victim. The victim could have spent the night at their house, or the offender had extensive amounts of time available to become overly involved with children (e.g., being on medical leave from work).
Selection of victims

Characteristics of the victims

The average victim's age across offences reported by extra-familial offenders was 10.49 (n=31), ranging from 5 to 25 years of age (i.e., one offender reported assaulting a female child, then adult). Two offenders reported committing assaults against a male child and a male adolescent. Overall, .30 of the sample reported committing offences across the age categories of child (0-12 years), adolescent (13-18 years), and adult (19 years and older).

Intra-familial offenders reported the average age of their victims across offences was 11.33 (n=30). The ages ranged from 3 to 18 years. Their offences appeared to be within the same age categories with two exceptions. The first exception was when the child they were offending became older. The second exception occurred when one offender was charged with offences against his child and adolescent, although he claimed to be innocent.

Both extra- and intra-familial offenders reported committing more offences against females than males. The extra-familial offenders reported committing approximately two offences against females for each offence against a male (1.82:1). None of these offenders reported assaulting both males and females. The intra-familial offenders reported a higher ratio of female to male victims (9:1) than the extra-familial offenders. However, .20 of the intra-familial
offenders stated they had assaulted both their daughters and sons.

**Victims' relationship to parents**

The most common response across categories by extra-familial offenders was that they did not know their victim's guardians (i.e., 11 out of 31 (.35)). Of those offenders who did know their victim's guardians, .56 lived with their biological mother and fathers, .33 with their biological mother and .11 with a biological mother and step-father. Their victim's relationships with their biological mothers when known were considered positive (.72) in most cases (negative .22; neutral .06). For example, she was described as "loving and caring." The victim's relationships with their biological fathers or step-fathers, when known, was also described as positive (.58) (negative .42; neutral .00).

All of the intra-familial offenders knew where their children/victims resided at the time of the offence. Their victims usually resided with their biological mother and father (.566) or their biological mother and step-father (.233) (biological father .067; biological father and step-mother .067; and step-father .067). These offenders described their victim's relationships with their mothers as slightly negative (.54), although positive relationships were also prevalent (.42) (neutral .04). The negative comments included being unaffectionate or distant. They described their relationships with their victims as slightly
more positive (.50) (negative .46; neutral .04). For example, they described their relationships as being affectionate and open.

**Victims' relationship to peers**

When child molesters were asked about their victims' relationships with their peers approximately half of the offenders in each group (extra-familial: 15 out of 31; intra-familial: 15 out of 30) could answer. Of those who knew, .60 of extra-familial offenders described them as favorable (unfavorable .20; neutral .20). In contrast, intra-familial offenders who knew described their victims' relationships with their peers as evenly split between favorable (.47) and unfavorable (.47) (neutral .06).

**Performance in school/sports**

The information on victims' performance in school and sports is limited due to the child molester's lack of knowledge. For school performance, both extra-familial (.47) and intra-familial (.57) offenders who responded described their victim's performance positively (extra-familial: negative .33, neutral .20; intra-familial: negative .34, neutral .09). This pattern held for the extra-familial offenders' evaluations of their victims performance in sports (positive .60, negative .20, and neutral .20). Although intra-familial offenders were evenly split (positive .47, negative .47) when evaluating their victims' sports performance (neutral .06).
It should be emphasized that all of the selection variables were collapsed across the offender’s first, two intermediate, and last offences, since child molesters did not appear to become involved with different types of victims over time. However, there were vast differences when child molesters described their victims. They were described as affectionate to violent, forward to shy, people-loving to lonely, and very close to strangers.

Seduction of victims

Offenders’ occupation

Fifty percent of the extra-familial offenders reported using their occupational skills to seduce children into sexual activities during their first offence. This occurred directly by being responsible for the children under their care (e.g., teacher), or indirectly by using their occupational skills in a way that attracted children (e.g., building toys). This pattern remained constant across all their offences (.47).

This was not the case for intra-familial offenders during their first offence. Ninety percent reported having occupations that were not involved with children (e.g., manual labor). Only one of those offenders reported committing a crime while working, although this was not an incestuous crime. Even the person who had a job that brought him in contact with children, denied committing any offences when undertaking his professional duties. Across
all offences intra-familial offenders reported using their occupational skills to offend in only .14 of the cases.

**Methods used for seduction**

Ninety percent of the extra-familial offenders admitted initiating sexual activities with the child during their first offence. But this percentage dropped to .44 for both their intermediate and last offences. Some offenders felt that their relationships with a child "just sort of evolved" into a sexual relationship, or they believed the child wanted to become involved in sexual activities with them. One offender explained:

> This night she came in to go to bed, she pulled this long dress off, it was her mother's dress, and she had nayry a stitch on. And then she quick hopped under the covers and snuggled right up to me...And I never ever touched her or anything before like that. But ah, well she was all gung-ho to be involved.

From such quotes it is unclear whether the child was innocently seeking affection, or had experienced previous sexual abuse. This pattern did not hold up for the intra-familial offenders. Seventy percent stated they initiated the sexual activities for the first offence, while .87 and .75 acknowledged initiating the sexual activities for the two intermediate and last offences.

For both groups of child molesters the methods they used for seducing the child were classified into four categories. These categories were labeled "playful," "comforting," "lure/bribe," and "force." The most common method reported by extra- (.33) and intra-familial (.46)
offenders across offences, involved comforting. The offender was comforting a sick, frightened, or distressed child, or the child was comforting the offender. For instance, one offender stated, "And, uh, we were broke and I couldn't afford a mechanic and, uh, when I went home there was nobody there and I needed a shoulder to cry on so I, I went to my oldest daughter." In either case, the offender turned comforting into sexual activities, such as fondling. The next most frequently reported method used by child molesters was force. Both groups in this category frequently reported complimenting their victims initially, before turning angry and taking what they wanted (extra-familial .28; intra-familial .23). Over time this pattern changed for one offender:

Didn't really get into sayin' "Ok. Yes, you do have nice eyes." I wasn't really into that no more, right, so I just... I just kept on doing more instead, instead of doing finger, I'd start entering her vagina and that was it. I was violent at the first.

Other methods that were reported included luring, bribing, or blackmailing their victims (extra-familial .28; intra-familial .23). Examples included not being able to play with their toys or other children, not going on outings, or being told their mother wouldn't like them anymore, since this was her idea. The last method "playfulness" was described least (extra-familial offences .11; intra-familial offences .08). "Pedophiles do tend to put things in their houses, consciously or subconsciously, that kids are
attracted to like Celecos or Atarisor...take them on outing...to the PNE," stated one offender. Although this approach appeared to be the method least likely to be described by the offender, it was the background upon which other methods were used by .50 of the extra-familial (intra-familial .00) offenders.

**Silencing of victims**

**Offenders' comments to child**

Most offenders (extra-familial .57, intra-familial .50) did not instruct the child to remain silent. The offenders tended to "trust" even young children, believing that they were "good at keeping secrets." In addition, two other reasons were given for believing the child would remain silent. First, the child would lose their relationship with the offender if they spoke up. "If anything was said this would break-up this sort of special relationship and, therefore, the child wouldn't have the benefits he was getting [pause] or what the child perceived he was getting." Second, engaging in illegal sexual experiences is a very private, if not embarrassing experience. One offender stated, "I knew that he wouldn't talk about it with his friends, I felt he would be too embarrassed or...I mean as, as male or females do we talk about our improprieties sexually?" This would be particularly true for older children.

Of the cases where the extra-familial offender did try to silence the child (9 out of 28, .32). Five of the 9
involved verbal manipulation or bribery. One offender explained that he probably said:

Don’t say anything or something like that. This kid liked money, so I’d maybe give him a buck or something...don’t be blabbering it around. I might have even said you know if you say anything I’m goin’ be I’m going to get into a hell of a lot of trouble or something like this.

Generally this type of manipulation was mild. However in the other four cases threats of physical violence occurred. But only two offenders accounted for these four offences.

In .33 of the intra-familial offences the offender admitted trying to silence the child. Six out of eight of these cases (.75) involved instructing the child not to tell. Occasionally bribery was used. In the other two cases, the fathers told the child that if anyone found-out, he would be sent to prison. In .11 percent of the extra-familial and .17 of the intra-familial offences the child molester did not know or could not remember if he instructed the child to remain silent.

**Suspicions of others**

The extra-familial offenders reported that less people were suspicious of their activities during their first (.125), rather than intermediate (.167) or latter (.375) offences. They were primarily concerned about other children, or their victims’ guardians finding out about their sexual activities. Intra-familial offenders also reported that less people were suspicious during their first (.14), rather than last offence (.25) (two intermediate
.11). They were concerned about other children in the family, or social services finding out.

**Meta-ethical measures**

The meta-ethical measures consisted of a personal continuum and two skeptical doubt measures (i.e., Livian War, and Child Abuse). The personal continuum was administered to 19 child molesters, 10 were extra-familial offenders, 9 were intra-familial offenders. While 17 child molesters participated in the skeptical doubt tasks: 9 were extra-familial offenders and 8 were intra-familial offenders. These classifications were the same as the those used for the unstructured interview. All child molesters were also classified into low- or high-treatment groups based on the amount of treatment they received. Treatment ranged from none to intensive treatment at the Regional Psychiatric Center (RPC). The reliability in classifying child molesters into treatment groups was relatively high (.85).

**Personal Continuum**

The child molesters' arguments, in response to challenging them on how they have changed or remained the same, were scored according to five levels: Simple Inclusion, Typological, Essentialist, Foundational, and Narrative Arguments. The higher levels require more effective strategies. It was predicted that intra-familial offenders would have had more effective strategies for defining the self than extra-familial offenders. The
reliabilities for the scoring of these strategies was .84, when all of the interviews were re-coded. Using a Fisher Exact Probability test these comparisons were found to be nonsignificant (p > .05). However, as predicted, the high-treatment group used more effective strategies for defining the self than the low-treatment group (p ≤ .05). This is apparent from Table 5 where .90 of the high-treatment group used level 3 or 4 (i.e., Essentialist or Foundational) arguments, compared to .44 of the low-treatment group.

**Skeptical Doubt**

The skeptical doubt tasks were scored according to the effectiveness of the strategies: level 1, Defended Realism; level 2a, Dogmatism; level 2b, Skepticism; and level 3, Post-skeptical Rationalism. The higher levels require more effective strategies. It was predicted that intra-familial offenders would score higher than the extra-familial offenders. Using the Fisher Exact Probability Test this hypothesis was not supported (p > .05). Nor was the hypothesis supported that the high-treatment group would have more effective strategies than the low-treatment groups (p > .05). Instead .89 of the offenders in the high-treatment group took a subjective (i.e., Skeptical or Post-skeptical Rationalism) form of reasoning, while only .11 took a dogmatic (i.e., Defended Realism or Dogmatic) perspective. This pattern was reversed for the low-treatment group: .625 reasoned dogmatically, while .375 reasoned subjectively. When the reasoning on the skeptical
 doubt tasks were considered separately, the following results were obtained. Fifty-three percent improved their performance on the Child Abuse task, while .47 maintained their performance. No one's performance decreased. The Sign Test revealed significant results (p < .01). The majority of child molesters who increased their scores moved from a level 1 on the Livian War dilemma to a 2a on the Child Abuse dilemma. Reliabilities were .81 for both the Livian War, and Child Abuse dilemmas. The reliabilities for combining both dilemmas into an overall score was .82.

Normative Ethical Measures

To assess reliabilities on the normative ethical measures, a second coder re-scored five dilemmas (.26 of the material). Both Global Stage Scores and Weighted Average Scores were calculated for the hypothetical and real-life dilemmas. For the hypothetical dilemmas there was 80% agreement for exact stage and 100% agreement within a half stage score. For the real-life dilemmas there was 80% agreement for exact and half stage scores. Reliabilities for the hypothetical dilemmas using the Weighted Average Score were high (r = .93). For the real-life dilemmas the reliabilities appear low (r = .25), however, excluding one subject raises the reliabilities (r = .95).

To evaluate the child molesters' performance on the normative ethical measures, a 2 (intra-familial x extra-familial offenders) by 2 (high- x low-treatment) by 2 (hypothetical x real-life dilemma) analysis of variance
(ANOVA) was conducted. The two independent variables (offender & treatment) were the between variables, while the one dependent variable (dilemma) was the within variable. Results indicated a statistically significant main effect for dilemma, $F(1, 15) = 38.01, p \leq .001$. The average score for the hypothetical dilemmas was 320.16, while the average score for the real-life dilemmas was 268.42. A three way interaction between offender, treatment, and dilemma was also statistically significant, $F(1, 14) = 9.20, p \leq .01$. The simple effects were analyzed for this three way interaction. Results indicated that the intra-familial offenders in the low-treatment group on average (316.67) scored at a higher level of moral reasoning on the real-life dilemma than the average (240.00) intra-familial offenders in the high-treatment group, $F(1, 15) = 6.79, p \leq .05$. No simple effects occurred for the hypothetical dilemmas.
DISCUSSION

Primary Purpose of this Research Project

Why Child Molesters Abuse Children

The primary purpose of this research project was to learn something about why and how child molesters sexually abuse children. Both Marshall (1989) and Tingle, Barnard, Robbins, Newman, and Hutchinson (1986) presented opposing theories to explain why adults sexually abuse children. Marshall believed that intra-familial and extra-familial offenders were unable to form a secure attachment to their primary caregivers. This resulted in an inability to form other social relationships, including intimate sexual relationships. In contrast, Tingle et al. believed child molesters were attached to their mothers, but had "early dependency conflicts." However, they were not close to their fathers. The hypotheses in this project were that extra-familial offenders would be insecurely attached (dependent) to their caregivers, while intra-familial offenders would be unattached to their caregivers. The child molester's descriptions of their relationships with their parents did lend support to these predictions. Extra-familial offenders often described their relationship with their mother and father negatively: their parents were less available than desired. They appeared to be overly dependent on their parents. On the other hand, intra-familial offenders usually described their parents in neutral terms, as if they were unattached to their primary
caregivers. They frequently reported being physically abused by their parents—even severely. This finding is consistent with Williams and Finkelhor's (1988) research. They suggested that intra-familial offenders may have experienced abuse and neglect, with physical abuse being more prevalent than sexual abuse.

Marshall's theory was supported in that both groups of offenders reported problems with peer relationships during childhood. They often felt lonely and isolated. However, these feelings did not appear to disrupt their childhood sexual explorations, but feelings of isolation may have interfered with their adolescent sexual relationships. Thus, there is partial support for Marshall's work. The type of sexual play described by both intra-familial and extra-familial offenders during childhood was consistent with normal sex play (Goldman & Goldman, 1988). According to Goldman and Goldman, it is natural for children to explore their bodies through sex games, such as "Mothers and Fathers," and "Doctors and Nurses." Unfortunately, Goldman and Goldman did not address whether it is normal for children to develop intimate sexual relationships with a peer. Such relationships were described by a few child molesters. During adolescence, however, over twice (.30) as many offenders as students (.12) (Goldman & Goldman, 1988) reported a lack of sexual relationships. Instead, they reported engaging in sexual fantasies and masturbation. Of the extra-familial offenders who did engage in sexual
relationships, their behaviors were often deviant. Deviant behaviors were reported less frequently for intra-familial offenders.

How Child Molesters Abuse Children

It was hypothesized that child molesters would initially involve vulnerable children in their deviant behaviors. Later, when more experienced, they would choose other types of children. This hypothesis blended past research indicating vulnerable children are at an increased risk for abuse (Lanning, 1986) and Marshall's recent theory emphasizing the offender's needs when considering a victim. Unfortunately, the most common finding was that extra-familial offenders were unable to provide pertinent information regarding the victim. Any information they did provide was not supportive of the hypothesized sequence of events: earlier victims did not appear to be any different from latter victims. Generally, the trend was for victims to be well-adjusted. They usually lived with their biological mother and father. They tended to get along well with their peers. Even their performance in school and sports was good. Of course, intra-familial offenders provided more information about their victims. Their victims usually resided with both biological parents, although a large proportion did reside with their biological mother and step-father. The intra-familial offenders described their victim's relationship with their mother as slightly negative, unlike their own relationship with the
victim that was viewed as slightly positive. Like the extra-familial victims, they had many positive peer relationships and performed well in school and sports. Overall, the findings provided by both groups of child molesters supported Marshall's theory that sex offenders chose children to satisfy their own needs.

Marshall's theory received further support when considering how sex offenders seduce children. The most common method extra-familial and intra-familial offenders used was "comforting." Although many offenders said they were comforting the child, others admitted they were in need of comforting. In Lang and Frenzel's (1988) study of female victims, the method of comforting was more commonly used by intra-familial offenders, but the authors did not mention the direction of the comforting: offender to victim, victim to offender, or mutual. Another method offenders reported using to meet their own needs was the use of "force." They started by complimenting the victim, but snapped into a streak of anger, or lost control. Other frequently used methods were bribery, blackmail, and luring children into sexual activities.

Previous research emphasized the role of bribery when "courting the child" (Virkkunen, 1975; Duncan & Hern, 1980; Caplan, 1982; and Erikson, Walbek & Seely, 1988). If children were bribed, Virkkunen found that they were more apt to make non-sexual contact with the offender. This non-sexual contact may have been interpreted as a desire for
sexual contact by the extra-familial offenders. In this project, offenders reported being aware of initiating sexual contact for their first offence. However, following offences were described as evolving into sexual relationships, or being initiated by the child. This was not the case for intra-familial offenders, who acknowledged approaching the child for sexual favors across offences.

It was further hypothesized that offenders used their social position (e.g., teacher) or occupational skills (e.g., face painting) to engage in sexual activities with children. This was reported frequently by extra-familial offenders, although rarely for intra-familial offenders. Although it should be emphasized that intra-familial offenders by the nature of the relationship used their role as an authoritative figure, or father figure to seduce their own children. Thus, both types of offenders abused their positions of trust.

As well, the offenders trusted the children not to speak out about the abuse. In this project, the majority of offenders did not recall instructing their victims to remain silent. The offenders reported that even young children could keep secrets, while older children considered sexual activities a private matter. Those offenders who did instruct their victim to remain silent, emphasized how they would get into trouble (e.g., going to prison). These findings were contrary to the original hypothesis that child molesters would engage in brief discussions with the child.
to maintain their silence. However, the hypothesis that the victim would not want to get the offender in trouble was supported. Lister's (1982) research also suggested that victims want to help, not hurt the offender.

**Secondary Purpose of this Research Project**

**Meta-ethical Issues**

The secondary purpose of this research project was to understand child molesters' strategies for reasoning out ethical issues. The data from the first meta-ethical task, personal continuum, partially supported the hypotheses. The high-treatment group did reason at more complex levels than low-treatment group. If the suggestions of Reckless, Dinitz, and Kay (1957), as well as Reckless and Dinitz (1967), are correct one would expect the high-treatment offenders to have a stronger inner self that could "insulate" them from "adverse environments." Since the child molesters' self concepts were evaluated as an overall formation, rather than in subsections of performance, findings may generalize across areas. (Thus the same restrictions on Vicary and Good's, 1983, treatment program may not apply here.) To apply these findings, treatment programs need to be developed that focus on the formation of the child molester's concept of self, while evaluating the results empirically.

The data from the second meta-ethical task did not support either of the original hypotheses. Instead of a continuum, the data described different types of strategies
for the skeptical doubt task. The high-treatment group took a subjective, rather than dogmatic approach to the dilemmas. While the low-treatment group used more dogmatic strategies to the dilemmas. Although most offenders increased their performance on the Child Abuse dilemma, the movement was from a defended realist's position to a dogmatic position. Note that this is the same level of reasoning the majority of offenders used in the low-treatment group.

A treatment program involving social interactions between child molesters could be used to challenge their strategies when confronted with conflicting information. A subjective approach to problem solving should be emphasized, since dogmatic positions may break-down once the offender is away from a highly structured environment. The emphasis should be on the development of flexible meta-ethical reasoning strategies.

Normative Ethical Issues

Although past researchers suggested that low levels of moral reasoning were common in criminal populations, Thornton and Reid (1982) found levels of moral reasoning varied across types of offenders. Moran (1987) and MacPhail (1989) observed that sex offenders have a relatively high level of moral reasoning, but did not apply their knowledge. This could reflect a lack of motivation, or ability. For this project it was hypothesized that child molesters would demonstrate this inconsistency with a gap between scores on the hypothetical and real-life dilemmas. The data supported
this prediction. This finding raises a theoretical issue for Kohlberg’s theory, regarding the structure criterion (i.e., individuals would not be expected to use different forms of reasoning across contexts). Although there was a gap in scores between the two types of dilemmas, there was a moderate correlation \((r=0.52)\) between the weighted average scores and 74% of the global stage scores were at the same or adjacent levels of reasoning. Thus there is support for Kohlberg’s structure criterion. An additional finding was that the intra-familial offenders in the high-treatment group scored at a less advanced level than the intra-familial offenders in the low-treatment group on the real-life dilemma. A couple of theoretical explanations may account for this finding. Taking Marshall’s perspective, it could be theorized that these men have too high moral expectations for their ability to interact socially. A second explanation is that these men are not motivated to act morally. They are men without a conscience (Cleckley, 1982). Future research is needed to evaluate intra-familial offenders who have received treatment, as they may be a serious threat to themselves and others.

**Limitations of this Research Project**

The first major limitation of this project was the small sample size consisting of convicted male sex offenders from a medium security prison. Although the interviews were in-depth, with a small sample size the information must be evaluated cautiously. As well, it is unknown how
descriptive this information is of other populations that sexually abuse children. For instance, child molesters who have never been convicted of an offence may be fundamentally different from child molesters who have been incarcerated for an offence. Likewise, these data describe male, not female child molesters. Female offenders who commit the same type of offences against children may develop alternative strategies, especially if their motivation for committing the offence is different from males. Finally, it is unknown whether this information generalizes to other prison populations. In this project, the child molesters were residing in an institution designated for sex offenders. Further research is needed to compare their responses to other groups of child molesters.

The second limitation of this study is that all the data from this project were obtained directly from child molesters through an interview conducted by a female researcher. It is the child molester's perspective being discussed, not the victim's. However, before the interview most molesters granted the researcher access to their files. This may have discouraged them from minimizing or denying their offences. The next point to be considered is the sex of the researcher. Being interviewed by a female researcher may have been an initial cause for concern by the child molesters (e.g., Can a woman understand a man's sex drive?). However, by the end of the interview many offenders stated they felt more comfortable being interviewed by a woman than
a man. To address these limitations, a file study could be undertaken to compare the information obtained from the interview to the sex offenders' statements in their files. Both types of information could be compared to victim statements. As well, the judges' comments and reasons for sentencing could be compared to the information provided by the sex offenders and victims. This would provide a more complete understanding of the events that occurred.

The third limitation of this project is that Marshall's theory, which appears to explain why and how child molesters abuse children cannot be adequately tested without using attachment measures. Such measures have been designed by psychiatrists and developmental psychologists. From a psychiatric perspective, Call (1984) described normal attachment from birth to three years using seven stages. Developmental psychologists have used Ainsworth's classification system (A=insecure-avoidant, B=secure, and C=insecure-ambivalent/resistant). Using this system researchers (Egeland & Sroufe, 1981; Crittenden, 1981) have found that physically abused infants frequently display insecure-avoidant behaviors, and neglected infants display insecure-ambivalent/resistant behaviors. (There is virtually no research addressing the effects of sexual abuse on attachment formation.) Main and colleagues are extending this research by establishing a D category for not-classifiable attachment behaviors, which can be broken down into subcategories. This approach is essential, as
maltreated infants are not only at risk socially, they may have problems developing a positive self-concept (Schneider-Rosen & Cicchetti, 1984). According to Houck and King (1989), the long-term effects of maltreatment include psychopathologies, or criminality.

Major limitations of this project are now evident, however, there were advantages to this approach. The in-depth personal interviews with child molesters provided an enormous amount of information. By examining their statements it appears that child molesters are trying to meet their own needs by sexually abusing children. This may account for why and how children are sexually abused. These offenders require treatment to cease victimizing themselves and innocent children. According to the present findings, treatment programs designed to emphasize meta-ethical reasoning appear promising. However, programs designed to increase moral reasoning (i.e., normative ethics) may be beneficial for some, but detrimental for other sex offenders. Specifically, extra-familial offenders should be included in programs, while intra-familial offenders should be excluded from programs, until more information is available on appropriate treatment programing.
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TABLE 1

THE OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF TERMS
FOR THE UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEW

1.) **Selection**
   a.) Selection refers to the child molester’s decision to chose a particular child for a sexual partner. Consideration will be given to whether this decision is based on the vulnerability of the child.
   b.) Selection variables pertaining to the child include: age, sex, parents (biological, step, adopted, or foster), relationships (parents, peers), and performance (athletic, school).

2.) **Seduction**
   a.) This is defined as the child molester’s pattern of behavior to instigate sexual contact in the relationship. This might occur initially by choice of occupation, or other activities. It also refers to the actual process of luring and disinhibiting the child.
   b.) Seduction variables pertaining to the offender’s status include occupation (e.g., teacher), activities (e.g., sports coach). Seduction variables pertaining to the actual process include bribery (e.g., buying gifts), coercion (e.g., exposure to pornography), or force (e.g., use of physical strength).

3.) **Silencing**
   a.) The range of methods used by the child molester to silence the child will be considered in relationship to effectiveness over time. The question is examined in two ways: activities that maintain silence are compared to activities that break the silence.
   b.) Silencing variables apply to discussions (e.g., "I wish we could tell"), techniques to instill guilt (e.g., "I would go to jail"), or embarrassment (e.g., "Your friends would call you gay."), and blackmail (e.g., releasing photographs of the child engaging in sexual activities). Suspicions by significant others will be considered.
4.) **Sexual Acts**
   a.) Sexual acts pertain to any erotic activities engaged in by the child molester and child.
   b.) Sexual acts include involvement with sexually explicit materials; exposing genitals; fondling; oral, digital, vaginal, or anal intercourse.
A TYPOLOGY OF POSSIBLE CONTINUITY WARRANTS
-STRUCTURAL WARRANTS-

Level 1: Simple Inclusion Arguments

Conception of Self
The self is seen as a static, composite collection or mosaic of juxtaposed attributes. Change amounts to the simple addition or deletion of parts.

Grounds of Continuity Claims
A "sufficient" number of attributes characteristic of one's former self are assumed to co-occur in one's self at the moment.

Level 2: Typological Arguments

Conception of Self
The self is conceived of as a typologic space, each facet of which represents another side of one's fixed character. Change is considered merely presentational and should be discounted as only apparent.

Grounds of Continuity Claims
Facets of one's character are sometimes eclipsed from view but, although hidden, remain as fixed features of the architecture of the self.

Level 3: Essentialist Arguments

Conception of Self
The self is conceived of as a hierarchicalized system governed by deep lying essential attributes. Change is considered phenotypic, only occurring in surface attributes, but not in the essential core of self.

Grounds of Continuity Claims
Phenotypic changes are rationalized as alternative manifestations or paraphrases of a common, unchanging essential core of one's identity.
Level 4: Foundational Arguments

Conception of Self
The self is understood as a network of relations of implicative mediation tying the present to its ancestral past. Changes may be structural but are seen to constitute the conditions of satisfaction of a determining past.

Grounds of Continuity Claims
The novel aspects of the person one has become are seen to be coherently connected to the person one once was because it would be logically impossible to become the latter without previously having been the former.

Level 5: Narrative Arguments

Conception of Self
The self is conceived of as an autobiographical or narrative centre of gravity. Changes may be structural and these structural changes are matched by changing constructions of the narrative meaning of the self.

Grounds of Continuity Claims
The narrative that constitutes one’s autobiographical self is counted as continuous so long as it makes possible a coherent and followable network of interpretable connections.
STRATEGIES FOR DEALING WITH NASCENT SKEPTICAL DOUBT

Level 1: Defended Realism

Criterion for Knowledge Claim
Absolute Certainty

Explanation of Divergent Views
Personal biases and vested interests block the sort of objectivity that would lead to a consensus of truth.

Response to diversity
Search for disinterested third party who can objectively arbitrate truth claims.

Level 2: Dogmatism/Skepticism

Criterion for Knowledge Claim
Absolute Certainty

Explanation of Divergent Views
Knowledge claims are inherently subjective and amount to no more than personal opinions which cannot be evaluated rationally.

Response to diversity
(D) Search out some extra-personal source of objective truth or
(S) reject all rational criteria and rely, instead, upon non-cognitive decision making strategies.

Level 3: Post-Skeptical Rationalism

Criterion for Knowledge Claim
Relative Certainty

Explanation of Divergent Views
Knowledge claims are inherently subjective but standards of judgment can be found by which to evaluate such rationally based truth claims.

Response to diversity
Search for rational criteria by which to choose between one truth claim and another.
TABLE 4
SIX STAGES OF MORAL JUDGMENT

Level 1: Preconventional:
Stage 1. Heteronomous morality

What is right
To avoid breaking rules backed by punishment, obedience for its own sake, and avoiding physical damage to persons and property.

Reasons for doing right
Avoidance of punishment and the superior power of authorities

Sociomoral perspective of stage
Egocentric point of view. Doesn’t consider the interest of others or recognize that they differ from the actor’s, doesn’t relate two points of view. Actions are considered physically rather than in terms of psychological interests of others. Confusion of authority’s perspective with one’s own.

Stage 2. Individualism, instrumental purpose, and exchange

What is right
Following rules only when it is to someone’s immediate interest; acting to meet one’s own interests and needs and letting others do the same. Right is also what’s fair, what’s an equal exchange, a deal, an agreement.

Reasons for doing right
To serve one’s own needs or interests in a world where you have to recognize that other people have their interests, too.

Sociomoral perspective of stage
Concrete individualistic perspective. Aware that everybody has his own interests to pursue and these conflict, so that right is relative (in the concrete individualistic sense).
Level 2: Conventional:

Stage 3. Mutual interpersonal expectations, relationships, and interpersonal conformity

What is right
Living up to what is expected by people close to you or what people generally expect of people in your role as son, brother, friend, etc. "Being good" is important and means having good motives, showing concern about others. It also means keeping mutual relationships, such as trust, loyalty, respect, and gratitude.

Reasons for doing right
The need to be a good person in your own eyes and those of others. Your caring for others. Belief in the Golden Rule. Desire to maintain rules and authority which support stereotypical good behavior.

Sociomoral perspective of stage
Perspective of the individual in relationships with other individuals. Aware of shared feelings, agreements, and expectations which take primacy over individual interests. Relates points of view through the concrete Golden Rule, putting yourself in the other guy's shoes. Does not yet consider generalized system perspective.

Stage 4. Social system and conscience

What is right
Fulfilling the actual duties to which you have agreed. Laws are to be upheld except in extreme cases where they conflict with other fixed social duties. Right is also contributing to society, the group, or institution.

Reasons for doing right
To keep the institution going as a whole, to avoid the breakdown in the system "if everyone did it," or the imperative of conscience to meet one's defined obligations.
Sociomoral perspective of stage
Differentiates societal point of view from interpersonal agreement or motives. Takes the point of view of the system that defines roles and rules. Considers individual relations in terms of place in the system.

Level 3: Postconventional or principled:
Stage 5. Social contract or utility and individual rights

What is right
Being aware that people hold a variety of values and opinions, that most values and rules are relative to your group. These relative rules should usually be upheld, however, in the interest of impartiality and because they are the social contract. Some nonrelative values and rights like life and liberty, however, must be upheld in any society and regardless of majority opinion.

Reasons for doing right
A sense of obligation to law because of one's social contract to make and abide by laws for the welfare of all and for the protection of all people's rights. A feeling of contractual commitment, freely entered upon, to family, friendship, trust and work obligations. Concern that laws and duties be based on rational calculation of overall utility, "the greatest good for the greatest number."

Sociomoral perspective of stage
Prior-to-society perspective. Perspective of a rational individual aware of values and rights prior to social attachments and contracts. Integrates perspectives by formal mechanisms of agreement, contract, objective impartiality, and due process. Considers moral and legal points of view; recognizes that they sometimes conflict and finds it difficult to integrate them.
Stage 6. Universal ethical principles

What is right
Following self-chosen ethical principles. Particular laws of social agreements are usually valid because they rest on such principles. When laws violate these principles, one acts in accordance with the principle. Principles are universal principles of justice: the equality of human rights and respect for the dignity of human beings as individual persons.

Reasons for doing right
The belief as a rational person in the validity of universal moral principles, and a sense of personal commitment to them.

Sociomoral perspective of stage
Perspective of a moral point of view from which social arrangements derive. Perspective is that of any rational individual recognizing the nature of morality or the fact that persons are ends in themselves and must be treated as such.
### TABLE 5: LEVEL OF REASONING BY TREATMENT: PERSONAL CONTINUUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Reasoning</th>
<th>Subjects by treatment group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Foundational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-treatment</td>
<td>n=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-treatment</td>
<td>n=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6: LEVEL OF REASONING BY TREATMENT: SKEPTICAL DOUBT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Reasoning</th>
<th>Subjects by treatment group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dogmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-treatment</td>
<td>n=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-treatment</td>
<td>n=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A
UNSTRUCTURED INTERVIEW

Thank-you for agreeing to participate in this project.

Before we begin, I would like you to know that the information discussed during this interview is confidential, but please do not disclose information identifying a particular child (e.g., their name, address, etc.). We make this request to maintain confidentiality for the child and for your protection (e.g., against future prosecution). Any comments accidentally made will be removed when transcribing the tape. Also, for your protection the information disclosed will be coded with an I.D. number, not your name. An independent file relating your name to the I.D. number will be kept separately, then destroyed upon completion of this project.

The goal of this project is to understand the various ways adults relate to children that could lead to sexual activities. This information is needed so that we may deal more effectively with all types of children. To accomplish this task, we need your assistance in describing the activities that have taken place. For instance, what sort of child did you become involved with? Why? How did the relationship come to the point of a sexual act? Was anyone else aware of the situation while it was occurring? During the interview, please do not hesitate to offer additional
comments, questions, or observations you believe are important.

**Background Information**

a. Name
   Date of Birth

b. Parents
   (bio/step/adopt/fost/other)
   Bro/Sis
   (no./sex/order)

c. Level of Education
   Employment
   (no./type)

d. Experience with criminal justice system prior to your latest charge.
   If yes, age/type of offense/charge/legal consequences
   (fine, probation, incarceration)

1. How long have you been at the Mountain Institute? What is a typical day like at the Institute (e.g., discuss work, educational, or recreational facilities)?

2. Please, describe yourself when you were a child?

   - free narrative
   - opening question phase, "Can you tell me any more about...
   - specific questions, family (parents/bro-sis)
     self-control (exhibiting/lacking)
     peers (same/opposite sex)
     school (affect/performance)

3. Can you describe what your parents were like during your childhood?

   - free narrative
   - opening question phase, "Can you tell me any more about...
   - specific questions, liked (involvement/affect)
     disliked (substance abuse)
     (physical/sexual abuse)
4. Can you recall your first memories of any sexual experiences when you were a child?

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Can you tell me more about....
-specific questions, sex education
(parents/peers/school)
1st saw adult genitals of
(same/opposite) sex
sex play
(males/females/group)
parents' reaction

5. How would you describe yourself during adolescence?

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Can you tell me any more about...
-specific questions, identity (political/religious)
identity (desired occupation)

6. Can you recall any memories of your sexual experiences, during adolescence?

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Can you tell me any more about...
-specific questions, sexual dreams, fantasies, magazines
1st aroused or ejaculated
socio-sexual behavior
(dating, relating)
(kissing, fondling, digital/oral/anal
sex, intercourse)

7. Can you describe any sexual urges or fantasies that you experienced in the past?

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Can you tell me any more about...
-specific questions, deviant urges or fantasies
(children/violent)
healthy urges or fantasies
(adults/non-violent)

8. Now, can you describe any sexual urges or fantasies that you experienced within the past six months?

-specific questions, deviant urges or fantasies
(children/violent)
healthy urges or fantasies
(adults/non-violent)
9. Do you think you are sexually oriented towards children?

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Can you tell me any more about...
-specific questions,

a. If yes, how many children have you been involved with?

  males/females
  preferred age range
  physical attributes
  psychological attributes

b. If no, how would you describe your relationship to children?

10. Can you describe your first sexual experience with a child?

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Who, when, where, and what."
-specific questions, (SELECTION)

  -child’s: age
  sex
  parents
  (bio, step, adopted, foster)
  relationships (parents/peers)
  performance (athletic/school)

(SEDUCTION)

  -inmate’s: occupation at that time
  interactions with children
  method
  (bribery, coercion, force)

(SEXUAL ACTS)

  -c/i/b: explicit materials
  -c/i/b: exposure
  -c/i/b: fondling
  -c/i/b: oral
  -c/i/b: digital penetration
  -c/i/b: vaginal/anal penetration
  -c/i/b: other

(SILENCING)

  -child: discussions
  -inmate: discussions
  guilt induced
  embarrassment
  blackmail

-others: suspicions
(How many times have your told this story?  
Who did you tell it to?  
How many times have you thought about this event?  
Do you do anything when thinking about this event?)

11. Can you describe a sexual experience with a child, 
during your 20’s, 30’s,...?

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Who, when, where, and what."
-specific questions, (SELECTION)

-child’s: age
   sex
   parents
   (bio, step, adopted, foster)
   relationships (parents/peers)
   performance (athletic/school)

(SEDUCTION)
-inmate’s: occupation at that time
   interactions with children
   method
   (bribery, coercion, force)

(SEXUAL ACTS)
-c/i/b: explicit materials
-c/i/b: exposure
-c/i/b: fondling
-c/i/b: oral
-c/i/b: digital penetration
-c/i/b: vaginal/anal penetration
-c/i/b: other

(SILENCING)
-child: discussions
-inmate: discussions
   guilt induced
   embarrassment
   blackmail
-others: suspicions

(How many times have your told this story?  
Who did you tell it to?  
How many times have you thought about this event?  
Do you do anything when thinking about this event?)
12. Tell me about your last sexual experience with a child.

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Who, when, where, and what."
-specific questions, (SELECTION)

-child’s: age
 sex
 parents
 (bio, step, adopted, foster)
 relationships (parents/peers)
 performance (athletic/school)

(SEDUCTION)

-inmate’s: occupation at that time
 interactions with children
 method
 (bribery, coercion, force)

(SEXUAL ACTS)
-c/i/b: explicit materials
-c/i/b: exposure
-c/i/b: fondling
-c/i/b: oral
-c/i/b: digital penetration
-c/i/b: vaginal/anal penetration
-c/i/b: other

(SILENCING)

-child: discussions
-inmate: discussions
 guilt induced
 embarrassment
 blackmail
 others: suspicions

(How many times have you told this story?)
 Who did you tell it to?
 How many times have you thought about this event?
 Do you do anything when thinking about this event?)

13. Overall would you describe your relationships with children as primarily the same, or did the relationships vary? (If so, how?)

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Who, when, where, and what."
-specific questions,

-one night stands
-long-term (mo.’s, yrs.)
-group sex (more than 1 adult
 more than 1 child)
-intimate/romantic/playful
14. Could you describe the events that led up to being convicted of child sexual abuse? (Offender may not describe a particular child.)

- free narrative
- opening question phase, "Who, when, where, and what."
- specific questions, (SELECTION)
  - child's: age
  - sex
  - parents
    (bio, step, adopted, foster)
  - relationships (parents/peers)
  - performance (athletic/school)

(SEDUCION)
- inmate's: occupation at that time
- interactions with children
- process that led up to accusation

(SILENCING-REASONS FOR ACCUSATIONS)
- child: discussions
- inmate: discussions
- others: suspicions

(SEXUAL ACTS)
- c/i/b: explicit materials
- c/i/b: exposure
- c/i/b: fondling
- c/i/b: oral
- c/i/b: digital penetration
- c/i/b: vaginal/anal penetration

(How many times have your told this story?
Who did you tell it to?
How many times have you thought about this event?
Do you do anything when thinking about this event?)

15. Were you ever involved in other types of sexual activities with children?

- free narrative
- opening question phase, "Can you tell me any more about...
  "Who, when, where, and what."
- specific questions, home photography/videos
  commercial pornography
  pedophilic organizations
  child prostitution
16. Can you describe other sexual experiences you have had that did not involve children?

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Can you tell me any more about... "Who, when, where, and what."
-specific questions, heterosexual (married, yrs./children) bisexual homosexual

17. Were there any personal benefits or consequences for engaging in sexual activities with a child?
(How did you benefit...What were the consequences...)

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Can you tell me any more about...
-specific questions, attention-affected self-esteem (increase/decrease) relationship (father figure/peer) reactions (family/friends)

18. Through-out your life, what have been the legal ramifications of engaging in sexual activities with children?

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Who, when, where, and what."
-specific questions, charges legal consequences (fine/probation/incarceration)

19a. Were you participating in any treatment programs before you came to the Mountain Institution?

-If yes, could you describe the program?
-If yes, how long did you participate in this program?

19b. Have you participated in any treatment programs at the Mountain Institute?

-If yes, could you describe the program?
-If yes, how long have you participated in this program?

20. How do you view your future? (The purpose of this question is to end the interview on a positive note.)

-free narrative
-opening question phase, "Can you tell me any more about....
-specific questions, how much longer living arrangements work
APPENDIX B

PERSONAL IDENTITY INTERVIEW

Now I am going to show you some comics that deal with a famous literary character. I would like to go over these carefully with you and when we have finished I am going to ask you some questions about what we have seen. I am especially interested in how you understand the changes that happen to the main character in this story, so pay special attention to the way that this character is shown to change.

(Read illustrated booklet.)
Now that you've heard/read the story of Jean Valjean, I'd like to ask you some questions about him. There are no right or wrong answers. However, try to give as many answers as possible to the following questions:

1. How would you describe Valjean at the beginning of the story?

2. How was Valjean different at the end of the story?

3. Are there other ways Valjean might be different at the end of the story?

4. In summary then, how would you say he has changed?

   Those are all important ways he has changed, but remember that he also (was a thief and a troublemaker at the beginning of the story) (was kind and generous at the end of the story) (went out of his way to help others at the end of the story).

5. Even though there were a lot of these changes, what is it that makes Valjean the same person throughout the story?

   (Assuming that only a list of similarities is offered) You are right - those are important ways that Valjean is the same, but the other changes that we talked about still took place. Given all of these important differences, one must still decide what it is that continues to make Valjean one and the same person. What do you think makes him the same person?

6. (Survival test) If Valjean did not have the same ______ would he still be the same person at the end of the story? (Use a number of items previously stated.)

7. What is it that makes him the same person throughout the story?

8. Does Valjean think he is the same person - that is, when he remembers the person he was in the beginning, does he feel that those things happened to the person he now takes himself to be?

9. How might Valjean explain to someone else that the same person could act in all of the different ways that he acted throughout the story?
We have been discussing changes in the life of a literary character - Jean Valjean - and my questions have been about how this character can be understood to be the same person despite the fact that he went through a number of important changes in the course of the story. Now, I want to ask some similar questions about you and your life.

1. First, I would like you to tell me the most important ways that you feel that you have changed in the last fifteen years. How are you different than you used to be?

2. Are there other important changes you could mention?
   Great - those are obviously very important changes.

3. In addition, I imagine that some of your beliefs are different from those that you held fifteen years ago. Can you name some of these?

4. How about your attitudes toward things? Have you changed any of your attitudes or opinions over the last fifteen years?
   Great. We now have a long list of changes that you feel have taken place in your own life. In all the ways that you have mentioned you are now very different than you were fifteen years ago. Still, all of these changes have taken place in your life and have happened to you. Like Valjean, the story you have told me about your life is a story about one person.

5. What I now want you to explain is why you think you are the same person that you were fifteen years ago. What makes you the same person?

6. Given all of the changes you listed before, how can you say you are the same person?

7. What would you say to someone who pointed to all of the changes in your life and claimed that it would be better to think of the person you are now and the person you were fifteen years ago as two different people?
8. Think about a person in a similar situation and all the ways that you and he are alike. In many ways you are probably more like this person right now than you are like the person you were fifteen years ago. Why do you say that you are still the same person, but that this other person is different from you?
Introduction of task:

North Livia and South Livia are two small countries that existed in the nineteenth century in central Asia. During the latter part of the century, there were a series of conflicts between the two countries, termed the Livian wars. The following are two brief accounts of the Fifth Livian War, which took place in 1878.

(The interviewer reads both of the accounts orally, as the participant follows with printed copies.)

(Counterbalance the presentations.)
A Brief Account of the Fifth Livian War
by Abdul Holleanius
National Historian of North Livia

During a period set aside in North Livia to honor one of their national leaders, the memorial ceremonies were interrupted by a sneak attack from the South Livians, beginning the Fifth Livian War. Because the North Livians were caught by surprise, they were unprepared at first and the South Livians won a few early skirmishes. But then the tide turned heavily in favor of the North Livians. Before the North Livians could reach a final victory, however, a neighboring large country intervened to prevent further bloodshed.

Despite their early setbacks, the later sweeping victories of the North Livians showed conclusively that they would have won, had the fighting continued. As a result of this, the North Livians proved once again their military superiority. Because of this, the South Livians showed a new respect for the North Livians, and the South Livians finally recognized that anything they gained from the North Livians would have to be worked out through peaceful negotiation. Thus ended the Livian Wars.
A Brief Account of the Fifth Livian War
by Ibn Khaldoun
National Historian of South Livia

In the Fourth Livian War, North Livia beat South Livia badly, took some of its land and refused to leave. When South Livia could no longer tolerate this situation, the Fifth Livian War began. The war took place with rapid, dramatic victories for South Livia, resulting in great national celebration. After these dramatic victories, the South Livians suffered some minor reverses. But, then, a neighboring large country intervened to prevent further bloodshed.

Despite their later setbacks, the ultimate victory of South Livia seemed assured because of its overall position of strength. As a result of this war, the South Livians felt a new self-respect. They had always felt embarrassed by their previous defeats, but now they had proven they were the equals of the North Livians on the battlefield. Because the South Livians had achieved military respect, they were willing to work out future differences through peaceful negotiation, thus ending the Livian Wars.
Ask the participant to "describe in your own words what the Fifth Livian War was about and what happened."

Specific questions:

1. Whose fault was it that this war took place? Why do you say that? Are you sure, based on what you read? Is there any other way to look at it?

2. Who was victorious in this war? Why do you say that? Are you sure, based on what you read? Is there any other way to look at it?

3. Why did the Livian wars end? Are you sure, based on what you read? Is there any other way to look at it?

4. Are the two historians' accounts of the war different in any important ways? In what ways are they different?

5. Could both of these historians' accounts of the Fifth Livian War be right? [If no] Why not? [If yes] How can that be?
NASCENT SKEPTICAL DOUBT INTERVIEW

Introduction of task:
Two Indian villages, Ninac and Irque, existed deep in the forests of the Northern Appalachian Mountain Range in the 17th century. In the fourth decade of that century explorers discovered these villages. They listened to the myth of creation handed down through the voices of the Shaman of each village.

(The interviewer reads both of the accounts orally, as the participant follows with a printed copy.)

(Counterbalance the reports.)

Modified from the Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data, 1985
The Voice of the Irque Shaman

Describing the Myth of Creation

In the time of Creation, Irque's protector was a young man who was criticized by his sister for his sexual preference for young boys. When he could no longer stand these criticisms, he began to compete with his sister to see whose creations showed the most strength, and cleverness. The young man created with a passion. He placed the sun in the heavens. Then ordered the birds in the sky to scoop up mud to create the earth. He made a beautiful place on earth for the children of his tribe to live. He looked at the children playing sexually with adults. A messenger from the children told him they were happy and free. Exhausted, the young man rested to see what his sister would do.

Before she had a chance to compete with her brother, the young woman was stopped by their parents. They said that no world should have to endure the tensions between siblings reflected in the suspension of the heavens surrounding the earth.

Despite the young man's exhaustion, the Irque's protector demonstrated his great powers. He had always been embarrassed about his sexual preference for children, but now he had proven he was the equal to his sister. Because the young man had achieved his sister's admiration, he was willing to discuss his tribe's sexual preferences for children with her, thus ending the tension.
The Voice of the Ninac Shaman
Describing the Myth of Creation

Before the time of creation, a young man tried to overpower his sister with grandiose projects. But the young woman, who is the protector of the Ninac people, was not intimidated for long. When she became distressed and overwhelmed by his work, the time of Creation began. She balanced his sun with a moon she created for the night. Then she created the great oceans by taking the rain from the sky to balance the mud of the earth. A messenger from the children told her that some children had been sexually abused by her brother’s tribe. The children were frightened and unhappy. She hid the children in a dense forest, so her brother could not find them. Then, she rested.

Her brother began his work again, but before she could re-balance the universe, her parents interceded to end the tensions in the universe caused by their creations.

Despite her inability to complete this task, it was obvious that her works served to balance the universe. Therefore, she could not help feeling proud. She had always felt inferior to her brother, but now she had proven she was his equal in her ability to create. Because she was now respected by her brother, he was willing to listen to her reasons for avoiding sexual activities with children, this ended the tension.
Now that you have read the descriptions of creation by the two Shaman, I’d like to ask you some questions about them.

1. First of all, on the basis of what you’ve read, tell me what these two Shaman said about the events that occurred.

2. Are the descriptions of the events by the two Shaman different in any important ways?

3. Why do you think these two Shaman told such different accounts of this time period?

4. How could the young man and young woman end up having such different things to say about the issue of sexual relationships with children?

5. Do you think that one of them has got the facts wrong? How important is that to the disagreement? (Would that be important to the disagreement?)

6. If the young man and young woman had exactly the same information about the children’s reactions, might they still disagree? How is that possible? (Why is that not possible?)

7. It sounds as though you’re saying that people can view things in any way that they want. Is that what you are saying?

8. What if another person talked to the messenger and decided that adults should be able to have sex with a child even if the child does not want to, would that be an okay opinion to have? Why (or why not)?

9. What if a group of authorities reviewed the positions of the young man and young women, do you think that the specialist might know what was best to do for the children? What makes you say that?

10. Is there a way of deciding which of the messenger’s reports should be paid the most attention? Could you explain why you think that?

11. What sorts of things should be considered in order to determine what is best in regard to adults engaging in sexual activities with children?
General Section

1. What is it about some situations (the Livian War situation) that makes finding out or deciding what is right or best so hard?

2. Is that true just for that situation or is it generally true? That is, was that just an unusual situation, or are there a lot of situations like that in life and in the world?

3. How should we approach these sorts of situations, what should we do? How should we decide what to believe and what to do?

4. We could just decide to go our own ways when we disagree but, as in these situations, we often cannot do that. What then shall we do? How do we decide what to think in these sorts of situations?
Introduction:
I am going to describe several situations to you that involve questions of morality. I would like you to answer some questions about each of these situations. In answering the questions, it is very important that you tell me not only what you think should be done or what you think is right but also why you think it is right.

Form B, Dilemma IV
There was a woman who had very bad cancer, and there was no treatment known to medicine that would save her. Her doctor, Dr. Jefferson, knew that she had only about six months to live. She was in terrible pain, but she was so weak that a good dose of a painkiller like ether or morphine would make her die sooner. She was delirious and almost crazy with pain, and in her calm periods she would ask Dr. Jefferson to give her enough ether to kill her. She said she couldn’t stand the pain and she was going to die in a few months anyway. Although he knows that mercy killing is against the law, the doctor thinks about granting her request.

1. Should Dr. Jefferson give her the drug that would make her die?

1a. Why or why not?
3. Should the woman have the right to make the final decision?

3a. Why or why not?

4. The woman is married. Should her husband have anything to do with the decision?

4a. Why or why not?

6. Is there any way a person has a duty or obligation to live when he or she does not want to, when the person wants to commit suicide?

6a. Why or why not?

7. Does Dr. Jefferson have a duty or obligation to make the drug available to the woman?

7a. Why or why not?

8. When a pet animal is badly wounded and will die, it is killed to put it out of its pain. Does the same thing apply here?

8a. Why or why not?

9. It is against the law for the doctor to give the woman the drug. Does that make it morally wrong?

9a. Why or why not?

10. In general, should people try to do everything they can to obey the law?

10a. Why or why not?

10b. How does this apply to what Dr. Jefferson should do?

Form B, Dilemma IV'

Dr. Jefferson did perform the mercy killing by giving the woman the drug. Passing by at this time was another doctor, Dr. Rogers, who knew the situation Dr. Jefferson was in. Dr. Rogers thought of trying to stop Dr. Jefferson, but the drug was already administered. Dr. Rogers wonders whether he should report Dr. Jefferson.
1. Should Dr. Rogers report Dr. Jefferson?

1a. Why or why not?

Dr. Jefferson did perform the mercy killing by giving the woman the drug. However, another doctor saw Dr. Jefferson give the woman the drug and reported him. Dr. Jefferson is brought to court and a jury is selected. The jury’s job is to find whether a person is innocent or guilty of committing a crime. The jury finds Dr. Jefferson guilty. It is up to the judge to determine the sentence.

2. Should the judge give Dr. Jefferson some sentence, or should he suspend the sentence and let Dr. Jefferson go free?

2a. Why is that best?

3. Thinking in terms of society, should people who break the law be punished?

3a. Why or why not?

3b. How does this apply to how the judge should decide?

4. The jury finds Dr. Jefferson legally guilty of murder. Would it be wrong or right for the judge to give him the death sentence (a legally possible punishment)?

4a. Why?

5. Is it ever right to give the death sentence? Why or why not? What are the conditions when the death sentence should be given in your opinion? Why are these conditions important?

6. Dr. Jefferson was doing what his conscience told him when he gave the woman the drug. Should a lawbreaker be punished if he is acting out of conscience?

6a. Why or why not?
Joe is a fourteen-year-old boy who wanted to go to camp very much. His father promised him he could go if he saved up the money for it himself. So Joe worked hard at his paper route and saved up the $100 it cost to go to camp and a little more besides. But just before camp was going to start, his father changed his mind. Some of his friends decided to go on a special fishing trip, and Joe’s father was short of the money it would cost. So he told Joe to give him the money he had saved from the paper route. Joe didn’t want to give up going to camp, so he thinks of refusing to give his father the money.

1. Should Joe refuse to give his father the money?
1a. Why or why not? (Dilemma related)

2. Does the father have the right to tell Joe to give him the money?
2a. Why or why not? (Dilemma related)

4. Is the fact that Joe earned the money himself important in this situation?
4a. Why or why not? (Issue centered)

5. The father promised Joe he could go to camp if he earned the money. Is the fact that the father promised the most important thing in the situation?
5a. Why or why not? (Issue centered)

6. In general, why should a promise be kept? (General issue)

7. Is it important to keep a promise to someone you don’t know well and probably won’t see again?
7a. Why or why not? (General issue)
8. What do you think is the most important thing a father should be concerned about in his relationship to his son?

8a. What is the most important thing? (General issue)

9. In general, what should be the authority of a father over his son? (General issue)

9a. Why?

10. What do you think is the most important thing a son should be concerned about in his relationship to his father?

10a. Why is that the most important thing? (General issue)

Personal Dilemma

1. In general, what makes something a moral problem for you, or what does the word "moral" mean to you?

2. [construction] At the Mountain Institute, have you ever been in a situation where you had to make a decision about what was right but you weren't sure what to do? Have you ever had a moral conflict? Could you describe the situation? What was the conflict for you in that situation? What was at stake for you?

3. [resolution] In thinking about what to do, what did you consider?

4. [evaluation] Do you think it was the right thing to do? How do you know?