

A STUDY OF HETEROSEXUAL AND HOMOSEXUAL PEDOPHILES USING PARALLEL FORMS CATTELL'S 16PF

Bogdan Pietrulenicz

Uniwersytet Kazimierza Wielkiego, Bydgoszcz, Poland

Laval University, Quebec, Canada

Summary. The present research uses the *Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire* of Cattell and Eber (1974) to find the different traits that could eventually establish a characteristic profile of pedophilia: homosexual and heterosexual. The statistical analyses are the results of three subject groups (N = 120): 30 heterosexual pedophiles; 30 homosexual pedophiles selected with the help of penile plethysmography, registered to a sexology clinic for deviant behavioral problems and 30 voluntary people recruited from the general public form the control group. The *t*-tests do not show any significant difference between the two groups of pedophiles; although a number of differences is noticed between the control group and the two clinical groups. The two deviant groups have the image of the personality which follows the same profile with a few particular differences associated to the sexual orientation.

Introduction

In most studies, the personality diagnostic of the sexual delinquent is done by using the MMPI. In our comparative study we are presenting the model profiles using the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire of Cattell and Eber (1975) form A and B for pedophiles with differing sexual orientation. The impact of faking was much lower in the parallel form condition (Winder, O'Dell & Karson, 1975), unfortunately a new 16PF-5 (Russel & Karol, 1994) can't offer this condition of administration.

The goal of the paper is to present the different observed scores that lead to formulating a characteristic profile of pedophiles using a factorial model of personality.

This study has been possible due to the financial support of the Faculty of Superior Studies and the Research of the University of Moncton.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Bogdan Pietrulenicz, e-mail: bogdan.pietrulenicz@psy.ulaval.ca

The reading of the empirical literature shows researchers have not been able to identify a consistent psychological profile or even a group of characteristics which would permit to discriminate those who sexually abuse others (Hollin & Howells, 1991).

However, a handful of studies have pointed to certain character traits or some characteristics of abusers. Pedophiles would be characterized by their lack of social abilities (Langevin, Paitich, Freeman, Mann & Handy, 1978; Hobson, Boland & Jamieson, 1985; Olander, 2002). Such persons would not have the necessary skills to be able to interact socially or sexually with adult partners as they would manifest anxiety in social situations (Curran, 1977). This anxiety could interfere with the development or expression of appropriate heterosocial feelings (Curran, 1977). They would also have a strong tendency to introversion, which according to Langevin et al. (1978), could be attributed to the social ostracism related to this type of anomalies. Finally, Fisher and Howell (1970) reported a tendency toward dependency and submission for the paedophilic groups. Overholser and Beck (1986) observed in their previous studies a group of individuals with different sexual problems (pedophiles, exhibitionists, rapists) belonging under a single classification, namely sexual deviants.

These samples of heterogeneous nature as well as the absence of adequate control groups eliminate any possibility of identifying the particular characteristics of a specific group of sexual abusers.

Method

Sample

A total of 90 men comprised the sample of this study: 30 heterosexual pedophiles and 30 homosexual pedophiles registered at the Sexology Clinic in Quebec for deviant sexual behavior problems. This solution eliminated the incest and violent cases. According to the DSM-IV-TR (*American Psychiatric Association, 2000*), not one person examined corresponds to a special code. Penile plethysmography was used to assess their sexual preference. Also thirty men were recruited from the local population to form the control group.

The mean age for heterosexual pedophiles is 41.2 years, the homosexual group 43.1 years and for the control group 41.0 years.

The selection of subjects included each within: 11 professionals, 1 businessman, 15 blue collar workers and 3 unemployed persons. All three samples are randomly selected.

Materials

The personality questionnaire in 16 factors (16PF) of R.B. Cattell administered in the present study is formed of 374 items when the forms A and B are combined. The majority of items are put together in a way that the subject must choose between

2 very opposed preferences or again solve a problem; the results finish by being a personality portrait.

The test systematically covers the differential aspects of personality revealed by the factorial analysis and the answers regroup in a profile that reports to the dimension called normal of the personality.

The 16 factors studied are the following: A – Warmth; B – Intelligence; C – Emotional stability; E – Dominance; F – Impulsivity; G – Conformity; H – Boldness; I – Sensitivity; L – Suspiciousness; M – Imagination; N – Shrewdness; O – Insecurity; Q1 – Radicalism; Q2 – Self-sufficiency; Q3 – Self-discipline; Q4 – Tension. Four secondary factors have also been included: Extraversion; Anxiety; Tough Poise; Independence (Cattell et al., 1975).

The structured system of these traits permits to establish two parallel profiles that we can compare to characteristic pattern of different pathologies (Golden, 1979). This is important because the present study is looking to elicit the different traits that could eventually establish some characteristic profiles of the pedophile homosexual and heterosexual orientation.

The test is standardized on a French population (Cattell, Eber & Tatsouka, 1984).

The psychometrical qualities of the instrument are satisfactory; the validity of the questionnaire is reported in numerous applications (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1994). The neutrality of the questions and parallel form had the advantage of making the test less perturbing to subjects, who showed reduced tendencies towards conscious falsification of responses (Lalonde & Grunberg, 1988).

Procedure

Forms A and B of Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) were administered to the 30 heterosexual pedophiles and 30 homosexual pedophiles registered at the Sexology Clinic in Quebec as well as to the 30 recruited volunteers in the general population, total $N = 90$. No mention was made concerning the objectives of the research so as not to influence the subjects' answers.

Results

The scores obtained from Form A and B of the 16PF have been subjected to analysis to ensure validity degree, but also the results obtained from both of them are presented as complementary clinical information (Table 1).

We notice that the scores are grouped round the central tendency ($M = 5$) because the standard deviations do not often exceed the 2 point value. The calculations of the t -test show many significant differences between the control group and the two clinical groups. First, if we compare in Table 2 the heterosexual pedophiles with the normal subjects, six scores are different: A ($p < .05$); B ($p < .05$); E ($p < .01$); F ($p < .05$); H ($p < .05$); N ($p < .001$). Then follow the differences between the normal

Table 1. The averages and the standard deviations of the three groups for the A, B and A+B forms of the 16PF

Factor	Form A						Form B						Form A+B					
	Control group		Heterosexual pedophiles		Homosexual pedophiles		Control		Heterosexual pedophiles		Homosexual pedophiles		Control		Heterosexual pedophiles		Homosexual pedophiles	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
A	6.30	1.90	5.37	1.71	5.80	2.07	6.17	1.67	5.07	2.45	5.97	2.02	6.17	1.49	5.03	2.20	5.77	1.96
B	7.53	1.52	5.33	2.15	5.27	1.69	6.40	2.22	5.33	2.02	5.53	1.56	6.77	2.27	5.30	2.38	5.40	1.86
C	5.03	2.30	4.80	2.22	4.23	2.42	5.73	1.55	4.67	1.97	4.60	1.74	5.30	1.99	4.33	2.09	4.00	1.97
E	4.80	2.02	4.47	1.71	4.67	2.12	6.17	2.25	4.27	2.19	5.17	1.92	5.53	2.43	4.03	1.66	4.73	1.78
F	5.53	2.15	4.23	1.76	4.63	2.07	5.80	2.07	5.17	1.70	5.10	1.66	5.53	2.30	4.33	1.78	4.50	1.76
G	5.47	1.79	5.83	1.84	5.40	1.38	5.67	1.99	7.10	2.18	6.10	1.98	5.27	1.95	6.27	2.20	6.57	1.90
H	5.27	2.38	4.33	2.47	4.90	2.15	5.57	2.30	4.50	2.47	4.83	1.89	5.50	2.42	4.17	2.46	4.73	2.17
I	5.87	1.74	5.93	1.53	5.97	1.94	4.93	2.30	5.23	1.86	5.33	2.23	5.50	2.15	5.67	1.52	5.73	2.02
L	5.83	1.93	6.30	1.90	6.97	2.10	5.60	1.63	6.20	2.20	6.13	2.32	5.73	1.60	6.57	1.91	6.77	2.04
M	4.77	2.08	5.57	1.75	4.53	2.11	5.63	2.17	4.60	2.06	4.53	2.25	4.93	2.00	4.63	1.66	3.90	2.15
N	4.10	2.01	6.83	1.53	7.47	2.04	5.70	1.95	5.57	1.98	5.03	1.58	4.43	1.74	6.37	1.58	6.37	1.76
O	6.20	2.11	6.53	2.25	6.53	2.09	5.47	1.93	6.53	2.01	6.23	2.20	6.00	2.02	7.00	2.21	6.37	2.07
O1	5.03	1.81	5.23	1.66	5.30	1.63	4.13	1.94	5.23	1.67	5.93	1.93	4.23	1.92	4.80	1.76	5.37	2.33
O2	5.90	1.42	5.73	2.06	6.07	1.95	4.07	2.56	5.73	1.96	5.70	1.64	4.97	1.94	5.77	2.12	5.73	1.63
O3	6.70	1.92	5.63	2.09	5.83	4.27	6.07	1.74	6.20	1.99	6.00	1.77	6.60	1.73	5.67	2.09	5.90	1.81
Q4	6.47	1.89	6.40	2.11	6.53	2.11	5.93	1.86	5.77	1.76	5.90	1.99	6.30	1.86	6.20	1.89	6.57	2.14

group and the homosexual pedophiles: B ($p < .05$); C ($p < .05$); L ($p < .001$); Q1 ($p < .05$). The results of the t -tests between clinical groups of subjects do not permit to trace the significant difference in the Form A and B (see Table 2). However, a number of differences were noted between the control group and two clinical groups.

Table 2. The t -tests between the three groups, for the A, B and A+ B forms of the 16PF

Factors	Form A			Form B			Form A+B		
	P1 vs. P2	P1 vs. CG	P2 vs. CG	P1 vs. P2	P1 vs. CG	P2 vs. CG	P1 vs. P2	P1 vs. CG	P2 vs. CG
A	-	2.00*	-	-	2.03*	-	-	2.33*	-
B	-	4.57***	5.46*	-	-	-	-	2.44*	2.54*
C	-	-	-	-	2.32*	2.56*	-	-	2.54*
E	-	-	-	-	3.32**	-	-	2.78-	-
F	-	2.56*	-	-	-	-	-	2.26*	-
G	-	-	-	-	2.66**	-	-	-	-
H	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.11 *	-
I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L	-	-	2.17*	-	-	-	-	-	2.08*
M	2.06*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N	-	5.93***	6.43***	-	-	-	-	4.51***	4.28***
O	-	-	-	-	-	2.09*	-	-	-
Q1	-	-	-	-	2.35*	3.59***	-	-	2.05*
Q2	-	-	-	-	2.83**	3.08***	-	-	-
Q3	-	2.06*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Q4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

P1 = heterosexual pedophiles, P2 = homosexual pedophiles, CG = control group
 $*p < .05$, $** p < .01$, $*** p < .001$

As for the second-order factors, as shown in Table 3, the results are mostly average. For the QI (Extraversion) factor, two clinical groups differ at $p < .001$ level, we assert the same tendency though less significant $p < .05$ with QIV (Independence) and we also have to take into account the QII (Anxiety) result between the homosexual pedophiles and the control group $p < .05$ (Table 4). The last objective employed consisted of finding four second-order factors, and their psychological characteristics also go towards the distinctive model. The results of the t tests done inside two clinical groups of subjects do not permit to trace the significant differences in the form A + B.

In whole, it is possible to assume that the personality profile is a meaning factor that gives complementary information on the deviant behaviours of paedophilic type. The factor titles suggest the behavioural nature of the two groups that obtain the same mark.

Table 3. Means of the three groups on second order factors Form A+B

Second order Factors	Control group		Heterosexual pedophiles		Homosexual pedophiles	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
QI Extraversion	7.97	2.04	4.30	2.14	4.83	1.88
an Anxiety	5.86	1.94	6.73	2.09	6.69	2.03
QIII Emotion	5.86	1.97	5.74	1.78	6.58	2.04
QIV Independence	5.33	2.00	4.05	1.98	4.10	1.96

Table 4. The *t*-tests between three groups on second order factors of the A + B form

Secondary Factors	P1 vs. P2	P1 vs. CG	P2 vs. CG
QI Extraversion	–	6.67***	6.15***
QII Anxiety	–	–	1.69*
QIII Tough Poise	–	–	–
QIV Independence	–	2.45*	2.41 *

P1 = heterosexual pedophiles

P2 = homosexual pedophiles

CG = control group

* $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$

The clinical image of the heterosexual pedophile includes such qualities as intellectual mediocrity associated with dissociation of feelings. Their emotional detachment confirms the difficulty in establishing interpersonal relationships and shows rigidity, suggesting a poor level of dynamic integration of personality. The answers to the questionnaire show incapacity to affirm one's self socially with other adults and a compensation for this aspect by abuse of weaker persons like children. These individuals have sometimes a strong tendency to manipulate in a subtle way, emotionally unfeeling. The scores on the second-order factors follow the description bringing forth the signification which corresponds to dimensions, like a tendency towards introversion and submission.

The subjects representing the second clinical group, the homosexual pedophiles, have many particular characteristics. They are very weak in adaptation to an event per-

ceived as menacing. The answers displayed by these individuals in stressful situations were not sufficiently organized to be expressed in tactful coping behavior. It seems that there are relations between the pedophilic homosexual orientation and projective tendencies of paranoia associated such as distrust, rigidity and egocentrism. These traits do not facilitate psychotherapy with subjects who suspect all new ideas and avoid changes. In accommodating themselves to a deviant sexual style, they are not attracted by a critical reflection for that aggravates their problems when they are slow to learn and understand. They show the evidence of concrete thought level. To the second-order factors, we have to add a strong anxiety related to many psychological non-adaptive experiences, which generally perturbs the functioning in social contexts.

The subjects representing these groups tend to be introvert, shy and inhibited in their contacts, to feel inferior, to have difficulty in externalising. The answers to the questionnaire show a tendency to the submission expressed as a social passivity. We observe that the social security in the pedophiles is accompanied by a paranoid defence development. They are often emotionally cold; grant importance to the practical questions but often lack imagination. The two groups show feelings of hopelessness, of uselessness, a strong tension, and depressive mood which give easy access to guilty feelings. In psychoanalytical terms, it is the anxiety generated under the pressure of the superego. Finally, the tension originating from the basic instinctual drive is in correlations with high sexual excitement.

Conclusion

The results demonstrate that the pedophiles, in general, are less intelligent and more sly (Howells, 1984) than the general population. Also, they are more introverts, which support the results of Langevin et al. (1983).

Furthermore, heterosexual pedophiles seem to demonstrate personality traits identified in earlier studies, like the submission (Fisher et al., 1970) and the anxiety manifestation in social situations (Curran, 1977). The homosexual pedophiles, on the other hand, demonstrate a personality trait that appears likely in particular being emotional instability and suspicion.

Following the results obtained, it is possible to affirm that the structure of personality can corroborate with pedophilic type behaviours.

This profile adds to other model types existing that indicate characteristic traits for the different psychopathology symptoms. These results justify the studies relating to the personality structure, the classification in accordance with a model profile and a criteria evaluation in trouble cases related to sexual behaviour using the similarity coefficient for a diagnostical goal. This method is elaborated by Cattell et al. (1985). It is recommended that while establishing criteria for the sexual deviation to compare first the individual output with a base model of a clinical group. Since there are no specific theories of sexual abusers, a limited number of developed measures is available specifically for this population (Hollin et al., 1991). This method looks promising.

Furthermore, the 16PF has the advantage to easily pass over the defensive aspect of the client during the clinical situations, which is not without importance in the case of pedophiles (Howells, 1984). This type of objective questionnaire (16PF) destined to a large population, can reveal itself useful and can be added more frequently to the evaluation methods already existing as to reinforce the diagnostical quality.

However, there is always a chance that a "normal" adult accused of a sexual crime can possess all the characteristics of these individuals (pedophiles), that have committed certain sexual abuse in the past, without having committed the crime in question (Hollin & Howells, 1991). It would therefore be important to acquire with a comprehension of sexual disorders so as to improve the diagnostic and the clinical intervention.

One of the benefits that we can conclude from the obtained results would be the therapy application to help the pedophiles to overcome their social anxiety, learn social abilities to facilitate their interactions with an eventual partner and the training of self affirmation so as to reduce their tendency toward submission and dependence. If these prone factors are eliminated, there are always chances that the total of second offences be also diminished.

All in all it is possible to assert that the personality structure can be prone to deviant behaviours of pedophilic type. The *Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire* can prove to be an interesting aid and add existing methods in order to increase diagnostic quality. The effects of faking on scores are not evident with parallel forms, so 16PF-5 in single form is very adequate for this kind of evaluation.

This research raises pertinent interrogations for investigations regarding the personality structure, classification by profile and criteria evaluation versus the sexual behavioural troubles. A good way to proceed requires that the individual criteria estimations and tendency to the sexual deviance be first practised on the base of a clinical group model.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. Fourth Edition. Text Revision. (DSM-IV-TR)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Cattell, R. B. & Eber, H. W. (1984). *Manuel: Test 16PF de R.B. Cattell. Questionnaire de personnalité en 16 facteurs*. Paris: Les Éditions du Centre de Psychologie Appliquée.
- Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W. & Tatsouka, M. M. (1975). *Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire – 16PF*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Curran, J. P. (1977). Skills training as an approach to the treatment of heterosexual social anxiety. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84, 140-157.
- Fisher, G. & Howell, L. M. (1970). Psychological needs of homosexual pedophiles. *Diseases of the Nervous System*, 31, 623-625.

- Golden, C. J. (1979). *Clinical interpretation of objective psychological tests*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Hobson, W. F., Boland, C. & Jamieson, D. (1985). Dangerous sexual offenders. *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality*, 19, 104-119.
- Hollin, C. R. & Howells, K. (1991). *Clinical Approaches to Sex Offenders and their Victims*. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons.
- Howells, K. (1984). *The Psychology of Sexual Diversity*. New York: Blackwell Inc.
- Lalonde, P. & Grunberg, F. J. (2001). *Psychiatrie Clinique: Approche Biopsychosociale*. Montreal: Gaetan Morin Editeur.
- Langevin, R., Paitich, D., Freeman, R., Mann, K. & Handy, L. (1978). Personality characteristics and sexual anomalies in males. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 10, 222-238.
- Murphy, K. R. & Davidshofer, C. O. (1994). *Psychological Testing: Principles and Applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Olander, R. (2002). *Defensive styles and other factors that differentiate between two types of child molesters: use of the MCMI-II, MMPI-2, and the 16 PF*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA.
- Overholser, J. C. & Beck, S. (1986). Multimethod assessment of rapists, child molesters and three control groups on behavioral and psychological measures. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 54, 682-687.
- Russell, M. T. & Karol, D. L. (1994). *The 16PF fifth edition administrator's manual*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Winder, P., O'Dell, J. W. & Karson, S. (1975). New motivational distortion scales for the 16PF. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 39(5), 532-537.