
Theses, Dissertations, and Projects

2008

Understanding male juvenile sexual offenders : an investigation of experiences and internalized masculinity

Adam Brown
Smith College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.smith.edu/theses>



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brown, Adam, "Understanding male juvenile sexual offenders : an investigation of experiences and internalized masculinity" (2008). Masters Thesis, Smith College, Northampton, MA.
<https://scholarworks.smith.edu/theses/1309>

This Masters Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations, and Projects by an authorized administrator of Smith ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@smith.edu.

Adam Brown
Understanding Male Juvenile
Sexual Offenders: An
Investigation of Experiences
and Internalized Masculinity

ABSTRACT

Reoffense of nonsexual crime in juveniles is 3 to 4 times more likely than the reoffense of sexual crime (Burton & Meezan, 2004). The purpose of this study was to investigate how the literature-based factors of experienced trauma, masculine beliefs, and substance abuse affect the commission of nonsexual violence in sexually offending juveniles. Three related quantitative articles were written in this investigation. The first article explores each factor separately among a group of sexual offenders to see how each explains their nonsexually violent behavior. Assumptions about trauma and masculinity in this group were not supported, but alcohol use was. Each of the next two articles isolates masculinity as the sole factor in sexual and nonsexual aggressivity among offending juveniles and compares masculine beliefs among subgroups according to type of offending and severity of violent behavior. None of the assumptions for masculinity were supported across subgroups, as all subgroups selected 'no opinion,' on average, when asked their opinions on masculine beliefs. More research is needed in understanding how subtypes of masculinity and hostility can be measured in juveniles, with extra attention to how gender-based factors are internalized cross-culturally in this population.

Understanding Male Juvenile Sexual Offenders: An Investigation of Experiences and
Internalized Masculinity

A project based upon an independent investigation,
submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Social Work.

Adam Brown

Smith College School for Social Work
Northampton, MA 01063

2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My mom, Susan Halkyard, LICSW, sister, Jennifer Brown, LMHC, and cousin, Michael Delrosso, LCSW, for their courage in blazing a trail through extraordinarily thick obstacles.

Susan and Bob Halkyard, for encouraging and supporting me, wherever I go and whatever I do.

Rob Whitman-Raymond, LICSW, CAS, for finding the spark in an opaque room and for guiding me to it, over and over again, until the muck clears without you, more often than not.

My advisor, mentor, and matey, David Burton, Ph.D., to whom I am so grateful to have met.

Mark Brown, for reminding me that perseverating with a good cigar is a wonderful alternative to perseverating without a good cigar.

Scott Pray, for supporting me while in school, and for encouraging me to go my own way.

Eric Stevens, who calls most mornings to help me along.

My internship site, the Faulkner Hospital Addiction Recovery Program in Jamaica Plain, MA, and especially to my supervisor, Susan K. Cantor, LICSW, for giving me space to write, time to think, and an incredibly enriching and supportive learning environment.

Jenifer Viencek, my editor, for keeping my insides warm.

A very special thanks to all of the participants who were recruited for this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..... ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... iii

ARTICLE

I. Trauma, masculinity, and substance abuse in the commission of nonsexual violence among male juvenile sexual offenders: an investigation toward predicting behavior..... 1

REFERENCES..... 21

II. Masculinity as pathology: An exploration of distorted masculine beliefs comparing juvenile sexual offenders and nonsexual offenders..... 31

REFERENCES..... 43

III. Macho-man: A close look at the relationship between masculinity and criminality in sexually offending and nonsexually offending juveniles..... 52

REFERENCES..... 66

Trauma, masculinity, and substance abuse in the commission of nonsexual violence
among male juvenile sexual offenders: an investigation toward predicting behavior

Adam Brown

Smith College School for Social Work

Abstract

Researchers have paid little attention to the overlap in commission of nonsexually violent offenses among juvenile sexual offenders. This, despite that reoffense of nonsexual crime in juveniles is 3 to 4 times more likely than the reoffense of sexual crime (Burton & Meezan, 2004). If juvenile sexual offenders are general delinquents who commit sexual crimes as a part of their general delinquency, this would suggest that the etiological factors presented in juvenile sexual offenders include the etiological factors presented in nonsexually offending delinquents as well as comorbid factors which make sexually offending behavior more likely, thereby making sexual offenses a variant of general delinquency. In a sample of 332 male juvenile sexual offenders, nonsexual violence is examined in order to see if the literature based factors of childhood trauma, masculinity, and substance abuse relating to aggression for nonsexual and sexually offending delinquents explains the degree of nonsexual violence for this group. Assumptions about trauma and masculinity relating to nonsexual crimes for sexual offenders need further exploration but were not supported in this study. However, similar to nonsexually delinquent youth, alcohol plays a role in explaining their nonsexual aggression.

Article I

Trauma, masculinity, and substance abuse in the commission of nonsexual violence among male juvenile sexual offenders: an investigation toward predicting behavior

Introduction

Due to the heterogeneity in the population and the robust variance in their characterological make-up, the etiological factors of juvenile sexual aggression remain unclear (Hunter, Figueredo, Malamuth & Becker, 2003; Veneziano & Veneziano, 2002). Much of the current literature on juvenile offenders compares nonsexually offending juvenile delinquents with those who do sexually offend in an attempt to determine possible risk factors for offending (Bullens, Wijk & Mali, 2006; Ford & Linney, 1995; Hunter, 2004; van Wijk, Blokland, Duits, Vermeiren & Harkink, 2007; van Wijk et al., 2005). However, most research up to this point has paid little attention to the overlap between groups in the commission of nonsexual violent offenses among juvenile sexual offenders. This, despite that reoffense of nonsexual crime in juveniles is 3 to 4 times more likely than the reoffense of sexual crime (Burton & Meezan, 2004).

If juvenile sexual offenders are general delinquents who commit sexual crimes as a part of their general delinquency, this would suggest that the etiological factors presented in juvenile sexual offenders include the etiological factors presented in nonsexually offending delinquents as well as other factors which make sexually offending behavior more likely, e.g. being a victim of sexual violence, early exposure to pornography, engaging in bestiality as a child, etc. (Able & Bradford, 2008; Ford & Linney, 1995), thereby making the sexual offenses a variant of general delinquency. However, if juvenile sexual offenders are merely violent young men who happen to

commit sexually violent crimes for less predictable reasons, likely offenders might be more difficult to identify and therefore more difficult to treat.

Literature Review

Nonsexual violence refers to behavior involving force or physical attack (or threat thereof) on another individual. Sexual violence is behavior which involves touching another person in a sexual way without consent or with an inappropriately aged person or person who can't give consent due to power, age, or other differences. Due to the fact that there is a dearth of existing literature regarding the commission of nonsexual violence among juvenile sexual offenders, the following review includes both violent juveniles who do not necessarily demonstrate sexual aggressivity and those who do.

Violence Begets Violence

Despite that most juveniles who come from violent homes or abusive environments will not go on to be violent themselves (Widom, 1989), one of the early and still extant theories for violent behavior (both sexual and nonsexual) in juveniles is that those who victimize are victims themselves who have gone on to repeat the cycle of violence (Ryan, 1989). Social learning theory, maladaptive coping, the development of hostile attributes, and possible changes in psychological functioning as a result of experienced violence are some of the ways in which early childhood maltreatment experiences are hypothesized to affect the development of violent and criminal behavior in later years (Widom, 2000). Severe physical discipline in the preschool years has been shown to be positively correlated with general adolescent violence (Herrenkohl, Egolf & Herrenkohl, 1997), as has the childhood observation of domestic violence (Haapasalo & Hamalainen, 1996). Also, juveniles who come from chaotic and hostile homes are more

likely to associate with delinquent peer groups and therefore engage in delinquent behavior similar to that of their peers (Patterson, DeBaryshe & Ramsey, 1989; Williams & Van Dorn, 1999).

As with nonsexually violent juveniles, much of the literature on sexually offending juveniles agrees that sexually aggressive behavior in youth is learned (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Burton & Meezan, 2004). Juveniles who sexually offend have almost always lived in environments with myriad forms of neglect and violence (Rich, 2003). Also, because sexually offending juveniles report sexual victimization in far greater numbers than do nonsexually offending delinquents, Bandura's social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) and the more recent social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 2001) have been successfully applied as ways to explain sexual violence in these juveniles (Burton, Miller & Shill, 2002; Ford & Linney, 1995; Lewis, Shanok & Pincus, 1981).

Masculine Identities

In the study of violent behavior in adult and juvenile males, some researchers believe it is helpful to determine if the violence committed is expressive (a physical reaction to an emotion), e.g. anger or frustration (Berkowitz, 1993; Geen, 1990), or instrumental (a means to achieve a goal with a distinct lack of emotional arousal whatsoever, even when great injury is committed upon another person), e.g. power or status (Cornell et al., 1996; Woodworth & Porter, 2002). The understanding of violence in expressive and instrumental polarities helps to support Moffitt's (1993) and Patterson's (1996) findings, that there are likely two types of antisocial juveniles: 1) the majority type, who commit crimes briefly during adolescence and later grow out of it and 2) a much smaller number of offending juveniles who exhibit high levels of antisocial

behavior before the age of 12 and continue this behavior into adulthood. The Type 1, majority 'expressive' type who 'grow out of it,' likely do so as they discover that pro-social behavior results in social acceptance, whereas those in Type 2 are perhaps a group unaffected by the reactions of others and have less capacity for empathy or the need of being socially accepted, making their violent expressions 'instrumental' to getting their needs met regardless of the consequences to others.

Instrumental violence might be used as an attempt to meet needs due to distorted masculine beliefs, e.g. "Men should always take the initiative when it comes to sex," and "Hugging and kissing should always lead to intercourse" (Levant et al., 1992). The existence of distorted masculine beliefs in some juvenile offenders might help to support Hunter's (2006) finding that sexually offending youth with the highest levels of nonsexual violence and highest percentage of sexual assaults against pubescent and post-pubescent females tend to offend for longer periods of time, despite consequences of this behavior.

Masculinity and Antisociality

Just by the very nature of their crimes, we know that juvenile sexual offenders have antisocial tendencies in abundance (Knight & Simms-Knight, 2004; Knight & Zakireh, 2002; Seto & Lalumiere, 2004; van Wilk et al., 2005; Zakireh, Ronis & Knight, 2008). However, most research tends to stop short of labeling sexually offensive youth with a personality disorder (e.g. antisocial personality disorder) perhaps due, in part, to evidence suggesting that many juveniles who demonstrate traits inherent in antisocial personality disorder in adults (e.g. shallow and superficial affect, inconsideration for

others, high risk behavior, and lack of empathy) may be considered clinically normative by clinicians who work with adolescents (Rich, 2003).

Studies in adult sexual offending literature have been more willing to attach psychopathology to sexual offending among criminals and find it helpful for the etiological study and treatment of offenders and potential offenders. In adult sexual offenders, psychopathology almost always includes the presence of cognitive distortions (Abel, Becker & Cunningham-Rathner, 1984; Abel, Gore, Holland, Camp et al, 1989; Feelgood, Cortoni & Thompson, 2005; Gannon & Polaschek, 2006; Ward, Polaschek & Beech, 2005), which are sometimes intrusive thoughts that lead to distorted thinking (e.g. an adult pedophile may come to believe that a child who does not resist his sexual advances must want sex) and a derivative of cognitive distortions known as schemas (Malamuth & Brown, 1994; Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss & Tanaka, 1991; Mann & Beech, 2003; Mann & Hollin, 2001), which are defined by Thakker, Ward, and Navathe (2007) as “categories consisting of prototypical entities that are created over time in response to the multitude of stimuli individuals come across” (p. 16) (e.g. one must control women in order to feel successful; one who feels as if he is wronged is justified in acting aggressively). Because it is unclear to what degree these cognitive distortions and schemas are post hoc rationalizations or preexisting beliefs in adult sexual offenders, the understanding of cognitive distortions and schemas in juvenile sexual offenders becomes all the more significant so that it might be shown how these could develop over time into true psychopathologies in adulthood. While juveniles have been shown to be highly vulnerable to cognitive distortions (Prescott & Longo, 2006), these have yet to be substantively examined in juvenile sexual offenders. Therefore, in measuring masculine

beliefs and nonsexual violence among sexually offending juveniles, the discovery of correlates might be useful.

Substance Abuse and the Commission of Violence

There is little empirical substance to support incidence ratios of substance abuse and sexual offending in juveniles, which vary from 3.4% to 72% (Lightfoot & Barbaree, 1993). For example, many (now dated) studies have concluded that the prevalence of substance use among juvenile sexual offenders is uncommon (Awad & Saunders, 1989; Awad, Saunders & Levene, 1984; Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Groth, 1977), while more recent studies show that substance abuse has been shown to be a positive correlate of both sexual violence and general delinquency (Kelley, Lewis & Sigal, 2004; J.A. Tinklenberg, Steiner, Huckaby & Tinklenberg, 1996; Valois, McKeown, Garrison & Vincent, 1995). Caserta and Burton (2008) found that nearly half of juvenile sexual offenders report using substances before and/or after a criminal offense occurred, while Martin (2001) found alcohol use to be related to one-half to two-thirds of severe crimes such as homicide and other serious assaults committed by juvenile offenders.

Little-if-any literature has demonstrated how substance use among juvenile sexual offenders affects the commission of their nonsexually violent crimes and what implications this information might have to our understanding and treatment of substance abusing juvenile sexual offenders.

Putting the Pieces Together

Researchers have used trauma, distorted masculine beliefs, and substance abuse as ways to understand both general juvenile delinquency and juvenile sexual offending, but have largely neglected to explore how these three factors affect the commission of

nonsexual violence among juvenile sexual offenders. In the current project, a sample of 332 juvenile sexual offenders is used to explore the commission of nonsexual violence.

Methods

After consents were obtained, confidential data were collected from sexually offending youth in six residential facilities in a Midwestern state. For this study, data were collected from 332 adjudicated juvenile sexual offenders, including demographics and non-standardized measures of aggression.

The average age of the juvenile sexually offending youth sample ($N = 332$) was 16.70 years ($SD = 1.65$ years). On average, sexual offenders were currently in the 9th grade ($SD = 1.63$ years). Fifty percent of juvenile sexual offenders indicated their race as Caucasian ($n = 156$), 29% African American ($n = 90$), and 13% Other ($n = 43$), which includes those who indicated Hispanic, Asian, Pacific islander Native American, Arab American, or Other. An additional 13% of respondents ($n = 43$) did not report race.

On a 7 point scale of modus operandi, (1 = babysat or played with victims, 2 = threats, 3 = threats and babysat/games, 4 = force, 5 = force and babysat/games, 6 = force and threats, and 7 = force and babysat/games threats), juvenile sexual offenders reported an average of 2.44 ($SD = 2.08$).

On a 14 point scale indicating the severity or complexity of sexual crimes committed, (1 = exposure, 2 = fondling, 3 = exposure and fondling, 4 = oral sex, 5 = exposure and oral sex, 6 = oral sex and fondling, 7 = oral sex, exposure, and fondling, 8 = penetration with penis, digits or objects, 9 = penetration and exposure, 10 = penetration and fondling, 11 = penetration, exposure, and fondling, 12 = penetration and oral sex, 13

= penetration, exposure, and oral sex, 14 = penetration, exposure, fondling, and oral sex), juvenile sexual offenders reported an average of 8.55 ($SD = 4.29$).

Measures

Socially Desirable Responding

The MACI is based on Millon's theory of patterns in personality (Millon & Davis, 1996) and is devised for youths in treatment or in correctional institutions. It was normed on 579 adolescents in treatment facilities with two smaller cross-validation samples. Its scales comprise 160 True-False questions, including "I would much rather follow someone than be the leader" and "I probably deserve many of the problems I have." Based on Millon's (1993) validity scoring procedures, data from eight juveniles were not used for this study.

Nonsexual Violence

In order to separate subjects who were exclusively sexually violent from those who also reported to be nonsexually violent, Elliot, Huizinga, and Ageton's (1985) Self-Report Delinquency Scale (SRD) was used to assess for nonsexual violence. This scale is comprised of 32 items which asked the juveniles to give the best estimate of the number of times they had engaged in the activity listed during the year before entering prison, and is scored: 1 = "Did not do," 2 = "Once a month," 3 = "Once every 2-3 weeks," 4 = "Once a week," 5 = "2-3 times a week," 6 = "Once a day," and 7 = "2-3 times per day." The subscale to measure nonsexual violence included four questions, including "Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting or killing that person" and "Used strong-arm methods to get money or things from people." Additionally, one question from the MACI was added to the measure of nonsexual violence. From the

MACI, respondents were expected to answer “True” or “False” to the question “I sometimes get pleasure by hurting someone physically,” which was scored 0 for “False” and 1 for “True.” Therefore, youth could have scored from 4 to 29 on this scale. Given the traditional coding of the SRD questions, a score of 4 meant that a given adolescent reported no nonsexual violence and was thereby ineligible for this study. Once subjects were excluded based on this nonsexual violence measure, a variable was created to add together all of the questions regarding non-sexual violence. In this group sample ($n = 167$), the average on this scale was 9.81 ($SD = 5.3$). The remaining measures were used exclusively on these remaining subjects.

Childhood Trauma

The Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ) measures traumatic experiences throughout childhood and has been reported to have good internal consistency and test-retest reliability (Bernstein & Fink, 1998). The CTQ is a retrospective self-report questionnaire that consists of items used to assess the extent to which respondents experienced five types of negative childhood experiences: physical, sexual, and emotional abuse, physical neglect, and emotional neglect. The questionnaire used consisted of 34 items which asked clients to rate the frequency with which various events took place when they “were growing up.” On a 1-5 scale, items were scored: 1 = “Never true,” 2 = “Rarely true,” 3 = “Sometimes true,” 4 = “Often true,” and 5 = “Very often true.” Questions included: “Someone tried to touch me in a sexual way or make me touch them,” “There was someone in my family who wanted me to be a success,” and “I was punished with a belt, board, cord, or some other hard object.” Bernstein et al. (2003) found that institutional adolescents score the highest levels of childhood maltreatment

when compared to community samples. The overall total trauma score for the subsample used in this analysis had a reasonable reliability of ($\alpha = .94$).

Masculinity

The Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI) consists of True-False questions to assess traditional and nontraditional masculine beliefs (Levant et al., 1992). Unique to the MRNI when compared to other masculinity inventories is that it calls for the respondents to make specific gender assignments to attitudes and beliefs without making any direct comparisons between men and women, thereby avoiding the likelihood of a respondent feeling shamed if he answers questions in a way which suggests femininity rather than masculinity (Levant & Richmond, 2007). Fifty-two opinions are offered which ask respondents how they felt before they were arrested. On a 1-7 scale, items are scored: 1 = "Strongly Disagree," 2 = "Disagree," 3 = "Slightly Disagree," 4 = "No Opinion," 5 = "Slightly Agree," 6 = "Agree," and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Examples of MRNI questions include: "A man should do whatever it takes to be admired and respected" and "A man should always be ready for sex." The total MRNI score was used with a respectable Cronbach's reliability of ($\alpha = .87$) for this subsample.

Substance Abuse

The alcohol use and drug use subscales of the Self-Report Delinquency Scale (SRD) were chosen to assess for substance use. Respondents answered questions regarding alcohol and drug use before being arrested on a 7 point scale as described in the Nonsexual Violence section above. Questions included, "I used alcohol or other liquor" and "Was drunk in a public place." The alcohol use subscale had acceptable inter-item

reliability of ($\alpha = .80$) for the subsample. However, the drug use subscale did not ($\alpha = .489$) and was not used in further analyses.

Administration

Confidential data were collected using pencil and paper surveys from six residential facilities in a Midwestern state. The surveys were administered in small (8-12) group format in classrooms; however, participants were separated to ensure that they could not view each other's responses. The youth were not provided with an incentive to complete the survey.

Results

Commission of Nonsexual Violence among Sexual Offenders

Surprisingly, the majority of the sexual offenders (61.73%) reported to not have committed any nonsexual violence in the year prior to entering prison, having responded "Did not do" to the four Self-Report Delinquency Scale (SRD) questions (see Tables 1-4). Among those who did report the commission of nonsexual violence, the question responded to most affirmatively regarded intent to hurt or kill a person, with 34% of the sample ($n = 101$) reporting to have engaged in this behavior (see Table 1). This was followed closely by the question regarding gang-related violence, with 32% ($n = 79$) reporting to have engaged in this activity (see Table 4). The nonsexual violence question most infrequently responded to in the affirmative regarded hitting or threatening to hit a supervisor, with 10% ($n = 30$) of the sample reporting to have done so (see Table 2).

With respect to the frequency of nonsexually violent incidents, the most used response among those who reported the commission of nonsexual violence was "Once

per month,” with 42% of all respondents who answered affirmatively to nonsexually violent behavior sample choosing this option (see Tables 1-4).

Table 1: Responses to “*During the year before your arrest, how often did you attack someone with the idea of seriously hurting or killing that person?*”

Frequency	n (Percent)
Did not do	197 (66.1%)
Once per month	47 (15.8%)
Once every 2-3 weeks	22 (7.4%)
Once a week	9 (3%)
2-3 times a week	3 (1%)
Once a day	8 (2.7%)
2-3 times a day	12 (4%)

Table 2: Responses to “*During the year before your arrest, how often did you hit or threaten to hit your supervisor or another employee?*”

Frequency	N (Percent)
Did not do	266 (89.6%)
Once per month	21 (7.1%)
Once every 2-3 weeks	2 (.7%)
Once a week	1 (.3%)
Once a day	2 (.7%)
2-3 times a day	4 (1.3%)

Table 3: Responses to “*During the year before your arrest, how often did you use force or strong-arm methods to get money or things from people?*”

Frequency	N (Percent)
Did not do	213 (71.7%)
Once per month	31 (10.4%)
Once every 2-3 weeks	11 (3.7%)
Once a week	11 (3.7%)
Once a day	6 (2%)
2-3 times a day	15 (5.1%)

Table 4: Responses to “*During the year before your arrest, how often were you involved in gang fights?*”

Frequency	N (Percent)
Did not do	203 (67.7%)
Once per month	21 (7%)
Once every 2-3 weeks	16 (5.3%)
Once a week	8 (2.7%)
Once a day	6 (2%)
2-3 times a day	28 (9.3%)

Of the 281 adolescents who responded to the MACI question in the assessment of nonsexual violence, only 21% of the sample (n = 59) responded affirmatively to the question “I sometimes get pleasure from hurting someone physically.”

Childhood Trauma

Among sexually offending adolescents who committed nonsexual violence ($n = 167$), the average score of experienced childhood trauma was, $M = 77.35$, $SD = 26.77$, with possible scores ranging from 34 (indicating no experienced childhood trauma) to 170 (the most varied and extreme experienced trauma).

Distorted Masculine Beliefs

On the total MRNI scale, the sexual offenders who committed nonsexual violence ($n = 167$) had an average score of 4.0 ($SD = .81$), which corresponds to the answer “No opinion” on measures of masculinity.

Substance Abuse Question

On the SRD alcohol abuse scale, the average for the sexual offenders who committed nonsexual violence ($n = 167$) was $M = 4.57$, $SD = 4.15$. This answer most closely corresponds to the answer “2-3 times a week.”

Regression Analysis

The final regression assesses the variance in the commission of nonsexual violence score among sexually aggressive juveniles explained by masculine beliefs and alcohol abuse and trauma.

In order to assess how well masculinity, substance abuse, and trauma account for variability in nonsexual violence, multiple regression was used with sexually abusive youth who had committed nonsexual crimes. In the first regression equation ($F = 25.96$, $p = 000$), which accounted for 40% of the variance in nonsexual violence, both substance abuse and trauma were significant variables, while masculinity was not. Therefore, a second regression was attempted without masculinity ($F = 40.32$, $p = 000$), which

accounted for 36% of the variance in nonsexual violence. Similarly, trauma was no longer significant in this equation. Consequently, the final equation was alcohol use regressed onto nonsexual violence ($F = 102.76, p = .000$) accounting for 39% of the variance in nonsexual violence (see Table 5), signifying that nonsexual violence among sexually offending adolescents was not found to be predicted by masculinity or trauma, but only by alcohol use.

Table 5: Final Regression Model

Variable	Beta	SE B	Standardized Beta	P
Constant	6.20	.487		.000
Alcohol Use	.802	.079	.624	.000

Dependent variable = nonsexual violence, $R^2 = .36, F = 40.32, p = .000$.

Discussion

The results indicate that less than half of all juvenile sexual offenders report the commission of nonsexually violent behavior, which might indicate that, as with adult offenders, juvenile sexual violators who also commit acts of nonsexual violence are a specialized group of offender. Of those who do commit nonsexually violent acts, findings indicate that neither masculinity nor childhood trauma is predictive of nonsexual violence, but alcohol use is. These are interesting findings, as past literature has shown both general delinquency and sexual offending (separately) among juveniles to be predicted by alcohol use and childhood trauma (Caserta & Burton, 2008; Herrenkohl et al., 1997) and masculine beliefs to be highly predictive of both general and sexual

aggression in adult men (Lisak & Beszterczey, 2007; Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes & Acker, 1995), while no researchers have previously combined these related.

It is possible that masculinity as measured by the Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI) was the not the best choice for this study, as past masculinity findings associated with sexual and general aggression have measured masculinity using a variety of different measures (Malamuth et al., 1995; Pleck, Sonenstein & Ku, 1994). The process of assessing masculinity in juveniles specifically is complicated by the fact that, at the time of data collection, no measure had been created to do so. Therefore, the measure chosen was done so according to what seemed to be the best choice for juveniles, without a measure already empirically tested on this population.

It was surprising that childhood trauma was not correlated with nonsexual violence among the juvenile sexual offenders when it typically is so for nonsexually offending youth (Patterson et al., 1989) and that juveniles who sexually offend have almost always lived in environments with many forms of neglect and violence (Rich, 2003). When compared to a control group of community samples, Bernstein et al. (2003) found that institutionalized adolescents score the highest levels of childhood maltreatment on the CTQ, regardless of causality. Therefore, it is possible that, while childhood trauma is a presenting factor in this group, it is not statistically tied to the commission of nonsexual violence apart from the sexual offending.

That alcohol use is the greatest predictor of nonsexual violence among sexually offending youth, is a new finding, but one consistent with extant literature on the relationship of alcohol to both general delinquency and sexual aggression in adolescents

(Johnson & Knight, 2000; Tinklenberg, Murphy, Murphy & Pfefferbaum, 1981; Van Ness, 1984).

Implications

Research

A better understanding of the relationship between alcohol use and the commission of nonsexual violence among juvenile sexual offenders can be aided by future analyses of patterns of behavior among juvenile sexual offenders specific to alcohol use before and after the commission of violent offenses, as well as exploring comorbid factors (e.g. mood disorders, family alcohol use, etc.) associated with alcohol use using a control group of nonsexually violent offending youth.

Despite that masculinity was not found to be a factor in the commission of nonsexual violence in this study, a further understanding of masculinity and its subtypes, and what this means to these offenders, might also help researchers to make formulations of gender role identity and how this internal process affects the behavior of sexually offending youth.

Treatment

As reported earlier, juvenile sexual offenders are 3 to 4 times more likely to reoffend nonsexually than sexually (Burton & Meezan, 2004; Worling & Curwen, 2000). The finding that alcohol abuse is the greatest predictor of nonsexual violence among juvenile sexual offenders suggests that alcohol-specific treatment for sexually offending youth might greatly reduce the commission of nonsexual violence among these young men. Currently, sexual offender programs for adolescents do not incorporate substance abuse treatment (Burton, Smith-Darden & Frankel, 2006).

Limitations

Despite using multiple facilities, this study was limited by using sexual offenders from one state only. Along with a larger sample size, subjects from varying geographic populations will aid future analyses. Also, despite controlling for truthfulness with the MACI lie scale, the subjects' self-report increases the chance of deception.

References

- Awad, G.A., & Saunders, E.B. (1989). Adolescent child molesters: Clinical observations. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 19*, 195-206.
- Awad, G.A., & Saunders, E.B. (1991). Male adolescent sexual assaulters: Clinical observations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6*, 446-460.
- Awad, G.A., Saunders, E., & Levene, J. (1984). A clinical study of male adolescent sexual offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 28*, 105-115.
- Abel, G.G., Becker, J.V., & Cunningham-Rather, J. (1984). Complications, consent, and cognitions in sex between children and adults. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 7*, 89-103.
- Abel, G.G., & Bradford, J.M. (2008, May). *The assessment and treatment of child sexual abusers*. Paper presented at American Psychiatric Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.
- Abel, G.G., Gore, D.K., Holland, C.L., Camp, N., et al. (1989). The measurement of the cognitive distortions of child molesters. *Annals of Sex Research, 2*, 135-153.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text revision). Washington, DC: Author.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 121-153). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Berkowitz, L. (1993). *Aggression: Its causes, consequences, and control*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bernstein, D., & Fink, L. (1998). *Childhood trauma questionnaire: A retrospective self-report manual*. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.
- Bernstein, D.P., Stein, J.A., Newcomb, M.D., Walker, E., Pogge, D., Ahluvalia, T., et al. (2003). Development and validation of a brief screening version of the childhood trauma questionnaire. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27, 169–190.
- Bullens, R., Wijk, A., & Mali, B. (2006). Similarities and difference between the criminal careers of Dutch juvenile sex offenders and non-sex offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 12(2), 155-164.
- Burton, D. (2003). Male adolescents: Sexual victimization and subsequent sexual abuse. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 29(4), 277-296.
- Burton, D.L., Miller, D.L., & Shill, C.T. (2002). A social learning theory comparison of the sexual victimization of adolescent sexual offenders and nonsexual offending male delinquents. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26, 893-907.
- Burton, D.L., & Meezan, W. (2004). Revisiting recent research on social learning theory as an etiological proposition for sexually abusive male adolescents. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*, 1(1), 41-80.
- Burton, D.L., Smith-Darden, J., & Frankel, S.J. (2006). Research on adolescent sexual

- abuser treatment programs. In Barbaree, H.E & Marshall, W.L. (Eds.), *The juvenile sex offender (2nd ed.)* (pp. 291-312). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Caserta, D.A., & Burton, D.L. (2008). *Examining substance use and abuse among juvenile sexual offenders: A descriptive investigation of the prevalence and related crime associated with mood altering substances*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Cornell, D.G., Warren, J., Hawk, G., Stafford, E., Oram, G., & Pine, D. (1996). Psychopathy in instrumental and reactive violent offenders. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*, 783–790.
- Decker, S. H., & Van Winkle, B. (1996). *Life in the gang: Family, friends, and violence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Elliot, D.S., Huizinga, D., & Ageton, S.S., (1985). *Explaining delinquency and drug use*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Fagan, J., & Wexler, S. (1988). Explanations of sexual assault among violent delinquents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 3*, 363-385.
- Feelgood, S., Cortoni, F., & Thompson, A. (2005). Sexual coping, general coping, and cognitive distortions in incarcerated rapists and child molesters. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 11*, 157-170.
- Ford, M.E., & Linney, J.A. (1995). Comparative analysis of juvenile sexual offenders, violent nonsexual offenders, and status offenders. *Journal for Interpersonal Violence, 10*(1), 56-70.

- Gannon, T.A., & Polaschek, D.L.L. (2006). Cognitive distortions in child molesters: A reexamination of key theories and research. *Clinical Psychology Review, 26*, 1000-1019.
- Geen, R.G. (1990). *Human aggression*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Groth, A.N. (1977). The adolescent sexual offender and his prey. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 21*, 249-254.
- Haapasalo, J., & Hamalainen, T. (1996). Childhood family problems and current psychiatric problems among young violent and property offenders. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 34*, 1394-1401.
- Herrenkohl, R.C., Egolf, B.P., & Herrenkohl, E.C. (1997). Preschool antecedents of adolescent assaultive behavior: A longitudinal study. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 6*(3), 422-432.
- Huff, C.R. (1996). The criminal behavior of gang members and non-gang at-risk youth. In C.R. Huff (Ed.), *Gangs in America (2nd ed.)* (pp. 75–102). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hunter, J.A. (2006). Understanding diversity in juvenile sexual offenders: Implications for assessment, treatment, and legal management. In R. Longo & D. Prescott (Eds.), *Current perspectives: Working with sexually aggressive youth & youth with sexual behavior problems* (pp. 63-77). Holyoke, MA: NEARI Press.
- Hunter, J.A. (2004). Developmental pathways in youth sexual aggression and delinquency: Risk factors and mediators. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*(4), 233-242.

- Hunter, J.A., Figuerdo, A.J., Malamuth, N.M., & Becker, J.V. (2003). Juvenile sex offenders: Toward the development of a typology. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 15*(1), 27-48.
- Johnson, G.M., & Knight, R.A. (2000). Developmental antecedents of sexual coercion in juvenile sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 12*, 165-178.
- Kelley, S.M., Lewis, K., & Sigal, J., (2004). The impact of risk factors on the treatment of adolescent sex offenders. *Journal of Addictions and Offender Counseling, 24*, 67-81.
- Knight, R. A., & Zakireh, B. (2002, October). *Assessing juvenile sexual offenders using the Multidimensional Assessment of Sex and Aggression*. Paper presented at the 21st Annual Meeting of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Montreal, Canada.
- Knight, R.A., & Sims-Knight, J.E. (2004). Testing an etiological model for male juvenile sexual offending against females. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 13*(3-4), 33-55.
- Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L., Celentano, E., Cozza, T., Hill, S., MacEachern, M., et al. (1992). The male role: An investigation of norms and stereotypes. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14*, 325-337.
- Levant, R.F., & Richmond, K. (2007). A review of research on masculinity ideologies using the Male Role Norms Inventory. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 15*(2), 130-146.
- Lewis, D.O., Shanok, S.S., & Pincus, J.H. (1981). Juvenile male sexual assaulters: Psychiatric, neurological, psychoeducational, and abuse factors. In D.O. Lewis

- (Ed.), *Vulnerabilities to delinquency* (pp. 89-105). New York: SP Medical & Scientific Books.
- Lightfoot, L.O., & Barbaree, H.E. (1993). The relationship between substance use and abuse and sexual offending in adolescents. In H.E. Barbaree, W.L. Marshall & S.M. Hudson (Eds.), *The juvenile sex offender* (pp. 203-224). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Lisak, D., & Bezterczey, S. (2007). The cycle of violence: The life histories of 43 death row inmates. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 8(2), 118-128.
- Malamuth, N.M., & Brown, L.M. (1994). Sexually aggressive men's perceptions of women's communications: Testing three explanations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 699-712.
- Malamuth, N.M., Sockloskie, R., Koss, M.P., & Tanaka, J. (1991). The characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59, 670-681.
- Malamuth, N.M., Linz, D., Heavey, C.L., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(2), 353-369.
- Mann, R.E., & Beech, A.R. (2003). Cognitive distortions, schemas, and implicit theories. In T. Ward, D.R. Laws & S.M. Hudson (Eds.), *Sexual deviance: Issues and controversies* (pp. 135-153). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mann, R.E., & Hollin, C.R. (2001, November). *Schemas: A model for understanding cognition in sexual offending*. Paper presented at the 20th Annual Research and

- Treatment Conference, Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, San Antonio.
- Martin, S.E. (2001). Alcohol, youth, and the justice system: Underage drinking as a normative behavior, a status offense, and a risk factor for delinquency. In S.O. White, (Ed.), *Crime and justice: Handbook of youth and justice* (pp. 159-231). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic Plenum Publishers.
- Millon, T. (1993). *Millon adolescent clinical inventory: Manual*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- Millon, T., & Davis, R. (1996). *Disorders of personality DSM-IV and beyond*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Moffitt, T.E. (1993). Adolescent-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, *100*(4), 674-701.
- Patterson, G.R. (1996). Some characteristics of a developmental theory for early onset delinquency. In M.F. Lenzenweger & J.J. Haugaard (Eds.), *Frontiers of developmental psychopathology* (pp. 81-124). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Patterson, G.R., DeBaryshe, B.D., & Ramsey, E. (1989). A developmental perspective on antisocial behavior. *American Psychologist*, *44*, 329-335.
- Pleck, J.H., Sonenstein, F.L., & Ku, L.C. (1994). Attitudes toward male roles among adolescent males: A discriminant validity analysis. *Sex Roles*, *30*(7/8), 481-501.
- Prescott, D., & Longo, R.E. (2006). Current perspectives: Working with young people who sexually abuse. In R. Longo & D. Prescott (Eds.), *Current perspectives:*

- Working with sexually aggressive youth & youth with sexual behavior problems* (pp. 45-61). Holyoke, MA: NEARI Press.
- Rich, P. (2003). *Understanding, assessing, and rehabilitating juvenile sexual offenders*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Reilly, J., Muldoon, O.T., & Byrne, C. (2004). Young men as victims and perpetrators of violence in northern Ireland: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(3), 469-484.
- Ryan, G. (1989). Victim to victimizer: Rethinking victim treatment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 4, 325-341.
- Seto, M. C., & Lalumiere, M.L. (2004). Conduct problems and juvenile sexual offending. In H.E. Barbaree & W.L. Marshall (Eds.), *The juvenile sex offender* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.
- Sowell, E.R., Thompson, P.M., Tessner, K.D., & Toga, A.W. (2001). Mapping continued brain growth and gray matter density reduction in dorsal frontal cortex: Inverse relationships during postadolescent brain maturation. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 21(22), 8819-8829.
- Thakker, J., Ward, T., & Navathe, S. (2007). The cognitive distortions and implicit theories of child sexual abusers. In T.A. Gannon, T. Ward, A.R. Beech, & D. Fisher (Eds.), *Aggressive offenders' cognition: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 11-29). West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Tinklenberg, J.R., Murphy, P., Murphy, P.L., & Pfefferbaum, A. (1981). Drugs and criminal assaults by adolescents: A replication study. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 13, 277-287.

- Tinklenberg, J.A., Steiner, H., Huckaby, W.J., & Tinklenberg, J.R. (1996). Criminal recidivism predicted from narratives of violent juvenile delinquents. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development, 27*, 69-79.
- Valois, R.F., McKeown, R.E., Garrison, C.Z., & Vincent, M.L. (1995). Correlates of aggression and violent behaviors among public high school adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 16*, 26-34.
- Van Ness, S.R. (1984). Rape as instrumental violence: A study of youth offenders. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation, 9*, 161-170.
- van Wijk, A.P.H., Blokland, A.A.J., Duits, N., Vermeiren, R., & Harkink, J. (2007). Relating psychiatric disorders, offender and offence characteristics in a sample of adolescent sex offenders and non-sex offenders. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 17*, 15-30.
- van Wijk, A., Loeber, R., Vermeiren, R., Pardini, D., Bullens, R., & Doreleijers, T. (2005). Violent juvenile sex offenders compared with violent juvenile nonsex offenders: Explorative findings from the Pittsburg youth study. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 17*(3), 333-352.
- Veneziano, C., & Veneziano, L. (2002). Adolescent sex offenders: A review of the literature. *Journal of Trauma, Violence and Abuse, 3*(4), 247-260.
- Ward, T., Polaschek D.L.L., & Beech, A.R. (2006). *Theories of sexual offending*. New Jersey: Wiley.
- Widom, C. (1989). Does violence beget violence? A critical examination of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 106*(1), 3-28.

- Widom, C.S. (2000). Understanding the consequences of childhood victimization. In R.M. Reece (Ed.), *Treatment of child abuse: Common ground for mental health, medical, and legal practitioners* (pp. 339-361). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Williams, J. H., & Van Dorn, R. A. (1999). Delinquency, gangs, and youth violence. In J. Jenson & M. O. Howard (Eds.), *Youth violence: Current research and recent practice innovations* (pp.199-228). Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Woodworth, M., & Porter, S. (2002). In cold blood: Characteristics of criminal homicides as a function of psychopathy. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 111*, 436–445.
- Worling, J. R., & Curwen, T. (2000). Adolescent sexual offender recidivism: Success of specialized treatment and implications for risk prediction. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 24*, 965–982.
- Zakireh, B., Ronis, S. T., & Knight, R. A. (2008). *Individual beliefs, attitudes, and victimization histories of male juvenile sexual offenders*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Masculinity as pathology: an exploration of distorted masculine beliefs comparing
juvenile sexual offenders to nonsexual offenders

Adam Brown

Smith College School for Social Work

Abstract

Although the endorsement of masculine beliefs has long been correlated to sexual and general aggression in adult males (Lisak, Hopper & Song, 1996; Lisak & Roth, 1990), researchers have historically ignored how traditional masculinity might also engender a culture of offending in some boys as they develop into adolescents (Messerschmidt, 2000). In a sample of 502 juvenile sexual and nonsexually offending juveniles, masculine beliefs are examined. Subjects were found not only to have no meaningful difference in masculine beliefs, by group, but both groups largely responded, on average, with a 'no opinion' response to most of the masculinity questions. While it is possible that the lack of an age-appropriate measure for masculinity at this time is the reason for these findings, it is also believed that the rapidly changing brain development and integration of male identity in the mean age ($M = 16.63$) of subjects may account for the difference in ability to account for masculinity in youth, as is done successfully the adult offending population.

Article II

Masculinity as pathology: an exploration of distorted masculine beliefs comparing juvenile sexual offenders to nonsexual offenders

Literature Review

Sexual assault by juveniles is a serious social problem with many psychological, familial, and sociocultural layers which, if left untreated, may lead to both nonsexual and sexual recidivism of criminal behavior throughout adolescence and into adulthood (Abel, Osborn & Twigg, 1993; Knight, 1999; Knight & Cerce, 1999). In the last 20 years, there has been notable progress made in understanding and treating juvenile sexual offenders distinctly from adult offenders as researchers have discovered group differences in etiological makeup and treatment needs (Gerhold, Browne & Beckett, 2007). However, in separating the men from the boys, as it were, much of the extant literature remains dedicated to the exploration of traditional masculine beliefs in adult male sexual aggressivity (Berkowitz, 2002; Burt, 1980; Kanin, 1984, 1985; Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes & Acker, 1995), while juvenile sexual offender research up to this point largely neglects the intertwining of masculinity and sexual violence (Messerschmidt, 2000).

Due to the paucity of published analysis on masculine beliefs among juvenile sexual offenders, the following review includes both adult and juvenile male sexual and nonsexual offenders in the exploration of masculinity as it relates to sexual aggressivity.

Understanding Masculinity

Although there is no universally accepted diagnostic tool, adults with antisocial personality disorder are those who commit repeated criminal and/or other antisocial acts (Guy, Poythress, Douglas, Skeem & Edens, 2008). In the conceptualization of sexual

offenders, researchers liberally overlap the language of antisocial traits and masculine traits. What might help to explain this overlap is that, A) nearly all reported sexual offenders are male (Hendriks & Bijleved, 2006; Lane & Lobanov-Rostovsky, 1997; Ray & English, 1995) and B) from a young age, despite sharing equal risk factors as children (e.g. low constraint, high negative emotionality, and high impulsivity), males are far more likely to become conduct disordered and antisocial than females (Moffitt, Caspi, Rutter & Silva, 2001). Furthermore, it is largely agreed upon by researchers that a developmental antecedent of a likely juvenile sexual offender is the presence of antisocial traits (Figueredo, Sales, Russell, Becker & Kaplan, 2000; Knight & Simms-Knight, 2004; Morton, Farris & Brenowitz, 2002; Oliver & Chambers, 1993; Zakireh, Ronis & Knight, 2008).

Masculinity in both adult and juvenile male offenders is often understood by researchers to fall into one of two subsets: 1) an expression of emotion (Berkowitz, 1993; Geen, 1990) or an 2) expression of dominance (Cornell et al., 1996; Woodworth & Porter, 2002). The first masculinity subset, expression of emotion, is the more commonly found version of the two among adolescents and less concerning over the long term, as these boys tend to engage in antisocial behavior briefly in adolescence and later grow out of it as they mature (Moffitt, 1993; Patterson, 1996; Reilly, Muldoon & Byrne, 2004). For example, boys tend to learn more pro-social ways of expressing and/or sublimating anger after realizing that punching and kicking people is disconcerting to others and might have undesirable long term social consequences. The second subset of masculinity, expressed as dominance (also commonly referred to as hypermasculinity (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984) and hostile-masculinity (Malamuth et al., 1995)), is the less

common and more concerning of the two, because these males tend to not become emotionally aroused when committing acts of violence upon others (Cornell et al., 1996) and, for adolescents, are individuals who commit more sexual and nonsexual crimes for longer periods of time (Hunter, 2006; Moffitt, 1993). Norris, George, Cue Davis, Martell and Leonesio (1999) also found that hypermasculine adult males lack empathic capacity - a trait present in psychopathy (Hare, 1991, 1996, 1999, 2003) and antisocial personality disorder in adults (DSM-IV-TR; American Psychiatric Association, 2000).

Importance of Understanding Masculinity in Juveniles

Thus far, no measure of masculine attitudes in relation to sexual offending has been standardized in adolescents (Farr, Brown & Beckett, 2004), making treatment modalities used with juvenile sexual offenders more generic than those used with adults (Alexander, 1999; Barbaree, 1997; Hall & Nagayama, 1995; O'Connor, 1996; Raine & Dunkin, 1990; Serin, Mailloux & Malcolm, 2001). According to Figueredo et al. (2000), it is not understood exactly why some sexually coercive juvenile males exhibit qualities that are more demonstrative of dominance and control, while others use sexual coercion for the sake of conquests in competition with other males. In a recent study of male juvenile sexual and nonsexual offenders, researchers reported that it was unclear whether the sexual and nonsexual violence by their subjects was an expression of emotion or dominance (Bullens et al., 2006). Researchers have found expressions of dominant masculinity in juveniles to be positively correlated to sexual aggressivity toward peers and older women (Hall, Sue, Narang & Lilly, 2000; Malamuth, 1998; Malamuth & Malamuth, 1999), while Rowe, Vazsonyi and Figueredo (1997) have shown expressions of emotional masculinity to be predictive of general delinquency and promiscuity.

Hunter (2004), however, found neither dominant nor emotional expressions of masculinity in juveniles to be predictive of sexual aggression toward female peers or older women. This variance in findings suggests that more work is needed in understanding this issue.

One problem in the lack of knowledge on this subject is that most research on sexual behavior as it relates to masculinity is with male college subjects who report sexually aggressive behavior (Muren, Wright & Kaluzny, 2002). The Male Role Norms Inventory (MNRI) (Levant et al., 1992; Levant & Fischer, 1998), for example, is a measure of masculinity which has consistently been shown to be a reliable tool in assessing masculine beliefs for more than 15 years with this population (Levant & Richmond, 2007). In college-age males, the MRNI has been shown to be predictive of both general sexual aggression with rape supportive attitudes (Gale, 1996) and relationship violence (Jakupcak, Lisak & Roemer, 2002). While this information is helpful with respect to understanding the relationship of masculinity and sexual aggressivity in late adolescence, it is not necessarily useful for understanding juvenile sexual offending, as brain integration of information is much more affected by experiences during early adolescence than in the college years (Blakemore & Choudhury, 2006; Chambers & Potenza, 2003; Siegel, 1999; Sowell, Thompson, Tessner & Toga, 2001). In fact, much recent attention in neuropsychology has been given to understanding how and why executive functioning (the capacity to control thoughts and behavior) greatly improves throughout adolescence (Hooper, Luciana, Conklin & Yarger, 2004; Leon-Carrion, Garcia-Orza & Perez-Santamaria, 2004; Luciana, Conklin, Cooper & Yarger, 2005; Luna, Garver, Urban, Lazar & Sweeney, 2004), with some evidence

suggesting that the maturation of the prefrontal cortex during adolescence affects more abstract social constructs such as self-awareness (Ochsner, 2004) and the ability to understand others (Frith, 2001). This is relevant to the understanding of sexually aggressive adolescent males who demonstrate dominant masculine organization in particular, as juveniles have been shown to be highly vulnerable to cognitive distortions (Prescott & Longo, 2006), and it might be possible for treatment providers to address cognitively distorted ways of thinking during this crucial period of brain development while social constructs are still thought to be malleable.

In a sample of 502 juvenile sexual offenders and nonsexually offending juvenile delinquents, masculine beliefs are examined. It is hypothesized that sexually aggressive juveniles will express higher levels of masculinity.

Methods

After consents were obtained, confidential data were collected from sexually offending and nonsexually offending youth in six residential facilities in a Midwestern state. The original sample was comprised of 331 adolescent males incarcerated for sexual offenses and 171 adolescent males incarcerated for other crimes (juvenile delinquents).

On average, the youth were 16.63 years of age with no difference between groups ($t = 1.45, p = .15$). The youth were, on average, in the 9th grade, also with no differences between groups ($t = .99, p = .33$). However, the two groups do vary by race ($\chi^2 = 39.50, p = .000$), as is typical on most comparison studies, with many sexual offenders selecting Caucasian as their race (49.8%, $n = 156$), compared to the nonsexual offenders (37.5%, $n = 60$). Twenty-nine percent (28.8%, $n = 90$) of the sexual offenders selected African

American, compared to 56.2% (n = 90) of the nonsexual offenders. Twenty-one percent (n = 70) of the sexual offenders selected Other, which includes those who indicated Hispanic, Asian, Pacific islander, Native American, Arab American, or Other, compared to 6.2% (n = 10) of the nonsexual offenders.

Measures

Measure and results are divided into two categories: developmental antecedents and criminal behaviors. Each set of measures is described below:

Socially Desirable Responding

The MACI is based on Millon's theory of patterns in personality (Millon & Davis, 1996) and was devised for youths in treatment or in correctional institutions. It was normed on 579 adolescents in treatment facilities with two smaller cross-validation samples. Its scales comprise 160 True-False questions, including "I would much rather follow someone than be the leader" and "I probably deserve many of the problems I have." Based on Millon's (1993) validity scoring procedures, data from eight juveniles were not used for this study.

Masculinity

The Male Role Norms Inventory (MNRI) consists of 52 normative statements to which subjects indicate their degree of agreement/disagreement on 7-point Likert-type scales (Levant et al., 1992). On the scale, items are scored: 1 = "Strongly Disagree," 2 = "Disagree," 3 = "Slightly Disagree," 4 = "No Opinion," 5 = "Slightly Agree," 6 = "Agree," and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Unique to the MRNI when compared to other masculinity inventories is that it calls for the respondents to make specific gender assignments to attitudes and beliefs without making any direct comparisons between men

and women (Levant & Richmond, 2007). It has been suggested gender-specific questions could affect the subject's self-esteem (and test reliability) if he senses that an idiosyncratic trait in his personality is associated with femininity rather than masculinity (Garnets & Pleck, 1979; Pleck, 1981). Two examples of MRNI questions are "A man should do whatever it takes to be admired and respected" and "A man should always be ready for sex." The total traditional MRNI scale has sound reliability with a Cronbach's of ($\alpha = .873$). However, none of the subscales of the MRNI were suitable with Cronbach's ranging from ($\alpha = .329$) for rejecting homosexuality to ($\alpha = .481$) for the aggression subscale and are not used in further analysis.

Administration

Confidential data were collected using pencil and paper surveys from six residential facilities in a Midwestern state. The surveys were administered in small (8-12) group format in classrooms; however, participants were separated to ensure that they could not view each other's responses. The youth were not provided with an incentive to complete the survey.

Results

Using a simple independent sample *t* test, the two groups vary significantly on the MRNI total traditional scale with the nonsexually offending youth having a slightly higher average score ($M = 4.11, SD = .826$) than the sexual offenders ($M = 3.90, SD = .842$) ($t = 2.35, p = .019$). In both groups, the mean answer given most closely corresponds to the answer, "No Opinion."

Discussion

The results indicate that there is a significant difference in masculinity between groups, with nonsexually offending youth endorsing more masculine beliefs than sexually offending youth. However, the difference between the groups is .21 points of a five point scale, meaning that the actual content of answers between the groups is nearly identical, rendering the difference in the results statistically significant but probably not meaningful. Interestingly, the results also indicate that neither the sexually offending nor the nonsexually offending youth frequently have an opinion at all about the questions on masculinity, rather than a universal endorsement or denial of the beliefs. One possibility for this finding is that the MRNI is not an appropriate measure of masculinity in adolescents. At the time of data collection, there was no single measure of masculinity for adolescents, and while the MRNI has shown reliable results in college age males over many years, it is possible that the measure is not able to discern masculine beliefs in individuals who are at a different stage of brain development, as suggested above.

Another possibility for the lack of universal endorsement or denial of masculine beliefs is that antisociality is more nuanced in mid-adolescence than a measure of masculinity could account for, as has been done in males in late-adolescence and adulthood with the MRNI. If juveniles are in a near-constant state of integrating new information into the construction of their identities, it is possible that current ways of thinking about masculinity in polarities of either endorsing or denying masculine beliefs may not be enough in the formulation of juvenile offenders. Salekin (2006) has suggested that there are more subtypes of youth offenders than previously considered. For example, Moffitt (1993) found that life-course persistent delinquents have been found

to have many neurological deficits, including low intelligence, while newer research, has found high intelligence to be associated with life-course youth offending (Vincent, Vitacco, Grisso & Corrado, 2003). The seeming contradictions between these findings, along with the findings here that MRNI measured-masculinity is not a meaningful factor in discerning nonsexual offenders from sexual offenders, might explain why it is possible that work with youth offenders in the future must incorporate an understanding of more fluid identities, unlike work with adults in whom identity is typically more static.

Implications

Research

While it is possible that the understanding of traditional and nontraditional masculinity in adolescent males might be an outdated concept, the understanding of how males integrate a sense of identity using gender is a salient piece of offending. Research should continue to look for patterns of hostility and aggression in young male offenders and ask how these individuals understand themselves as boys and young men. The development of an adolescent-specific measure of gender identity might serve to help researchers understand how males who offend differ from a control group of non-offending youth. Although it is possible that traditional and nontraditional masculinity as measured in adults is not useful to the understanding of difference in these populations, it is certain that males still account for the majority of violent and nonviolent juvenile crime in the United States (Snyder, 2006) and that there is something to masculinity, or at least gender and its social construction, that accounts for this difference.

Treatment

Helping male offenders talk about how their experiences as boys and young men have affected them continues to be important in the treatment of these individuals. While it is not known why boys offend in far greater numbers than girls, it is certain that there is something to the experience of being male that accounts for this difference. Therefore, providing a talk-therapy environment which focuses on the male experience might provide boys and young men a comfortable space in which to explore how the experience of being male affects the decisions they make. Group therapy in a closely monitored environment would likely be helpful, as the opportunity to share experiences and see commonalities may assist the males to appreciate how most offending comes from a confluence of experiences, rather than the mistakes of a “bad” individual.

Limitations

Despite using multiple facilities, this study was limited by using offenders from one state only. Along with a larger sample size, subjects from varying geographic populations will aid future analyses. A control group of non-offending juvenile males should be used in the future, as finding standards of measurement for masculinity in adolescents is still very much in the trial phases. Also, despite controlling for truthfulness with the MACI lie scale, the subjects’ self-report increases the chance of deception. Questioning treatment providers, friends and families of the subjects may have provided a clearer understanding of the subjects’ masculinity.

References

- Abel, G., Osborn, C., & Twigg, D. (1993). Sexual assault through the life span. Adult offenders with juvenile histories. In H. Barbaree, W. Marshall & S. Hudson (Eds.), *The juvenile sex offender* (pp. 104-117). New York: Guilford.
- Alexander, M.A. (1999). Sexual offender treatment efficacy revisited. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, *11*, 101-116.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th Ed., text revision). Washington, DC: Author.
- Barbaree, H. (1997). Evaluating treatment efficacy with sexual offenders: The insensitivity of recidivism studies to treatment effects. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, *9*, 111-128.
- Baron, R.M., & Kenny, D.A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*(6), 1173-1182.
- Berkowitz, A.D. (2002). Fostering men's responsibility for preventing sexual assault. In P.A. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing violence in relationships: Interventions across the lifespan* (pp. 153–196). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Berkowitz, L. (1993). *Aggression: Its causes, consequences, and control*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Blakemore, S., & Choudhury, S. (2006). Development of the adolescent brain: implications for executive function and social cognition. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *47*(3/4), 296-312.

- Bullens, R., Wijk, A., & Mali, B. (2006). Similarities and difference between the criminal careers of Dutch juvenile sex offenders and non-sex offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 12*(2), 155-164.
- Burt, M.R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(2), 217-230.
- Chambers, R.A., & Potenza, M.N. (2003). Neurodevelopment, impulsivity, and adolescent gambling. *Journal of Gambling Studies, 19*(1), 53-84.
- Cornell, D.G., Warren, J., Hawk, G., Stafford, E., Oram, G., & Pine, D. (1996). Psychopathy in instrumental and reactive violent offenders. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*, 783–790.
- Farr, C., Brown, J., & Beckett, R. (2004). Ability to empathise and masculinity levels: Comparing male adolescent sex offenders with a normative sample of non-offending adolescents. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 10*(2), 155-167.
- Figueredo, A.J., Sales, B.D., Russell, K.P., Becker, J.V., & Kaplan, M. (2000). A Brunswikian evolutionary-developmental theory of adolescent sex offending. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 18*, 309-329.
- Frith, U. (2001). Mind blindness and the brain in autism. *Neuron, 32*, 969-979.
- Gale, S. R. (1996). *Male role norm endorsement and acquaintance sexual aggression among college students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Garnets, L., & Pleck, J.H. (1979). Sex role identity, androgyny, and sex role transcendence. A sex role strain analysis. *The Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3*(3), 270-283.

- Geen, R.G. (1990). *Human aggression*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Gerhold, C.K., Browne, K.D., & Beckett, R. (2007). Predicting recidivism in adolescent sexual offenders. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*(4), 427-438.
- Guy, L.S., Poythress, N.G., Douglas, K.S., Skeem J.L., & Edens, J.F. (2008). Correspondence between self-report and interview-based assessments of antisocial personality disorder. *Psychological Assessment, 20*(1), 47–54.
- Hall, G., & Nagayama, C. (1995). Sexual offender recidivism revisited: A meta-analysis of recent treatment studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63*, 802-809.
- Hall, G.C.N., Sue, S., Narang, D.S., & Lilly, R.S. (2000). Culture-specific models of men's sexual aggression: Intra- and interpersonal determinants. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 6*(3), 252-268.
- Hare, R.D. (1991). *The hare psychopathy checklist-revised manual*. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R.D. (1996). Psychopathy: A clinical construct whose time has come. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 23*, 25–54.
- Hare, R.D. (1999). Psychopathy as a risk factor for violence. *Psychiatric Quarterly, 70*(3), 181-197.
- Hare, R.D. (2003). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised Manual (2nd ed.)*. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-Health Systems.
- Hendriks, J., & Bijleveld, J.H. (2006). Female adolescent sex offenders- an exploratory study. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 12*(1), 31-41.

- Hooper, C.J., Luciana, M., Conklin, H.M., & Yarger, R.S. (2004). Adolescents' performance on the development of decision making and ventromedial prefrontal cortex. *Developmental Psychology, 40*, 1148-1158.
- Hunter, J.A. (2004). Developmental pathways in youth sexual aggression and delinquency: Risk factors and mediators. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*(4), 233-242.
- Hunter, J.A. (2006). Understanding diversity in juvenile sexual offenders: Implications for assessment, treatment, and legal management. In R. Longo & D. Prescott (Eds.), *Current Perspectives: Working with Sexually Aggressive Youth & Youth with Sexual Behavior Problems* (pp. 63-77). Holyoke, MA: NEARI Press.
- Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., & Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perpetration of relationship violence. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 3*, 97-106.
- Kanin, E.J. (1984). Date rape: Unofficial criminals and victims. *Victimology, 9*, 95.
- Kanin, E.J. (1985). Date rapists: Differential sexual socialization and relative deprivation. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 14*, 219-231.
- Knight, R.A. (1999). Validation of a typology for rapists. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 297-323.
- Knight, R.A., & Cerce, D.D. (1999). Validation and revision of the multidimensional assessment of sex and aggression. *Psychologica Belgica, 39*(2), 135-161.
- Knight, R.A., & Sims-Knight, J.E. (2004). Testing an etiological model for male juvenile sexual offending against females. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 13*(3-4), 33-55.

- Lane, S., & Lobanov-Rostovsky, C. (1997). Special populations. In G. Ryan & S. Lane (Eds.), *Juvenile sexual offending* (pp. 322-359). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leon-Carrion, J., Garcia-Orza, J., & Perez-Santamaria, F.J. (2004). The development of the inhibitory component of the executive functions in children and adolescents. *International Journal of Neuroscience, 114*, 1291-1311.
- Levant, R. F., & Fischer, J. (1998). The male role norms inventory. In C. M. Davis, W. H. Yarber, R. Bauserman, G. Schreer, & S. L. Davis (Eds.), *Sexuality-related measures: A compendium (2nd. ed.)*, (pp. 469-472). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Levant, R.F., Hirsch, L., Celentano, E., Cozza, T., Hill, S., MacEachern, et al. (1992). The male role: An investigation of norms and stereotypes. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14*, 325-337.
- Levant, R.F., & Richmond, K. (2007). A review of research on masculinity ideologies using the male role norms inventory. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 15*(2), 130-146.
- Luciana, M., Conklin, H.M., Cooper, C.J., & Yarger, R.S. (2005). The development of nonverbal working memory and executive control processes in adolescents. *Child Development, 76*, 697-712.
- Luna, B., Garver, K.E., Urban, T.A., Lazar, N.A., & Sweeney, J.A. (2004). Maturation of cognitive processes from late childhood to adulthood. *Child Development, 75*, 1357-1372.
- Malamuth, N.M. (1998). The confluence model as an organizing framework for research on sexually aggressive men: Risk moderators, imagined aggression, and pornography consumption. In R.G. Geen & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Human*

- aggression: Theories, research, and implications for social policy* (pp. 229-245). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Malamuth, N.M., Linz, D., Heavey, C.L., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(2), 353- 369.
- Malamuth, N.M., & Malamuth, E.Z. (1999). Integrating multiple levels of scientific analysis and the confluence model of sexual coercers. *Jurimetrics*, *39*, 157-179.
- Messerschmidt, J.W. (2000). Becoming "real men" adolescent masculinity challenges and sexual violence. *Men and Masculinities*, *2*(3), 286-307.
- Millon, T. (1993). *Millon adolescent clinical inventory: Manual*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- Millon, T., & Davis, R. (1996). *Disorders of personality DSM-IV and beyond*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Moffitt, T.E. (1993). Adolescent-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, *100*(4), 674-701.
- Moffitt, T.E., Caspi, A., Rutter, M., & Silva, P.A. (2001). *Sex differences in antisocial behavior: Conduct disorder, delinquency, and violence in the dunedin longitudinal study*. New York: Cambridge.
- Morton, T.L., Farris, K.L., & Brenowitz, L.H. (2002). MMPI-A scores and high points of male juvenile delinquents: Scales 4, 5, and 6 as markers of juvenile delinquency. *Psychological Assessment*, *14*(3), 311-319.

- Mosher, D. L., & Sirkin, M. (1984). Measuring a macho personality constellation. *Journal of Research in Personality, 18*, 150–163.
- Murnen, S.K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If “boys will be boys,” then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 46*(11/12), 359-375.
- Norris, J., George, W., Cue Davis, K., Martell, J., & Leonesio, R. (1999). Alcohol and hypermasculinity as determinants of men’s empathic responses to violent pornography. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 683-700.
- Ochsner, K.N. (2004). Current directions in social cognitive neuroscience. *Current Opinions in Neurobiology, 14*, 254-258.
- O'Connor, W. (1996). A problem-solving intervention for sex offenders with an intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability, 21*, 219-236.
- Oliver, L.L., & Chambers, K. (1993). Introduction: Etiology and assessment. In G.C. Nagayama Hall, R. Hirschman, J.R. Graham, & M.S. Zaragoza (Eds.), *Sexual aggression: Issues in etiology, assessment, and treatment* (pp.7-16). Washington: Taylor & Francis.
- Patterson, G.R. (1996). Some characteristics of a developmental theory for early onset delinquency. In M.F. Lenzenweger & J.J. Haugaard (Eds.), *Frontiers of developmental psychopathology* (pp. 81-124). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pleck, J.H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Prescott, D., & Longo, R.E. (2006). Current perspectives: Working with young people who sexually abuse. In R. Longo & D. Prescott (Eds.), *Current perspectives: Working with sexually aggressive youth & youth with sexual behavior problems* (pp. 45-61). Holyoke, MA: NEARI Press.
- Raine, A., & Dunkin, J. (1990). The genetic and psychophysiological basis of antisocial behavior: Implications for counseling and therapy. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 68*, 637-644.
- Ray, J.A., & English, D. (1995). Comparison of female and male children with sexual behavior problems. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24*, 439-451.
- Rowe, D.C., Vazsonyi, A.T., & Figueredo, A.J. (1997). Mating-effort in adolescence: A conditional or alternative strategy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 23*(1), 105-115.
- Salekin, R.T. (2006). Psychopathy in children and adolescents: Key issues in conceptualization and assessment. In C.J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy* (pp. 389-414). New York: Guilford Press.
- Serin, R.C., Mailloux, D.L., & Malcolm, P.B. (2001). Psychopathy, deviant sexual arousal and recidivism among sexual offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*, 234-247.
- Siegel, D.J. (1999). *The developing mind: How relationships and the brain interact to shape who we are*. New York: Guilford.
- Sowell, E.R., Thompson, P.M., Tessner, K.D., & Toga, A.W. (2001). Mapping continued brain growth and gray matter density reduction in dorsal frontal cortex: inverse

- relationships during postadolescent brain maturation. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *21*, 8819-8829.
- Snyder, H.N. (2006). Juvenile arrests 2006. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Retrieved May 10, 2008, from <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/crime/qa05101.asp?qaDate=2006>.
- Vincent, G.M., Vitacco, M.J., Grisso, T., & Corrado, R.R. (2003). Subtypes of adolescent offenders: Affective traits and antisocial behavior patterns. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *21*, 695-712.
- Whitehead, S.M., & Barrett, F.J. (2001). The sociology of masculinity. In S.M. Whitehead & F.J. Barrett (Eds.), *The masculinities reader* (pp. 1-26). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Woodworth, M., & Porter, S. (2002). In cold blood: Characteristics of criminal homicides as a function of psychopathy. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *111*, 436-445.
- Zakireh, B., Ronis, S. T., & Knight, R.A. (2008). *Individual beliefs, attitudes, and victimization histories of male juvenile sexual offenders*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Macho-man: A close look at the relationship between masculinity and criminality in
sexually offending and nonsexually offending juveniles

Adam Brown

Smith College School for Social Work

Abstract

Although the endorsement of masculine beliefs has long been correlated to sexual and general aggressivity in adult males (Lisak, Hopper & Song, 1996; Lisak & Roth, 1990), researchers have historically ignored how traditional masculinity might also engender a culture of offending in some boys as they develop into adolescents (Messerschmidt, 2000). In a sample of 502 juvenile sexually and nonsexually offending juveniles, masculine beliefs are examined. The sample is then sub-divided into four theoretically constructed mutually exclusive groups: 1) Rapists, 2) Child Molesters, 3) Violent Juvenile Delinquents (no sexual aggressivity), and 4) Nonviolent Juvenile Delinquents (no sexual aggressivity). Masculinity is measured in each of the four groups to assess the group differences. None of the assumptions about masculinity were supported. Furthermore, the subjects across all subgroups largely responded, on average, with a 'no opinion' response to most of the masculinity questions. Further research is needed using different measurements of masculinity and/or the creation of an age-appropriate measure of masculinity.

Article III

Macho-man: A close look at the relationship between masculinity and criminality in sexually offending and nonsexually offending juveniles

Literature Review

Juvenile sexual and nonsexual criminal offending has elicited much concern from researchers and continues to be a serious issue today (Barbaree, Hudson & Seto, 1993; Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1998; Patterson, DeBaryshe & Ramsey, 1989; Patterson, Reid & Eddy, 2002). In 2006, the United States Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention reported an estimate of more 2,200,000 juvenile arrests, with more than 19,500 of those arrests for sex-related crimes (not including prostitution) (Snyder, 2006). While sobering in number, it is estimated that the number of crimes reported by agencies and the offenders themselves represent a fraction of the actual crimes committed and unreported (Baker, Tabacoff, Tornusciolo & Eisenstadt, 2001; Loeber & Farrington, 1998; Righthand & Welch, 2001).

Violent offending is distinct from other criminal behavior in that the offender uses or threatens to use violent force upon the victim, whether force is the object of the offense (e.g. assault) or the means to an end (e.g. robbery). Sexual violence is specific behavior which involves touching another person in a sexual way without consent or with an inappropriately aged person or a person who cannot give consent due to power, age, or other differences. Violent juvenile offenders (both sexual and nonsexual) are of particular concern because they tend to be the most versatile and frequent offenders, starting younger and continuing later, and having high instances of co-occurring nonviolent criminality and other problematic behaviors (Farrington & Loeber, 2000).

In the United States in 2006, males accounted for 71% of all juvenile arrests (both sexual and nonsexual) and 83% of all violent criminal arrests (Snyder, 2006). When isolating sexual criminality only (other than forcible rape and prostitution), males accounted for 90% of all arrests. For the most extreme violent offense of forcible rape, males represented 98% of all juveniles arrested. Therefore, in looking at criminality among juvenile offenders (violent and nonviolent, sexual and nonsexual), it is not surprising that researchers sometimes acknowledge the presence of masculine beliefs in the epidemiology of offenders (Hunter, Figueredo, Malamuth & Becker, 2003; Knight & Simms-Knight, 2004; Reilly, Muldoon & Byrne, 2004; Zakireh, Ronis & Knight, 2008). What is surprising is that, while feminist writing in the last 30 years has made great gains in understanding how traditional femininity has engendered a culture of victimhood among many girls as they develop into adolescence (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Ferraro, 1996; Gilligan, 1982, 1990), researchers have historically ignored how traditional masculinity might also engender a culture of offending in some boys as they develop into adolescence (Messerschmidt, 2000). Consequently, no single measure of masculine attitudes in relation to sexual offending has yet been standardized in adolescents (Farr, Brown & Beckett, 2004).

In adult offender research, many direct links between violent offenders and masculine beliefs have been made. For example, men who endorse rape-supportive attitudes towards women tend to present with multiple masculine ideologies simultaneously, including hostility toward women (Lisak & Roth, 1990), risk-taking, highly competitive and power-seeking behavior, (Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes & Acker, 1995), an attitude that danger is exciting and violence is manly (Mosher &

Anderson, 1986), and promiscuous behavior consequent to seeking sexual conquests (Malamuth et al., 1995). In nonsexually violent men, masculine beliefs have also been associated with increased general violence (Lisak, Hopper & Song, 1996), while the management of perceived threats to masculinity has been found to correlate to domestic-partner violence (Schwartz, Waldo & Daniel, 2005). Adult child molesters, on the other hand, do not typically endorse any of these traditional masculine beliefs (Mann & Hollin, 2007).

The few studies which have considered masculinity in juvenile sexual and nonsexual offenders have done so with a broad brush in terms of linking violent and nonviolent offenses to the endorsement of masculine beliefs (Farr et al., 2004; Hunter et al., 2003; Knight & Sims-Knight, 2004; Zakireh et al., 2008). Furthermore, the masculinity measurements used in each of these studies vary, presenting a challenge to those looking to make broader connections between juvenile criminality and the endorsement of masculine beliefs.

In a sample of 502 juvenile sexual offenders and nonsexually offending juvenile delinquents, masculine beliefs are examined. The sample is then sub-divided into four groups: 1) sexual offenders of peers and adult women (rapists), 2) sexual offenders of children (child molesters), 3) nonsexually offending violent juvenile delinquents (violent juvenile delinquents), and 4) nonsexually offending nonviolent juvenile delinquents (nonviolent juvenile delinquents). No subject is included in more than one category. For example, if an individual has sexually abused children as well as peers or adult women, that person is in Group 1, as he is believed to be more indiscriminate in his offenses and

therefore more violent than an individual who would choose child victims only (in accordance with adult literature already mentioned).

Using extant literature on adult and juvenile offenders, it is hypothesized that Groups 1 (rapists) & 3 (violent juvenile delinquents) will endorse the highest traditional masculine beliefs, as general violence seems to be a strong predictor of masculine beliefs both sexual and nonsexual (Lisak & Beszterczey, 2007; Malamuth et al., 1995). The next highest masculinity score hypothesized is Group 2 (child molesters). The hypothesis that child molesting juveniles will endorse higher levels of masculinity than nonviolent juvenile delinquents stands in contrast to what is known of adult child molesters, who do not typically endorse masculine beliefs (Mann & Hollin, 2007), but molest for more cognitively distorted reasons (Abel, Becker & Cunningham-Rathner, 1984; Mihailides, Devilly & Ward, 2004). Schwartz et al. (2005) found that adult males who abuse their female partners often do so for two reasons: 1) as a consequence of shame related to perceived threats to their power at work and in the community and 2) the presence of low self-esteem combined with high emotionality. If we replace these adult issues of power at work and in the community with age-appropriate juvenile issues of power at school and with peer relations out of school, the model fits for reason 1. Reason 2, however, is not age specific. Therefore, it is hypothesized that juveniles who molest children typically do so for reasons more reflective of adult partner violence- as a masculine expression of power and control- rather than for the more cognitively distorted reasons seen in adult child molesters.

As noted, any sexual offense in this study will have a victim and therefore be considered an act of violence. Therefore, Group 4 (nonviolent juvenile delinquents) is

hypothesized to have the lowest levels of masculine beliefs, as there is no expression of violence on another individual; nonsexual and nonviolent offending (e.g. drug dealing) has not previously been correlated to masculine beliefs in juveniles or adults.

Methods

After consents were obtained, confidential data were collected from sexually offending and nonsexually offending youth in six residential facilities in a Midwestern state. The original sample was comprised of 331 adolescent males incarcerated for sexual offenses and 171 adolescent males incarcerated for other crimes (juvenile delinquents). For hypothesis testing, youth were then placed into four categories (N = 378): 1) Rapists (peer or adult) (n = 45, 11.9%), Child Molesters (sexually abused children only) (n = 174, 46.0%), Violent Juvenile Delinquents (nonsexually offending) (n = 79, 20.9%), and Nonviolent Juvenile Delinquents (nonsexually offending) (n = 80, 21.2%).

When comparing demographics using an ANOVA ($F = 4.91, p = .006$), there was a significant age difference between the rapists and the child molesters ($p = .01$), as well as between the rapists and the nonviolent juvenile delinquents ($p = .02$) in post hoc Scheffe tests (see Table 1). However, despite this significance, these differences amount to less than one year and therefore are not meaningful to this study. There were no group differences on grade ($F = 2.6, p = .052$); the group was in the 9th grade on average ($SD = 1.52$ years).

Table 1: Age by group

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Rapists	44	17.30	1.50
Child Molesters	169	16.43	1.70
Violent Juvenile Delinquents	75	16.49	1.26
Nonviolent Juvenile Delinquents	78	16.41	1.26
Total	366	16.54	1.53

Measures

Socially Desirable Responding

The Millon Adolescent Clinical Inventory (MACI) (Millon, 1993) was designed for youth in treatment or correctional facilities. It was normed on 579 adolescents in treatment facilities with two smaller cross-validation samples. The scales are derived from the 160 True-False items based on Millon’s theory of personality (Millon & Davis, 1996). The entire MACI was used to determine social desirability, with example questions including, “I would much rather follow someone than be the leader” and “I probably deserve many of the problems I have.” Data from eight youth were eliminated from the study using Millon’s validity scoring procedures. For the violence measure, only one item was used from the MACI, as described below.

Violence

Elliot, Huizinga and Ageton’s (1985) Self-Reported Delinquency (SRD) measure was used to assess violent behavior. This scale is comprised of 32 items which asked the juveniles to give the best estimate of the number of times they had engaged in the activity listed during the year before entering prison and is scored: 1 = “Did not do,” 2 = “Once a month,” 3 = “Once every 2-3 weeks,” 4 = “Once a week,” 5 = “2-3 times a week,” 6 =

“Once a day,” and 7 = “2-3 times per day.” The subscale to measure violence included four questions, including “Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting or killing that person” and “Used strong-arm methods to get money or things from people.” Additionally, one question from the MACI was added to the measure of nonsexual violence. From the MACI, respondents were expected to answer “True” or “False” to the question “I sometimes get pleasure by hurting someone physically,” and were scored 0 for “False” and 1 for “True.”

Therefore, the total violence scale was created using five questions. Four of these were from the SRD (items 9, 12, 17 and 24) and one from the MACI (item 97).

Cronbach’s reliability for this created scale showed $\alpha = .73$. (See Table 2 for exact questions).

Table 2: Violence subscale questions

SRD 9 “In the year before I was arrested, I attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting or killing that person.”

SRD 12 “In the year before I was arrested, I was involved in gang fights.”

SRD 17 “In the year before I was arrested, I hit or threatened to hit my supervisor or another employee.”

SRD 24 “In the year before I was arrested, I used force or strong-arm methods to get money or things from people.”

MACI 97 “I sometimes get pleasure by hurting someone physically.”

Masculinity

The Male Role Norms Inventory (MNRI) (Levant et al., 1992; Levant & Fischer, 1998) was developed to assess traditional and nontraditional masculine beliefs across a diverse population of males. The MRNI differs from many masculinity scales insofar as it measures male norms without making direct comparisons to women, which have been

suggested to affect reliability, as gender-specific questions could affect the subject's self-esteem and responses if he senses that an idiosyncratic trait in his personality is associated with femininity rather than masculinity (Garnets & Pleck, 1979; Pleck, 1981). Fifty-two opinions are offered on the MRNI, asking respondents how they felt before they were arrested, using the following scoring: 1 = "Strongly Disagree," 2 = "Disagree," 3 = "Slightly Disagree," 4 = "No Opinion," 5 = "Slightly Agree," 6 = "Agree," and 7 = "Strongly Agree." Examples of MRNI questions include "One should not be able to tell how a man is feeling by looking at his face" and "A man shouldn't have to worry about birth control." The MRNI has consistently been shown to be a reliable tool in assessing masculine beliefs for more than 15 years (Levant & Richmond, 2007), and in college-age students, has been shown to be predictive of both general sexual aggression with rape supportive attitudes and relationship violence (Gale, 1996; Jakupcak, Lisak & Roemer, 2002). Subscales were created which were believed to be more appropriate for juveniles than the total MRNI but showed poor and unusable reliabilities with Cronbach's alpha ranging from $\alpha = .32$ to $\alpha = .60$. Subsequently, the total traditional MRNI scale was used, showing an acceptable alpha ($\alpha = .87$), and used for further analysis.

Administration

Confidential data were collected using pencil and paper surveys from six residential facilities in a Midwestern state. The surveys were administered in small (8-12) group format in classrooms; however, participants were separated to ensure that they could not view each other's responses. The youth were not provided with an incentive to complete the survey.

Results

In a 4 way ANOVA, ($F = 1.7, p = .169$) no difference was found between the four groups on the MRNI total masculinity score (see Table 3).

Table 3: MRNI total traditional by group

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Rapists	42	3.9412	.94001
Child Molesters	162	3.8899	.85316
Violent Juvenile Delinquents	72	4.1333	.71546
Nonviolent Juvenile Delinquents	71	4.0541	.79518
Total	347	3.9802	.82848

Using a simple t test, the nonsexually offending youth have significantly higher average MRNI scores ($M = 4.10, SD = .83$) than the sexually offending youth ($M = 3.9, SD = .84$) ($t = 2.35, p = .019$).

Discussion

The results indicate that there is no meaningful difference in masculine beliefs among the four groups. While the t test shows a significant difference in masculine beliefs between all sexually offending juveniles and all nonsexually offending juvenile delinquents in the sample, the mean difference between the answers is less than .2 points out of a possible 5 points, which amounts to very little, if anything, in actual question content. This is a surprising finding, because male juveniles account for 71% of all juvenile crime, with the percentage increasing to 83% for all violent crime and 98% for all forcible rape (Snyder, 2006). The hypothesis was that the higher the percentage of exclusively male criminality, the higher the masculinity quotient among the criminal population, which has been suggested in adult research on masculinity and violent

behavior (Lisak et al., 1996; Mann & Hollin, 2007). Also surprising was that the answers consistently given among all four groups most closely corresponded to having no opinion at all on masculine beliefs, as opposed to universal endorsement or denial. Malamuth et al. (1995) found that sexually aggressive college-age men (average age = 23) who held hostile-masculine beliefs largely retained these beliefs when followed-up on ten years later, suggesting that these beliefs are deeply ingrained, long-lasting, and predictive of behavior. While the subjects in the current study are different with respect to a number of demographics to those in the Malamuth study (e.g. grade-level and institutional setting), subjects in both studies are close enough in age for one to believe that a measure of masculinity should have yielded some difference between groups in the current study, if not showing higher scores among the violent juveniles.

While Gale (1996) found a positive correlation between acquaintance rape among college males and MRNI scores, it is possible that masculinity as measured by the Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI) was the not the best choice for this study, as past masculinity findings associated with sexual and general aggression have measured masculinity using a variety of different measures (Malamuth et al., 1995; Pleck, Sonenstein & Ku, 1994). The process of assessing masculinity in juveniles specifically is complicated by the fact that, at the time of data collection, no measure had been created to do so. Therefore, the measure chosen was done so according to what seemed to be the best choice for juveniles, without having a measure already empirically tested on this population.

Implications

Research

The design and testing of more appropriate measures for assessing masculinity in juveniles is essential to future analyses. While the results here were unable to separate the groups in terms of masculine beliefs using the current instrument, there is too much empirical adult offender research demonstrating the relationship between masculinity, violence, and sexual offending to accept the results in this study as evidence that there is no relationship between masculinity and juvenile offending. Adolescent-specific measurements which control for the differences in cognition between adolescents and adults, the life experiences, and cultural influences should be explored. It is also important to consider that gender norms are understood and internalized in ways which are rapidly changing. Perhaps it is becoming necessary to restructure how we think about the meaning of gender and how it is understood cross-culturally (e.g. the growing acceptance of homosexuality and the presence of women in traditionally male high-power jobs in western cultures). In terms of violent behavior, it is possible that male hostility is a more useful tool than masculine beliefs in general.

Treatment

Helping adolescent boys in their attempts to establish identities as men is particularly challenging when so many cultural mores equate “act like a man” with violence, dominance, and control. Without an appropriate measure of hostile masculinity for the population at this time, it becomes more challenging for treatment providers to cull out variables within the population that might predict recidivism as it relates to masculine beliefs, as can be done with adult men (Lisak & Beszterczey, 2007). In talk

therapy, exploring triggers for aggression and the need to dominate others might help the clients make connections between managing affect and acting-out.

Limitations

Despite using multiple facilities, this study was limited by using offenders from one state only. Along with a larger sample size, subjects from varying geographic populations will aid future analyses. A control group of non-offending juvenile males should be used in the future, as finding standards of measurement for masculinity in adolescents is still very much in the trial phases. Also, despite controlling for truthfulness with the MACI lie scale, the subjects' self-report increases the chance of deception. Questioning treatment providers, friends and families of the subjects may have provided a clearer understanding of the subjects' masculinity.

References

- Abel, G.G., Becker, J.V., & Cunningham-Rather, J. (1984). Complications, consent, and cognitions in sex between children and adults. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 7, 89-103.
- Baker, A.J., Tabacoff, R., Tornusciolo, G., & Eisenstadt, M. (2001). Calculating number of offenses and victims of juvenile sexual offending: The role of posttreatment disclosures. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research & Treatment*, 13(2), 79-90.
- Barbaree, H.E., Hudson, S.M., & Seto, M.C. (1993). Sexual assault in society: The role of the juvenile offender. In H.E. Barbaree, W.L. & S.M. Hudson (Eds.), *The juvenile sex offender* (pp. 1-24). New York: Guilford Press.
- Brown, L.M., & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girl's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. London: Open Books.
- Elliot, D.S., Huizinga, D., & Ageton, S.S., (1985). *Explaining delinquency and drug use*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Farr, C., Brown, J., & Beckett, R. (2004). Ability to empathise and masculinity levels: Comparing male adolescent sex offenders with a normative sample of non-offending adolescents. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 10(2), 155-167.
- Farrington, D.P., & Loeber, R. (2000). Epidemiology of juvenile violence. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 9(4), 733-748.
- Ferraro, K.F. (1996). Women's fear of victimization: Shadow of sexual assault? *Social Forces*, 75, 667-690.

- Gale, S. R. (1996). *Male role norm endorsement and acquaintance sexual aggression among college students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Garnets, L., & Pleck, J.H. (1979). Sex role identity, androgyny, and sex role transcendence. A sex role strain analysis. *The Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 3(3), 270-283.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1990). Joining the resistance: Psychology, politics, girls and women. *Michigan Quarterly Review*, 39(4), 501-531.
- Hill, M.S., & Fischer, A.R. (2001). Does entitlement mediate the link between masculinity and rape-related variables? *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48(1), 39-50.
- Hunter, J.A., Figueredo, A.J., Malamuth, N.M., & Becker, J.V. (2003). Juvenile sex offenders: Toward the development of a typology. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 15(1), 27-48.
- Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., & Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perpetration of relationship violence. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 3, 97-106.
- Knight, R.A., & Sims-Knight, J.E. (2004). Testing an etiological model for male juvenile sexual offending against females. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 13(3-4), 33-55.
- Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L., Celentano, E., Cozza, T., Hill, S., MacEachern, et al. (1992). The male role: An investigation of norms and stereotypes. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 14, 325-337.

- Levant, R.F., & Richmond, K. (2007). A review of research on masculinity ideologies using the male role norms inventory. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 15*(2), 130-146.
- Lisak, D., Hopper, J., & Song, P. (1996). Factors in the cycle of violence: Gender rigidity and emotional constriction. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 9*(4), 721-743.
- Lisak, D., & Roth, S. (1990). Motives and psychodynamics of self-reported, unincarcerated rapists. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 60*, 268–280.
- Lisak, D., & Beszterczey, S. (2007). The cycle of violence: The life histories of 43 death row inmates. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 8*(2), 118-128.
- Loeber, R., & Farrington, D.P. (1998). Executive summary. In R. Loeber, & D.P. Farrington (Eds.), *Serious & violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions* (pp. xix-xxv). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1998). Development of juvenile aggression and violence: Some common misconceptions and controversies. *American Psychologist, 53*, 242–259.
- Malamuth, N.M., Linz, D., Heavey, C.L., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(2), 353- 369.
- Mann, R.E., & Hollin, C.R. (2007). Sexual offenders' explanations for their offending. *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 13*(1), 3-9.
- Messerschmidt, J.W. (2000). Becoming “real men” adolescent masculinity challenges

- and sexual violence. *Men and Masculinities*, 2(3), 286-307.
- Mihailides, S., Devilly, G.J., & Ward, T. (2004). Implicit cognitive distortions and sexual offending. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 16(4), 333-350.
- Millon, T. (1993). *Millon adolescent clinical inventory: Manual*. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.
- Millon, T., & Davis, R. (1996). *Disorders of personality DSM-IV and beyond*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mosher D. L., & Anderson, R. D. (1986). Macho personality, sexual aggression, and reactions to imagery of realistic rape. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 20, 77-94.
- Murnen, S.K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If “boys will be boys,” then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles*, 46(11/12), 359-375.
- Patterson, G. R., DeBaryshe, B. D., & Ramsey, E. (1989). A developmental perspective of antisocial behavior. *American Psychologist*, 44, 329–335.
- Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Eddy, J. M. (2002). A brief history of the Oregon model. In J. B. Reid, G. R. Patterson, & J. Snyder (Eds.), *Antisocial behavior in children and adolescents: A developmental analysis and model for intervention*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Pleck, J.H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pleck, J.H., Sonenstein, F.L., & Ku, L.C. (1994). Attitudes toward male roles among adolescent males: A discriminant validity analysis. *Sex Roles*, 30(7/8), 481-501.

- Reilly, J., Muldoon, O.T., & Byrne, C. (2004). Young men as victims and perpetrators of violence in Northern Ireland: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(3), 469-484.
- Righthand, S., & Welch, C. (2001). *Juveniles who have sexually offended: A review of the professional literature*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Schwartz, J.P., Waldo, M., & Daniel, D. (2005). Gender-role conflict and self-esteem: Factors associated with partner abuse in court-referred men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 6(2), 109-113.
- Snyder, H.N. (2006). Juvenile arrests 2006. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Retrieved May 10, 2008, from <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/crime/qa05101.asp?qaDate=2006>.
- Zakireh, B., Ronis, S. T., & Knight, R. A. (2008). *Individual beliefs, attitudes, and victimization histories of male juvenile sexual offenders*. Manuscript submitted for publication.