10

PERSONALITY AND BEHAVIOR

Personality represents a second group of offender characteristics that can be used to make predictions about behavior in a science of profiling. Studies of offender personality are valuable to profiling in that they identify the range of attitudes, dispositions, beliefs, and other personality traits or states that may operate within the realm of offending and offenders. For the purpose of building a science of profiling, it is critical to relate information about personality to behaviors and crime scene evidence. Although most studies in the extant literature do not explicitly link personality characteristics to behaviors within the context of offending, there is a considerable amount of personality research available on which to build (see, e.g., the discussion in this chapter). The task at hand is to examine the current state of the personality literature on offending; identify its strengths and weaknesses; and consider ways to improve offender personality research, with a specific eye toward relating personality characteristics to behavior and crime scene evidence to produce information that will be useful to investigations. This chapter describes how to accomplish this task, using the example of personality research in sex offending.

DISCERNING PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS: THE STUDY OF SEX OFFENDING

Sex offending provides a good example of the use of personality characteristics in profiling. For example, the models of profiling make special note

of sex offenses. Holmes and Holmes (1996) listed sadistic torture in sex assaults, rape, lust and mutilation murder, and child molesting as some of the crimes most appropriate for profiling. Likewise, Douglas, Ressler, Burgess, and Hartman's (1986) model states that rapists lend themselves to profiling techniques and that profiling has been of "particular usefulness" (p. 405) in investigating serial sexual homicides. In addition, within the clinical psychological literature, studies of sex offenders have burgeoned over the last 20 years, and a significant portion of this literature has been devoted to the study of personality characteristics (e.g., Burgess, Hartman, Ressler, Douglas, & McCormack, 1986; Canter & Gregory, 1994; Dale, Davies, & Wei, 1997; Davies, Wittebrood, & Jackson, 1997; Dietz, Hazelwood, & Warren, 1990; Gratzer & Bradford, 1995; Kaufman, Hilliker, Lathrop, & Daleiden, 1993; Ressler, Burgess, Douglas, Hartman, & D'Agostino, 1986). In general, these studies have been conducted in an attempt to differentiate among types of offenders for the purposes of planning treatment and predicting recidivism. Some of these studies, however, also attempt to relate offense behaviors to personality characteristics and relate personality to other offender characteristics.

At the outset, it is important to note that the overwhelming majority of the literature examining personality and sex offending consists of empirical studies that use self-report personality inventories, including the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI; Hathaway & McKinley, 1983), the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI; Millon, 1982), and the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ; Eysenck, 1973). Also within the clinical literature are reported findings from studies of researchers using projective tests such as the Rorschach Inkblot Test (Rorschach, 1921) and the Thematic Apperception Test (Murray, 1943). As discussed in chapter 5, projective tests have come under increased scrutiny, and their use within the scientific psychological community is not encouraged (Lilienfeld, Wood, & Garb, 2000). For this reason, findings from these studies will not be considered.

It is also important to recall the person-versus-situation debate within personality psychology, which is described in chapter 8. Although there has been considerable disagreement over whether personality is composed of traits or more situation-specific states, with the recent consensus being that personality is best understood situationally, much of the offender and clinical literature treats personality as a trait-based construct. The studies that are discussed in the following section are all clinical in nature, and the reader should therefore expect a bias toward the understanding of personality as a trait-based construct unless otherwise indicated.

The sex offender literature on personality described in the following section discusses and compares three main groups of offenders: juveniles,

adult child molesters, and adult rapists. Some studies examined these groups separately, whereas other studies examined combinations of offender types. For the purposes of this chapter, the literature on juveniles is considered in a single section. Although it is certainly the case that juvenile sex offenders can also be subdivided into those who offend against younger children and those who offend against older individuals or peers, the majority of sex offenses committed by juveniles appears to be perpetrated against younger children (G. E. Davis & Leitenberg, 1987). In addition, the empirical study of juvenile sex offending is still in its infancy, particularly compared with the study of adult sex offending, and the primary task in the study of juveniles has been to conduct research to validate clinical impressions. For this reason, the literature on juvenile sex offender personality is considerably smaller than that of adult sex offender personality, with few studies differentiating or comparing offenders according to victim age.

Juvenile Sex Offenders

The sex offender literature indicates that juvenile sex offenders are a heterogeneous population across many dimensions of assessment (Becker, 1998; Becker, Harris, & Sales, 1993; G. E. Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Hunter, Hazelwood, & Slesinger, 2000; Worling, 1995). Because of this variability in juvenile sex offender characteristics, researchers have attempted to identify subgroups of offenders to facilitate treatment planning and assist in dispositional decision making. Juvenile sex offenders have thus been distinguished by demographics (Graves, Openshaw, Ascione, & Ericksen, 1996), crime type (Hagan & Cho, 1996), psychopathology (Kavoussi, Kaplan, & Becker, 1988), and family environment (Kaplan, Becker, & Cunningham-Rathner, 1988).

In addition, juvenile sex offenders have been described according to personality. Personality studies that have used a variety of self-report inventories have elicited clusters of personality traits that reportedly distinguish juvenile sex offenders from nonoffenders as well as from other types of juvenile offenders. For example, structural equation models examining the influence of personality on juvenile-perpetrated child molestation show adolescent child molesters to have deficits in self-confidence, independence, assertiveness, and self-satisfaction. Adolescent sex offenders appear to be more pessimistic and self-blaming compared with nonperpetrating youth (Hunter & Figueredo, 2000). Adolescent sex offenders also show higher scores on the Schizophrenia and Psychopathic Deviate scales of the MMPI than do non-sex offenders (Losada-Paisey, 1998). On Cattell's High School Personality Questionnaire (Cattell & Cattell, 1969), compared with oppositional-defiant adolescents, adolescent sex offenders have been found

to be detached, self-indulgent, followers of others, and frustrated (Moody, Brissie, & Kim, 1994). These adolescent sex offenders have also been characterized as being impatient, demanding, and impulsive.

Other measures of personality have also elucidated clusters of traits that distinguish among different types of juvenile sex offenders. For example, adolescents who offend against younger children have demonstrated higher scores on the Schizoid, Avoidant, and Dependent scales of the MCMI, whereas adolescents who offend against peers show more narcissistic traits. Thus, adolescents who offend against children may have more difficulty with social interactions with peers and may be more comfortable relating to younger children, in contrast to offenders who target peers and are more exploitative (Carpenter, Peed, & Eastman, 1995). Structural equation models indicate a similar set of personality traits. Hunter, Figueredo, Malamuth, and Becker (2003) found that juveniles who offended against young children showed more *psychosocial deficits*—which they described as problems with self-esteem and self-efficacy as well as negative attributional styles, pessimism, depression, and anxiety—than those who offended against pubescent females. Offenders against children were further characterized by a lack of social confidence, feelings of social alienation, and a preference for the company of younger children.

On the MMPI, a sample of juveniles who committed sodomy behaviors scored higher on the Schizophrenia and Psychopathic Deviate scales than juveniles who committed rape and other types of sex abuse. Juveniles who committed sodomy behaviors also appeared to show more deficits in social skills than other juvenile sex offenders (Herkov, Gynther, Thomas, & Myers, 1996).

In the Netherlands, youth who committed solo sex offenses (i.e., without group participation) had significantly higher scores on scales of neuroticism and impulsivity and lower scores for sociability on a variety of instruments, including the Junior Netherlands Personality Questionnaire, the Adolescents Temperament List, the Amsterdam Biographical Questionnaire, and the Netherlands shortened MMPI (Bijleveld & Hendriks, 2003). In contrast, however, youth who committed sex offenses as part of a group had average, nondeviant scores on personality measures. Solo offenders were also three times more likely than group offenders to have committed previous sex offenses.

Within the literature that has attempted to distinguish among different types of juvenile sex offenders, there are two studies that have identified typologies for juvenile sex offenders based on personality traits. An early MMPI study designed to identify groups of adolescent sex offenders used MMPI factor scores to classify 178 adolescent sex offenders into four groups. Group I was described as shy, emotionally overcontrolled, and having few friends; Group II was narcissistic, demanding, insecure, and argumentative;

Group III was socially outgoing, honest, and prone to emotional outbursts; and Group IV exhibited poor self-control and judgment and was mistrustful and undersocialized (Smith, Monastersky, & Deisher, 1987). An attempt to replicate this study using the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1957) revealed four similar groups in a sample of 112 adolescent male sex offenders: (1) Antisocial/Impulsive, (2) Unusual/Isolated, (3) Overcontrolled/Reserved, and (4) Confident/Aggressive (Worling, 2001). The Antisocial/Impulsive group was the largest. These offenders were characterized as having delinquent and impulsive personality traits and were most likely to have received criminal charges for their most recent offense. In addition, they were the most likely group to have been physically abused by their parents. Both the Antisocial/Impulsive and the Confident/Aggressive juveniles were most likely to be living in some type of residential setting. The two most pathological groups were the Antisocial/Impulsive and the Unusual/Isolated groups. They were most likely to have separated or divorced parents, and they were the most likely to have recidivated (sexually or nonsexually) at a 6-year follow-up assessment.

There are similarities among the sets of four groups identified in these studies. In both studies (i.e., Smith et al., 1987; Worling, 2001), two relatively healthy groups emerged. One group was emotionally overcontrolled and socially reserved (Smith et al.'s Group I and Worling's Overcontrolled/Reserved group), and the other was a group of honest, outgoing offenders prone to aggression (Smith et al.'s Group III and Worling's Confident/Aggressive group). In addition, two more pathological groups emerged in both studies. First was a group of antisocial and impulsive adolescents (Smith et al.'s Group IV and Worling's Antisocial/Impulsive group), and second was a group of emotionally disturbed, insecure youth (Smith et al.'s Group II and Worling's Unusual/Isolated group). These studies therefore suggest the presence of at least four clusters of personality characteristics for juvenile sex offenders. An examination of the remaining literature also indicates support for some, if not all, of these four clusters.

For the purposes of building a science of profiling, the value of discerning these personality characteristics lies not only in identifying types of sex offenders but also in linking personality characteristics or types with crime scene evidence and offender behaviors that are relevant for investigation. In this regard, there are two points of interest in the previously reviewed body of literature.

First, there appears to be a general distinction between the personality characteristics of adolescents who offend against young children and those who offend against peers or adults, such that offenders against children seem to display avoidance, a negative affective style, social skills deficits, and a preference for socializing with younger children. As noted earlier in this section, however, the limited number of studies that have differentiated

juvenile sex offenders according to victim age warrants caution in interpreting this finding. However, if this distinction can be validated, it is significant because of its potential use in making predictions about unknown offenders. For example, if a young child reports to investigators that she has been molested by a teenager who is unknown to her, the inference that this perpetrator might be somewhat socially inept and prefer to socialize with children might lead to a different investigative strategy than if a teenage girl reported that she was raped by a same-aged peer. In both cases, an investigative strategy might be to interview teachers or counselors at the nearby high school, but in the first case it might be more fruitful to search for individuals who might present as more withdrawn or anxious, whereas in the second case the perpetrator may be more likely to have a more normal (although possibly delinquent) social circle.

Second, it is also apparent from the literature that at least a small subgroup of adolescent sex offenders will present as having average, nondeviant personality characteristics. Both of the typology studies (Smith et al., 1987; Worling, 2001) indicated two groups of relatively healthy personality clusters, and the study on solo versus group offenders (Bijleveld & Hendriks, 2003) also indicated that adolescents who commit sex offenses in groups show nondeviant personality characteristics. For profiling purposes, it would be useful to discern the types of crime scene evidence and offense behaviors that might be associated with these "normal" personality profiles.

Adult Sex Offenders

The literature on adult sex offenders divides offenders into child molesters/pedophiles and rapists. Some studies have examined the two types of offenders separately, whereas others compare them with each other.

Child Molesters

The literature on personality characteristics of child molesters seems to indicate a cluster of traits similar to those of juvenile sex offenders who offend against young children, discussed previously. The essential features of this cluster appear to be social ineptness, anxiety, avoidance, depression, and pessimism. Finkelhor and Araji (1986) proposed a model to explain this cluster of traits, suggesting that the "typical" child molester is socially and emotionally immature, with deficits in social skills and impulse control. The personality characteristics of child molesters are thus congruent with the developmental stage of their victims.

Studies using the MMPI and MMPI–2 (Butcher, Dahlstrom, Graham, Pellegen, & Kremer, 1989) have yielded some support for this cluster of traits and its specific relationship to child molesting. In terms of using

personality traits to identify child molesters, clinical scales on the MMPI–2 have been used to distinguish child molesters from control respondents with an 81% degree of accuracy (Ridenour, Miller, Joy, & Dean, 1997). Studies have also used the MMPI to describe clusters of traits within samples of child molesters. For example, in a sample of 97 Roman Catholic priests and religious brothers alleged to have committed sex offenses against children, four clusters of personality traits were identified using the MMPI–2 along with other measures (Falkenhain, Duckro, Hughes, Rossetti, & Gfeller, 1999). The largest cluster, which constituted 42.3% of the total sample, indicated a pattern of social discomfort, insecurity, passivity, submissiveness, and deficits in emotional development. This is consistent with the model of child molester personality traits described earlier. Shealy, Kalichman, Henderson, Szymanowski, and McKee (1991) also found four MMPI profile subtypes in their sample of 90 incarcerated child molesters. Similar to the findings from the two typology studies of juveniles discussed in the previous section (Smith et al., 1987; Worling, 2001), Shealy et al.'s study elicited two less disturbed groups and two more pathological groups. The two more disturbed groups showed traits indicating anger, anxiety, poor judgment, and suicidal ideation. Finally, a study that compared the MMPI scores of child molesters with those of offenders against adolescents and adults (Kalichman, 1991) found that the scores of child molesters on the "neurotic triad" (Kalichman, 1991, p. 193) were higher than those of the other sex offenders. These score elevations suggest significant difficulty with developing interpersonal relationships, feelings of social alienation, immaturity, anxiety, and emotional disturbance.

Despite the previously mentioned support for a cluster of personality traits typifying child molesters, other researchers have had more equivocal results and have launched criticisms against research that claims to demonstrate accurate and reliable MMPI profiles for child molesters. For example, although some studies have found similar patterns of personality traits on the MMPI, as described earlier, several authors have pointed out that the percentage of offenders accounted for by these traits is rather modest. Mann, Stenning, and Borman (1992) found MMPI scale elevations indicating low social skills, discomfort, and submissiveness in their sample of pedophiles who were in sex offender treatment programs at state, federal, and military prisons. Unfortunately, this elevation was present in only 18% of their sample, leading the authors to conclude that there is no characteristic profile of a pedophile. Another study found that the most common MMPI profile in a sample of child molesters accounted for only 7% of the total and was not significantly more frequent than any other profile (Hall, Maiuro, Vitaliano, & Proctor, 1986). A larger study of 403 convicted sex offenders elicited 43 of the possible 45 MMPI code types (Erickson, Luxenberg, Walbek, & Seeley, 1987). For child molesters, the most common subtype

accounted for only 12.6% of the total. These findings, indicating the heterogeneity of individual MMPIs for pedophiles, led the authors to state that the findings "do not support descriptions of any MMPI profile as typical of any sort of sex offender" (Erickson et al., 1987, p. 569). They further stated that attempts to identify individuals as sex offenders on the basis of the MMPI were "reprehensible" (Erickson et al., 1987, p. 569). This assertion is further supported by findings that the error rate for classifying child molesters using the MMPI is substantial. One study that compared MMPI scores and results from penile plethysmographs in a sample of 90 alleged child molesters found that even though scores on the MMPI separated child molesters who had deviant arousal from those who did not (McAnulty, Adams, & Wright, 1994), use of MMPI scores alone still resulted in the misclassification of one third of the individuals.

In addition to the failure of the studies discussed previously to identify a clear cluster of personality traits typifying the child molester, other studies that have used the MMPI have failed to find clusters of personality traits that distinguish child molesters from other types of sex offenders or that discriminate among different types of child molesters. For example, Quinsey, Arnold, and Pruesse (1980) found no differences among child molesters, rapists, violent offenders, and property offenders on the MMPI, and MMPI scores have also failed to distinguish between intrafamilial versus extrafamilial child molesters (Panton, 1979) and outpatient intrafamilial child molesters versus nonoffenders (Scott & Stone, 1986).

Other measures of the personality traits of child molesters have yielded similarly equivocal results. Studies that have used the 16 Personality Factors Questionnaire (Cattell, Cattell, & Cattell, 1993; Langevin, Hucker, Ben-Aron, Purins, & Hook, 1985; Langevin, Paitich, Freeman, Mann, & Handy, 1978) to examine pedophiles from clinical and forensic samples have failed to confirm the cluster of pedophilic personality traits proposed in the Finkelhor and Araji (1986) model described earlier. Although pedophiles were found to be more shy and reserved than control participants, there were no significant differences between pedophiles and other sexually deviant respondents. In Langevin et al.'s (1985) study, pedophiles were not found to be significantly more shy than the comparison group, and the authors also concluded that there was no support for the idea that pedophiles are unassertive, particularly as compared with other sex offenders.

Studies of pedophiles that have used the EPQ reported findings that support a cluster of traits consistent with the "typical" child molester described earlier, but a closer examination of the results seems to cast doubt on these findings. Wilson and Cox (1983) reported finding higher indicators of depression, loneliness, shyness, isolation, and sensitivity to social situations in a sample of 77 child molesters versus control respondents. Unfortunately, although pedophiles scored higher than controls on indicators of

social deficits, the authors reported that there was no marked lack of social skills overall. In addition, the measures of depression and loneliness comprised face-valid items (e.g., "I feel lonely") and not valid clinical measures of depression or other mood disorders. Gingrich and Campbell (1995) found increased neuroticism in fixated pedophiles compared with regressed pedophiles, exhibitionists, and rapists. The division of individuals into the categories of fixated and regressed pedophiles, however, makes the interpretation of findings problematic, as there have been challenges to the validity of the fixated–regressed dichotomy of child molesters (e.g., Simon, Sales, Kaszniak, & Kahn, 1992).

More recent studies have used the MCMI to attempt to discern personality characteristics of child molesters. Similar to the studies that used the EPQ, these studies have reported promising findings that become problematic on closer examination. For example, one study (Cohen et al., 2002) found interpersonal deficits, lack of assertiveness, shyness, avoidance, narcissism, and self-doubt in a sample of pedophiles compared with control respondents. It is unfortunate that because the pedophile sample was not compared with rapists or any other type of offender, it is difficult to determine how particular this set of characteristics is to pedophiles or child molesters. It could be that these characteristics are also common to rapists and thus typify sex offenders as a group rather than being specific to child molesters. Other studies have found a higher degree of anxiety, depression, dependence, and avoidance in child molesters compared with rapists. Although the presence of comparison groups is helpful in demonstrating that the cluster of traits may be particular to child molesters, these traits represent only a portion of the cluster that has been discussed with regard to the "typical" child molester. The other characteristics measured by the MCMI that would be expected to occur in this cluster (e.g., negativism, self-defeating traits, and histrionic traits) were not found. Thus, these studies offer only partial support for a cluster of pedophilic personality traits (Ahlmeyer, Kleinsasser, Stoner, & Retzlaff, 2003; Chantry & Craig, 1994).

Other, isolated studies also have reported findings consistent with Finkelhor and Araji's (1986) model, but these have also been sufficiently problematic as to render their findings equivocal. For example, one study reported finding "anxiety neurosis" in a sample of pedophiles but did not explain how this was assessed (Bradford, Bloomberg, & Bourget, 1988). Fisher (1969) used the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to compare individuals who offended against minors with control respondents. Although the results indicated that offenders against minors were more passive, insecure, and unassertive than control respondents, there was not as much difference between offenders against minors and other types of offenders. A study that used the Kelly Repertory Grid (Kelly, 1955) to compare pedophiles and control respondents determined that the pedophiles were

lacking in social skills (Howells, 1979). Unfortunately, this was the only significant finding in the study, and a later project failed to replicate it (Horley, 1988).

Thus, an examination of the personality literature on child molesters does not reveal unequivocal support for any single profile of a typical child molester; neither does it show any consistent set of personality characteristics that distinguish child molesters from other types of offenders. However, the lack of consistent findings may have to do with the problems in the research more than with the lack of the existence of a personality profile. Aside from the criticisms levied against the individual studies of child molester personality just described, there are three overarching problems worth noting. First, there are no consistent definitions across studies of what a pedophile or child molester is. In some cases, *pedophile* and *child molester* are used interchangeably, despite the possibility that pedophiles may not have committed any illegal acts (see the discussion of the Holmes & Holmes [1996] model, chap. 2). There may be important differences in personality traits between offenders who act on their inappropriate sexual urges toward children and those who do not, but the overlap in definitions may obscure these differences. Also, differences in legal and social definitions of *child victims* may also create a certain degree of confusion, such that researchers using a legal definition of *child* might include victims up to age 18, even though such individuals might be considered by societal standards to be sexually mature (Okami & Goldberg, 1992). There may be important differences in personality between individuals who offend against prepubescent children and those who offend against teenagers that may not be clearly identified without a consistent definition of *child* that takes into account the multiple characteristics that define maturity (e.g., age, mental development, emotional status, physical development).

Second, few of the studies previously described have used nonoffender or non-sex offender control samples. This is an important issue because to show that there is a characteristic set of personality traits for child molesters, the research must not only demonstrate that child molesters consistently exhibit these traits but also clearly show that other types of sex offenders and general offenders do not exhibit these traits. If child molesters are shown to be socially inept, anxious, and depressed, but rapists and burglars show the same set of traits, then this cluster of traits cannot be said to exclusively describe child molesters. Instead, the cluster might more generally describe all sex offenders or all offenders. The failure to include control groups, or the appropriate control groups, in the existing studies thus makes it unclear whether the personality traits identified by these studies are more characteristic of specific or general groups of offenders (e.g., pedophiles, sex offenders, all offenders).

Third, there are data to suggest that sex offenders display substantial response bias on psychological tests (Grossman, Haywood, & Wasyliw, 1992; Lanyon, 1993; Wasyliw, Grossman, & Haywood, 1994) and that child molesters show more impression management than rapists (Nugent & Kroner, 1996). When completing self-report instruments, sex offenders, particularly pedophiles, may not answer questions honestly but instead may answer in such a way as to make themselves appear either more psychologically healthy, or more pathological, than they actually are. Because the vast majority of personality inventories have a self-report format, this tendency toward manipulating self-presentation is of significant concern. Depending on how successful offenders are at manipulating their personality profiles on these instruments, and depending on the direction in which they bias their answers (e.g., health vs. pathology), the results of studies that use these instruments to evaluate sex offenders are unlikely to reflect offenders' personality traits.

Rapists

The study of personality characteristics in rapists has been approached in a manner similar to that of child molesters. Efforts have centered primarily on the use of the MMPI, MCMI, and other personality inventories in an attempt to elucidate clusters of characteristics that typify rapists and distinguish them from other types of offenders.

A series of studies has identified five clusters of rapist personality characteristics using the MMPI (Kalichman, 1991; Kalichman, Craig, et al., 1989; Kalichman, Szymanowski, McKee, Taylor, & Craig, 1989). In the first of this set of studies (Kalichman, Szymanowski, et al., 1989), 120 incarcerated rapists were administered the MMPI, and the following clusters of personality emerged: Profile Type 1 contained no significant elevations. This was the least disturbed group, and their profiles were similar to those of other types of offenders. Profile Type 2 was characterized by antisociality and aggression. The authors described this type of offender as the "prototypical rapist" (Kalichman, Szymanowski, et al., 1989, p. 153) who victimizes strangers. Profile Type 3 was described as antisocial and hostile, and offenders in this type were likely to commit rapes during the course of committing other crimes. Offenders in Profile Type 4 were said to show poor adjustment to incarceration. They were described as highly deviant, with a wide range of deviant personality characteristics. Finally, Profile Type 5 was characterized as the most deviant, with the greatest amount of psychological disturbance.

In a subsequent study (Kalichman, Craig, et al., 1989), a sample of 127 incarcerated rapists was administered the MMPI in an effort to replicate

the earlier findings. Analyses resulted in the presence of the same five clusters. In an effort to cross-validate these findings, the authors reclassified respondents into cluster subgroups using the classification rules from the earlier study. Using this procedure, the authors were able to correctly reclassify 59% of the rapists into their clusters. Finally, in a study that compared rapists with child molesters and with offenders against adolescents, Kalichman (1991) used the MMPI to conclude that the rapists were the least disturbed of the three groups and evidenced emotional restraint and antisociality.

A more recent study that used the MMPI (Curnoe & Langevin, 2002) examined 228 offenders, comparing a variety of types of sex offenders and nonviolent, non-sex offender control respondents. The authors found considerable overlap between the mean scores of sex offenders and control respondents. Although they also stated that there were some group differences in levels of depression and persecutory ideation, the authors admit that this effect was not statistically significant (Curnoe & Langevin, 2002).

Research on rapists using the MCMI does not provide any clear insights into rapist personality traits. For example, one study found that rapists tended to show elevations on measures of dysthymic, posttraumatic stress disordered, and depressive traits; however, they determined that there were very few differences between rapists and non-sex offenders (Ahlmeyer et al., 2003). Likewise, another study that compared rapists, child molesters, and non-sex offenders reported that rapists' personalities were more similar to those of non-sex offenders than to those of child molesters (Chantry & Craig, 1994).

Studies that have used other measures of personalities have been similarly equivocal. For example, a comparison of semistructured interviews conducted with elderly sex offenders and elderly non-sex offenders found that the sex offenders tended to show more schizoid and avoidant traits. Unfortunately, the sample comprised a combination of child molesters and rapists, and findings were not reported separately for rapists (Fazel, Hope, O'Donnell, & Jacoby, 2002). A study of rapists and child molesters that used the Clinical Analysis Questionnaire and an additional semistructured social history questionnaire reported that rapists evidenced more inadequacy, insecurity, and passivity than did child molesters (Hillbrand, Foster, & Hirt, 1990), whereas another study found, conversely, that rapists were more extraverted than exhibitionists and pedophiles, as measured by the EPQ (Gingrich & Campbell, 1995). Unfortunately, both of these studies suffered from small sample sizes. Hillbrand et al.'s (1990) study used a sample of 29 patients in a forensic hospital, and Gingrich and Campbell (1995) based their conclusions on only seven rapists.

Compared with the child molester literature, the number of articles devoted to the description of rapists is small, and their findings are much less cohesive. The child molester literature primarily centers on the dispute

over whether there is a cluster of personality characteristics, reflecting insecurity, passivity, fear, and avoidance that typifies child molesters. Although the findings have varied, the child molester literature nonetheless reflects a collective effort on the part of researchers in the area to address similar questions about the personality characteristics of child molesters. Studies using various personality inventories have thus provided both support and disconfirming evidence for the cluster of child molester personality characteristics previously described. In contrast, the literature on rapist personality has not seemed to settle on any one cluster of traits to either support or refute. As with the literature on child molester personality, the literature on rapists does not indicate any profile of a typical rapist; neither does this literature provide convincing support for the idea that there are distinct personality clusters that can be used to distinguish among different types of rapists or differentiate them from child molesters. However, as with the literature on child molesters, this may be because the literature on rapist personality contains many problematic studies that include limitations such as small sample sizes, lack of nonoffender control groups, and a scattered representation of a seemingly infinite variety of personality traits across samples of rapists. These difficulties render it virtually impossible to draw any reliable and valid conclusions about the personality traits of rapists based on the use of personality inventories and the studies discussed earlier.

RELATING OFFENDER PERSONALITY TO CRIME SCENE EVIDENCE AND OFFENDER BEHAVIOR

With respect to the relationship among sex offender personality, crime scene evidence, and offender behavior, the previously reviewed literature is of very limited use to a science of profiling, for two main reasons. First, the literature itself is unclear and imprecise. Across both juvenile and adult studies, the literature consists of very general conclusions about sex offender personality. These conclusions center on a search for clusters of personality characteristics that will describe child molesters and rapists and distinguish them from other types of offenders. Unfortunately, as already noted, it is not clear that such clusters of characteristics can be consistently found. It is also not clear that where clusters of personality characteristics appear to exist, they describe sex offenders and not offenders in general. It is also unclear that certain personality characteristics describe child molesters or rapists specifically, rather than sex offenders in general. Attempts to make these finer distinctions and clear demarcations between sex offenders and other offenders, as well as among different types of sex offenders, appear to have been largely unsuccessful.

Second, the literature has failed to demonstrate relationships between personality characteristics and crime scene evidence and behavior. Most of the studies that are reviewed in this chapter do not explicitly link personality characteristics with crime scene evidence or offender behaviors at all. Instead, most of these studies relate personality traits to each other. For example, one of the juvenile sex offender personality clusters identified by Smith et al. (1987) describes a constellation of traits that includes narcissism, demandingness, insecurity, and argumentativeness. This suggests that the four offender characteristics described are related to each other in some way and can be expected to occur together. Thus, from a profiling perspective, when one finds a juvenile sex offender who is narcissistic, one may also find that same offender to be argumentative. Another example can be seen in Falkenhain et al.'s (1999) clusters of alleged child molesters. The most prevalent cluster of alleged offenders in that study indicated a pattern encompassing the traits of social discomfort, insecurity, passivity, submissiveness, and deficits in emotional development. Thus, if one can determine that a child molester is insecure, it is also likely that he will turn out to be passive and submissive. Unfortunately, these types of relationships are not sufficient to be of use in an investigation because they do not refer to behavior. As described in chapter 8, the value of having information about personality traits lies in what they can predict about behavior and, consequently, crime scene evidence. For example, if the traits of insecurity, passivity, and submissiveness described by Falkenhain et al. could be described in terms of how they predict how a child molester will behave during the commission of a crime and, thus, what kind of evidence he will leave behind, they would be of increased value to the field of profiling. It may be that a child molester who possesses these three traits would be hesitant to approach a child, would seek reassurance from the child, and would withdraw on rejection from that child rather than use any kind of physical force. Thus, the evidence that would be left might include verbal statements to the victim asking for reassurance or approval, lack of physical injury to the victim, and a cessation of sexually inappropriate behavior on a refusal from the victim. Unfortunately, the majority of studies of personality and sex offending have not used personality characteristics to make predictions about offender behavior such as these.

A small number of studies in the reviewed literature have attempted to link offender personality traits or clusters to offense behaviors. For example, in an MMPI study of rapists, the Profile Type 2 (antisocial and aggressive) rapist was described as being likely to attack strangers, and Profile Type 3 (antisocial and hostile) rapists were described as being more opportunistic and likely to commit sex offenses during the course of committing other crimes (Kalichman, Szymanowski, et al., 1989). From an investigative perspective, associations such as this suggest that certain personality traits

may predict variations in offense behaviors. Unfortunately, even if these inferences and relationships are valid, they would still not be specific enough to narrow down a pool of suspects to a single individual. The process of relating a somewhat generalized cluster of personality traits (antisocial and aggressive) to a generalized description of offense behaviors (offends against strangers) is not rigorous enough to be a useful tool to law enforcement and is somewhat reminiscent of the kinds of investigative inferences suggested by the nonscientific profiling models. For example, in the nonscientific profiling models it is also not uncommon to see generalized descriptions of personality (e.g., organized) related to equally generalized descriptions of offense behaviors (e.g., plans the offense). These limited studies are therefore too vague to advance the state of knowledge with regard to relationships between personality characteristics and sex offense behavior. In addition, the validity and reliability of associations such as those previously described remains to be seen. In future research, offender personality characteristics and offense behaviors should be separated into discrete variables to be measured and related to each other through statistical analyses. For example, rather than describing a profile of antisocial–aggressive or antisocial–hostile personalities (which appear on the face to be very similar personality types), the individual personality characteristics proposed as composing these groups could be measured and compared with specific offense behaviors, such as breaking into a victim's home, hitting her, or stealing her property.

Despite the shortcomings of the personality literature on child molesters and rapists, there is an area of personality research that has demonstrated some promise in elucidating important personality traits among sex offenders. This area of study is psychopathy. *Psychopathy* is a clinical construct that encompasses a variety of interpersonal, affective, and lifestyle characteristics (Cleckley, 1976; Hare, 1999). Interpersonally, psychopaths are "grandiose, arrogant, callous, dominant, superficial and manipulative" (Hare, 1999, p. 183). In terms of affect, they are "short-tempered, unable to form strong emotional bonds with others, and lacking in guilt or anxiety" (Hare, 1999, p. 183). Their lifestyles are socially deviant, such that psychopaths tend to ignore social conventions and engage in impulsive and irresponsible behavior.

Although not all psychopaths are criminal offenders, the constellation of traits central to psychopathy is certainly consistent with increased contact with the criminal justice system. In particular, the prevalence of psychopathy in sex offenders is noteworthy. Among rapists and individuals who offend against both children and adults, the prevalence is estimated to be between 40% and 50% (Hare, 1999). One study that compared sex offenders with incarcerated non-sex offenders (n = 329) found that 64% of the mixed offenders (offenders against both children and adults) were psychopaths (Porter et al., 2000).

Psychopathy is also a robust predictor of both sexual and violent recidivism, particularly when paired with deviant sexual arousal. Psychopathy has been found to be a general predictor of both violent and sexual recidivism (Quinsey, Harris, Rice, & Cormier, 2005; Quinsey, Rice, & Harris, 1995). Within 6 years of release, 80% of psychopaths recidivated violently (which included many instances of sexual recidivism as well), compared with 20% of nonpsychopaths. High scores on the Psychopathy Checklist (Hare, 1991) have been found to predict violent recidivism and, when paired with deviant sexual arousal as measured by the penile plethysmograph, high scores also predicted sexual recidivism (Rice & Harris, 1997). Furthermore, psychopathy paired with deviant sexual arousal appears to predict not only increased recidivism but also faster recidivism (Serin, Mailloux, & Malcolm, 2001).

Of particular relevance to profiling are the findings that link psychopathy to certain crime scene evidence and offender behaviors. Currently, there are three sets of findings that may inform a science of profiling in this regard. First, psychopaths are more likely to have convictions for non-sex offenses than for sex offenses (Hare, 1999). Therefore, if there are indicators of psychopathy during the investigation of a sex offense, it would not be fruitful to limit offender searches to individuals who have exclusive convictions for sex offenses. Second, there is substantial evidence to suggest that the sex offenses of psychopaths are more violent and sadistic than those of other sex offenders (Barbaree, Seto, Serin, Amos, & Preston, 1994; Quinsey et al., 1995; Serin, Malcolm, Khanna, & Barbaree, 1994). Pending the outcome of more comprehensive data sets demonstrating the validity of this finding, it may eventually become possible to use these crime features (evidence of excessive violence or sadism) to predict psychopathic personality traits and thereby narrow the pool of potential suspects in an investigation. Finally, A. J. R. Harris and Hanson (1998) found that high scores on the Psychopathy Checklist (Hare, 1991), combined with deviant sexual arousal, predicted more prior sex offenses, more kidnapping and forcible confinement, more non-sex offenses, and more violent recidivism than in other sex offenders. Once again, pending the appropriate empirical validation of these findings, it may be possible to use this research to make predictions about psychopathic offenders based on certain crime behaviors.

In terms of relating findings on sex offender personality to other information that is relevant to investigations, the body of literature on psychopathy and sex offending shows the most promise for informing a science of profiling. This literature uses the constellation of traits associated with the construct of psychopathy to successfully make predictions about crime behaviors (e.g., increased violence), past behavior (e.g., varied criminal record), and future behavior (e.g., likelihood and speed of recidivism). Future studies of personality and sex offending that are conducted with investigative

goals in mind should therefore incorporate psychopathy in attempting to make predictions about offenders and their offenses.

PERSONALITY AND PROFILING

Aside from the psychopathy literature, the limitations evident in attempting to relate the sex offender personality literature to a science of profiling are not uncharacteristic of the problems with other types of literature on personality. However, the specific limitations evident in much of the extant personality research can be remedied to make the application of personality to studies of offenders more suitable for profiling across a wide variety of offenses.

First, few studies on personality characteristics of offenders have been designed or carried out with profiling in mind. The goal of linking personality traits, crime scene features, and other offender characteristics is specific to an investigation and is not necessarily shared by researchers who conduct their studies with treatment or diagnostic concerns in mind. This disparity in goals makes it difficult to find studies on personality that attempt to associate their findings with other crime and offender characteristics.

Second, the literature on offender personality, like the clinical literature on sex offender personality, generally considers personality characteristics to be global, stable traits rather than conceiving of them as malleable and situation dependent. This is especially the case in discussions of personality within the profiling literature. Pinizzotto and Finkel (1990) stated that profiling "focuses attention on individuals with personality traits that parallel traits of others who have committed similar offenses" (p. 216). Ressler and Shachtman (1992) distinguished among types of offenders who "have very different personalities" and argued that these distinctions are "important to unraveling a crime" (p. 137). Holmes and Holmes (1996) discussed "the personality traits necessary to mold a criminal mind" (p. 28). Rossmo (2000) similarly wrote that the "interpretation of crime scene evidence can indicate the personality type of the individual(s) who committed the offense" (p. 68). It has thus been long assumed in profiling that offenders have distinct, discrete, stable, and predictable personality traits that can be determined by examining the crime scene evidence.

However, as discussed in chapter 8, the view of personality as dispositional rather than situational is no longer an uncontested or predominant paradigm among personality theorists. Alison, Bennell, and Mokros (2002) identified the personality paradox first articulated by Bem and Allen (1974) that is now evident in the offender and profiling personality literature. According to the original authors, a paradox exists whereby individuals persist in inferring global and stable traits from the behaviors of others,

even though empirical evidence demonstrates that trait constructs fail to predict behavior accurately across time and situations. This position has been supported by a number of other studies (Cheek, 1982; Dudycha, 1936; Kenrick & Stringfield, 1980; Mischel & Peake, 1982; Underwood & Moore, 1981). The roles of situational influences and the interactions between person and situation have thus been increasingly favored over traditional trait approaches (e.g., Bowers, 1973; Cervone & Shoda, 1999) in the personality and social psychology literature.

Given the inadequacy of the personality trait approach for investigative purposes, as highlighted by the equivocal findings from studies of sex offending, it seems that a science of profiling would more likely be advanced by viewing personality characteristics in the context of situational factors. As Alison et al. (2002) pointed out, this will be a challenging task. It is rare that contextual information on crimes, aside from items such as the time, date, location, and victim information, is available for study. As a starting point, Alison et al. recommended conducting interviews with both nonoffenders and offenders to assess what situational factors they consider to be relevant to certain behaviors. For example, some offenders may become hostile if they encounter victim resistance. Likewise, other offenders may become controlling in high-risk situations. By turning these into if–then statements (e.g., "If the victim resists me, then I become hostile") and cluster-analyzing the contingencies, it may be possible to generalize from one if–then contingency to another within the same taxonomic group (e.g., sex offenders).

Alison et al.'s (2002) approach to the application of personality to profiling is a promising starting point. There are four additional considerations that might enhance these ideas. First, the offender interviews suggested by Alison et al. should be conducted on a large scale, using a comprehensive population of offenders across a variety of states and jurisdictions. Second, in addition to conducting interviews, there may be additional value in using self-report instruments such as the MMPI and MCMI. Although there are certainly limitations to using these instruments, their utility may be increased if they are administered in various contexts and at multiple points in time. For example, instruments could be administered at arrest, pre- and postconviction, and after the appellate process and subsequent adjustment to incarceration. Although caution must be exercised in that the validity of results may be affected if this retesting occurs at intervals that are too brief, it may be possible to use results from multiple test administrations to determine whether the personality traits that are evident nearer to the time that a crime is committed are consistent with the personality traits that emerge once crime events have been resolved. Currently, personality inventories are typically administered only after an offender is incarcerated or in treatment. The offender's attitudes, dispositions, and beliefs may therefore

bear little resemblance to those he held at the time of the commission of the offense as well as to the behaviors that may have been generated from those attitudes, dispositions, and beliefs. Thus, to generate the types of if–then contingencies described by Alison et al. and relate offender statements of personality to predictions about behavior, one must discard the assumption that the personality characteristics identified by self-report instruments are global and stable in favor of an approach that permits variations in personality across situations.

Third, as mentioned in the discussion of offender motives, self-report data can be problematic for a variety of reasons, particularly when dealing with criminal offenders. Therefore, in addition to garnering offenders' own appraisals of their behavior and personality characteristics in various contexts through self-report inventories, it would be wise to investigate ways to measure personality traits without relying on self-report. This would likely require behavioral assessment but, unlike the studies mentioned earlier that have approached behavioral assessment of personality traits in an effort to demonstrate trait consistency and stability, newer studies might consider the influence of situations and environments on personality assessment and provide more context-specific appraisals of offender personality traits (e.g., behavioral assessments conducted at both the home and the workplace).

Finally, personality characteristics per se are not likely to be directly useful for profiling and criminal investigations, even when situational factors are taken into account. Understanding that an offender is shy in social situations, for example, will not necessarily assist police in identifying and apprehending him. Instead, the value of personality lies in its potential to predict characteristics that are of greater use to law enforcement, such as crime scene evidence and concrete offender behaviors. Therefore, in addition to conducting analyses on patterns of personality characteristics, studies of offender personality should reference the immense databases of collateral materials that have been collected across various law enforcement jurisdictions, to compare data gleaned from interviews and other personality assessments with crime scene information and crime behaviors. For example, information about the personality traits of a sample of burglars could be compared with crime scene evidence and police reports of offender behaviors from the offenses of those same burglars. On the basis of these comparisons it may be possible to make predictions about the offense behaviors and pieces of crime scene evidence that would be left by burglars with particular personality traits. Note that consideration should be given to the validity of testing contained in collateral materials, as this testing may not have been conducted with the rigor that would be expected in a scientific study. Where appropriate, testing may need to be conducted prospectively to ensure validity.

It is clear that there is much to be done with regard to creating a new literature of personality that can inform a science of profiling. Although the study of personality has been long-standing, and the basic tenets have been in place for decades, as Alison et al. (2002) pointed out, the adaptation of these tenets to profiling requires a paradigm shift and a new body of research that examines personality and offending in the light of situational and contextual factors. Although the challenge of building this body of research will be great, the potential benefits will be increased specificity and precision in relating offender personality characteristics to various offense situations and behaviors through the thorough study of personality across a wide variety of offenders and offenses. With adequate research, it may eventually be possible to use personality characteristics to make reliable and valid predictions about crime scene evidence and offender behavior that will enhance criminal investigations.