

Risk factors for sexual offending in men working with children –

A community-based survey

Daniel Turner,^{1,4} Juergen Hoyer,² Alexander F. Schmidt,³ Verena Klein,¹ and Peer Briken¹

¹Institute for Sex Research and Forensic Psychiatry, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

²Institute of Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany

³Institute for Health and Behaviour, Health Promotion and Aggression Prevention, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg

⁴To whom correspondence should be addressed at Institute for Sex Research and Forensic Psychiatry, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Martinistrasse 52, 20246 Hamburg, Germany; e-mail: turner.daniel@gmx.de

This preprint has been accepted for publication in ARCHIVES OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOR (03/2016)

ABSTRACT

Identifying risk factors for sexual abuse in men who work with children and who have already abused a child could lead to more appropriate screening and prevention strategies and is thus of major scientific and societal relevance. A total of 8,649 German men from the community were assessed in an extensive anonymous and confidential online survey. Of those, 37 (0.4%) could be classified as child sexual abusers working with children, 90 (1.0%) as child sexual abusers not working with children, and 816 (9.4%) as men who work with children and who have not abused a child. We assessed the impact of working with children as an individual risk factor for self-reported child sexual abuse and compared personal factors, pedophilic sexual fantasies, deviant sexual behaviors, antisocial behaviors, and hypersexuality among the three groups. Most interestingly, working with children was significantly associated with a self-reported sexual offense against children, however, it explained only three percent of its variance. Child sexual abusers working with children admitted more antisocial and more sexually deviant behaviors than child sexual abusers not working with children and than men working with children who have not abused a child. Our findings support some of the suggestions made by other researchers concerning factors that could be considered in applicants for child- or youth-serving institutions. However, it has to be pointed out that the scientific basis still seems premature.

KEY WORDS: antisocial behaviors; child sexual abuse; hypersexuality; pedophilic sexual interests; pedophilic behaviors

INTRODUCTION

Although child sexual abuse occurring in child- or youth-serving institutions accounts only for a small proportion of all child sexual abuse cases, such incidents often involve a large number of victims and are of major societal concern (Gallagher, 2000). To this end, sound screening and prevention strategies could help to reduce the risk that youth-serving institutions are misused by men who intend to abuse the children with whom they work. At present however, due to high costs, considerable personnel expenditure, or lack of time necessary for waiting for the results of individual background checks, great differences exist between institutions concerning recruitment and application processes when taking on new employees (Webster & Whitman, 2008). While most institutions dealing with children in the US and England conduct personal interviews, request references from previous employers, and perform criminal background checks, only about half of the institutions use probationary or orientation periods, and a small number do not screen applicants at all (Price, Hanson, & Tagliani, 2013; Webster & Whitman, 2008). Along these lines, it has been suggested that (potentially) relevant risk factors are often not considered in current screening efforts (Price et al., 2013; Sullivan & Beech, 2004). However, sound screening procedures must be based on risk factors that have an empirical association with sexual offending. Any primary prevention or screening measures should not infringe innocent applicants' rights and should be as sensitive and specific as possible (Price et al., 2013). Only then an ethically sound application process can be guaranteed that prevents the occurrence of classification errors in any possible direction (i.e. false positives, false negatives).

To the best of our knowledge, current research on relevant risk factors in child sexual abusers working with children (CSA-W) is limited to studies with incarcerated or convicted sexual offenders. However, it is obvious that there must also be a certain proportion of men in the community who are at risk of sexually victimizing children and who pose a threat to youth-serving institutions. This accounts especially for those men whose past sexual

offending has hitherto remained undetected. Moreover, recent data has demonstrated that although detected and undetected child sexual abusers share many characteristics, they also differ in some relevant personal and psychological variables (e.g. detected child sexual abusers are older, show a higher level of unemployment, have a lower level of education, and report having experienced more abuse themselves during childhood as well as experiencing less sexual preoccupation; Neutze, Grundmann, Scherner, & Beier, 2012).

Characteristics and Risk Factors of Child Sexual Abusers Working with Children

Previous research with convicted CSA-W has mainly focused on sociodemographic and developmental characteristics as well as on risk factors that have shown a strong association with sexual offending (e.g. Holt & Massey, 2013; Spröber et al., 2014; Sullivan & Beech, 2004; Turner, Rettenberger, Lohmann, Eher, & Briken, 2014a). It was found that CSA-W usually differed from child sexual abusers not working with children (CSA) in so far as they were older, better educated, and less likely to be in an adult relationship, while they did not differ concerning the frequency of having experienced sexual abuse themselves (Colton, Roberts, & Vanstone, 2010; Sullivan & Beech, 2004; Turner et al., 2014a). Recently, Turner and colleagues (2014a) reported that CSA-W were more likely to show indicators for pedophilic sexual interests while at the same time they showed fewer indicators for antisocial behaviors and reported fewer previous problems with alcohol compared to CSA not working with children (Turner et al., 2014a; see also Langevin, Curnoe, & Bain, 2000; Parkinson, Oates, & Jayakody, 2012; Spröber et al., 2014; Sullivan, Beech, Craig, & Gannon, 2011 for similar findings). Due to this constellation of risk factors it was concluded that CSA-W seem to exhibit more specific risk factors for sexual reoffending while they are not so much in danger for general or violent reoffending (Turner et al., 2014b).

Hypersexual behaviors as indicators of a high sex drive have been described as another individual predictor for sexual and violent reoffending in sexual offenders (Hanson &

Harris, 2000; Kingston & Bradford, 2013). Previous research found a higher rate of hypersexual behaviors in sexual offenders compared to men in the community (Marshall, Marshall, Moulden, & Serran, 2008). Furthermore, hypersexual behaviors in terms of a high frequency of pornography consumption were associated with a higher rate of sexual recidivism in CSA, however, only in those with a higher Static-99 score (Kingston, Fedoroff, Firestone, Curry, & Bradford, 2008). In men in the community, the number of orgasms per week was not related to sexually aggressive behavior towards women (Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes, & Acker, 1995), while in young Swedish men (17 to 20 years of age) an association was found between daily use of porn and sexually coercive behavior (Kjellgren, Priebe, Svedin & Langström, 2010). So far, the prevalence and impact of hypersexual behaviors in CSA-W compared to other offender groups has not been examined, underlining the need to evaluate the impact of this risk factor in CSA-W.

The Present Study

In the present study we analyzed data from a large community sample of German men, which was collected in an online study on child sexual abuse (Dombert et al., 2016). Our first goal was to examine the impact of working with children as a single risk factor for sexual offending against children. Secondly, we aimed at answering the question to what extent previous findings concerning specific risk factors (personal factors, pedophilic sexual fantasies, deviant sexual, antisocial, and hypersexual behaviors) identified in offender samples of currently incarcerated sexual abusers may also apply to a broad and less selective community sample of CSA-W. Thirdly, we intended to identify differences between CSA-W and men working with children who have not sexually offended against children before (non-CSA-W). These findings could provide further important indications of features that might describe a subgroup of men who work with children with an increased risk of committing child sexual abuse. Finally, we aimed to extend the current state of research concerning the

risk factors mentioned by comparing detected with undetected CSA-W (detected in this case as having committed any sexual offense and not necessarily only for sexual offenses against children): a topic that has not been studied so far.

METHOD

Participants

Altogether, 10,538 men from Germany participated in the present study (Dombert et al. 2016). Of these, 493 men (4.7%) withdrew their informed consent at the end of the investigation and another 1,396 (13.2%) men did not answer the items that were critical for being allocated to one of the study groups (i.e. a sexual offense against children, or professional or voluntary work with children). These participants were excluded from all further analyses, resulting in a potential sample of 8,649 males taken from the community who could be split into several comparison groups depending on their self-reported sexual behaviors with children (for a detailed description of the comparison groups please see the Results section on group prevalences; Table 1). The mean age of the participants was 43.6 years ($SD = 13.7$), and 79.9% ($n = 6,911$) were employed or in training while the remaining 21.1% ($n = 1,738$) men were either unemployed or retired.

Measures

Group allocation. Status regarding previous sexual victimization of children was evaluated by means of self-report, using the Explicit Sexual Interest Questionnaire (ESIQ; Banse, Schmidt, & Clabour, 2010) and/or items regarding previous experiences with child prostitution. The ESIQ is a 40-item self-report scale assessing sexual behaviors and fantasies with men/women/boys/and girls, with five items each. For the purpose of the present study, a shortened 24-item version of the ESIQ was used. All subscales of the ESIQ have demonstrated acceptable to good reliabilities ($.71 < \alpha < .94$; Dombert et al., 2016). Life-time sexual behaviors with children ≤ 12 years of age after the respondents were ≥ 18 years of age

were assessed with the following statements: “I have sexually caressed a boy/girl”, “I have tongue kissed a boy/girl”, “I have enjoyed getting my private parts touched by a boy/girl”. These items had to be answered on a dichotomous scale (yes/no). All of the child categories in the ESIQ were anchored to refer to children ≤ 12 years of age. Agreeing to at least one of these items was rated as meaning that contact sexual abuse of children had taken place. Furthermore, indicating having paid a child for sexual services was also rated as a sexual offense against children (child prostitution; see below). However, it has to be noted that age was not further specified in this variable. Men were also asked to indicate if they work with children ≤ 12 years of age within their profession and/or on a voluntary basis. Both questions had to be answered with either yes or no. Based on these items, participants were then classified as either CSA-W (self-reported child sexual abuse and works either professionally and/or voluntarily with children), or CSA (self-reported child sexual abuse but does not work either professionally and/or voluntarily with children), or non-CSA-W (no self-reported child sexual abuse but works either professionally and/or voluntarily with children).

Personal characteristics. Participants were asked whether they had ever been involved in a romantic relationship with an adult that lasted longer than two years (yes/no). Similarly, participants had to indicate whether they had had sexual contact with an adult before the age of 14 (own experience of sexual abuse).

Antisocial behaviors. The assessment of previous delinquency served as an indicator for antisocial behaviors. Participants were asked (yes/no) if they had ever been convicted of a property offense (e.g. theft, burglary, etc.), a violent offense (e.g. grievous bodily harm, battery, etc.) or a sexual offense (e.g. sexual assault, rape, child sexual abuse, etc. – hence this category does not exclude sexual offenses against adults and was used as group indicator for comparisons of the detected vs. undetected CSA-W). Furthermore, those participants who indicated that they had been involved in sexual behavior directed against children were asked if they were intoxicated during the sexual assault. Participants then had to rate on a scale from

0 to 100 how likely it was that they would ever have sexual contact with a person under the age of 13 years again.

Pedophilic sexual fantasies. Sexual fantasies involving children – more specifically involving boys or girls – were assessed using the shortened version of the ESIQ (Banse et al., 2010). Participants were asked to indicate whether they have ever a) got excited when imagining that a boy/girl sexually stimulates them, b) had daydreams about having sex with a boy/girl, and c) found it erotic to see a boy's or a girl's body through their clothes.

Sexual deviant behaviors. In order to tap into previous sexual delinquent behavior, participants were asked a) if they had consumed child pornographic material before (“Have you ever watched pornographic depictions of children, e.g. the nude genitals of children, in order to become sexually aroused, after you were 18 years of age?”), b) if they had ever intended to engage in child sex tourism (“Have you ever intended to travel to a foreign country in order to have sex with a child?”) or c) child prostitution (“Have you ever paid a child for sexual services?”). Furthermore, the participants' reports on the ESIQ sexual behavior with children scales, as described above, were utilized in this section. Additionally, in the case that a participant indicated any pedophilic sexual interest at any point in the whole survey (i.e. either behavior or fantasy), this participant was asked to indicate whether he had ever thought about seeking professional help because of his sexual interest in children.

Hypersexual behaviors. Hypersexual behaviors were measured using an adaptation of the Sexual Outlet Inventory (SOI; Kafka, 1991). The SOI consists of four items, and participants were asked to provide the number of orgasms per week independent of how these were achieved (e.g., masturbation, sexual intercourse, “wet dreams”). Furthermore, participants had to rate the strength of their sexual drive during the past week on a scale from 0 to 100 and had to estimate the amount of time in minutes they spent thinking about sexuality each day. Similarly, the fourth question assessed the amount of time participants spent with viewing pornography each day. All of the questions referred to a normal day or

week within the past month. Although the construct of hypersexuality involves much more than simply adding up the number of orgasms, we nevertheless followed the suggestions of Kafka (1997), who proposed that men who had seven or more orgasms per week could be classified as hypersexual. Additionally, since more recent research shows that hypersexuality can be regarded as reflecting a particularly strong sex drive on an underlying dimension (Graham, Walters, Harris, & Knight, 2015; Winters, Christoff, & Gorzalka, 2010), we also calculated an aggregated sex drive index (SDR; $\alpha = .66$) consisting of the four z -standardized SOI items. Furthermore, potential outliers were identified using the median absolute deviation (MAD; Leys, Ley, Klein, Bernard, & Licata, 2013), resulting in cut-offs for outliers with ≥ 10 orgasms per week, ≥ 165 minutes of sexual fantasies, and ≥ 95 minutes of pornography viewing every day (Klein et al., 2015)¹.

Procedure

An extensive online survey assessing pedophilic sexual interests and different associated risk factors was used in the present study (Dombert et al., 2016; see Osterheider et al., 2011 for a description of the broader research initiative of which the present study was a part). Participants were recruited via a market research institute and were offered 20€ for participating. All of the participants were informed about the contents and the complete anonymity of the study, and about the voluntary nature of their participation. They were asked to provide their informed consent before starting to fill in the questionnaire. After completing the questionnaire, participants had the opportunity to withdraw their consent regarding the use of their data, and in doing so were excluded from all further analyses. The Ethics Review Board of the German Psychological Society approved the present study. The median duration of answering the whole questionnaire was roughly 19 minutes.

¹ For the results concerning the prevalence of hypersexual behaviors and its association with self-reported child sexual abuse and child pornography consumption in the full sample, please refer to Klein et al. (2015).

Statistical Analysis

A hierarchical binary logistic regression analysis that utilized the full potential sample was conducted to multivariately assess the impact of working with children, pedophilic sexual fantasies, previous convictions, and sex drive index as risk factors for child sexual abuse. Furthermore, comparisons were performed to assess differences between CSA-W and CSA not working with children as well as between CSA-W and non-CSA-W with regard to the variables and risk factors described above. Finally, differences between CSA-W previously convicted for any sexual offense (detected CSA-W) and CSA-W who had not been detected so far were examined.

Group differences in dichotomous variables were evaluated using χ^2 -tests, and *t*-tests for independent samples were used in the case of continuous variables. Because multiple statistical tests were being performed on the same dataset, we controlled the level of significance for the accumulation of Type-I error using the False Discovery Rate (*FDR*) based on the approach developed by Benjamini and Hochberg (1995). This procedure sorts all *p*-values into ascending order and then divides each *p*-value according to its percentile rank (Noble, 2009). This leads to adjusted *p*-values, so-called *q**-values, or to a reduction of the *p*-value threshold. In order to assess the magnitude of the group differences observed, effect sizes and the corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were reported as well. Cohen's *d* was provided as an effect measure for continuous variables (*d* > 0.2 small effect, *d* > 0.5 medium effect, *d* > 0.8 large effect; Cohen, 1988) and Cramer's *V* for dichotomous variables (*V* > 0.1 small effect, *V* > 0.3 medium effect, *V* > 0.5 large effect; Davis, 1971).

RESULTS

Group Prevalences

Of the 8,649 participants, 37 men (0.4%) indicated that they work with children less than 13 years of age and additionally admitted to having sexually abused a child (CSA-W). Of the CSA-W included, 15 (40.5%) indicated that they had contact with children on a professional and voluntary basis, while 14 CSA-W (37.8%) reported only voluntary contact to children, and 8 CSA-W (21.6%) only professional contact (due to small subgroup sizes we refrained from breaking these groups down for further comparisons). Only one CSA-W solely admitted having paid a child money for sex and denied all other behaviors with children assessed with the ESIQ. Furthermore, 90 men (1.0%) did not work with children but reported having sexually abused a child in the past (CSA). Of those, ten men reported only child prostitution, while refusing sexual behaviors with children assessed with the ESIQ. The third comparison group consisted of 816 men (9.4%) who worked with children less than 13 years of age but reported that they had never sexually abused a child (non-CSA-W). The remaining 7,706 men (89.1%) neither worked with children nor had sexually abused a child. Demographics of the comparison groups are presented in Table 1. CSA-W were significantly younger than CSA ($p < .001$) and non-CSA-W ($p = .02$).

Please insert Table 1 here

Logistic Regression

Working with children was significantly associated with previous sexual offenses against children ($p < .001$), however it only explained 3% of the variance of self-reported child sexual abuse (Table 2). Notably, the correct classification rate of CSA-W based solely on work-status with children was 98.6%. However, it has to be taken into consideration that following this model all participants were classified as non-CSA (sensitivity = 0; specificity = 1). Adding the risk factors of antisociality, pedophilic sexual fantasies, and the sex drive index explained a total of 38% of the variance of self-reported child sexual abuse and

increased correct classifications to 98.8% (sensitivity = .24; specificity = .98). Notably, all of the risk factors except sex drive showed statistically significant associations with self-reported child sexual abuse with odds ratios ranging between 3.4 and 3.9 (Table 2).

Please insert Table 2 here

Group Comparisons

Table 3 provides an overview of the risk factor differences between CSA-W and CSA. Correction for multiple testing revealed that the intended level of significance of $p = .05$ corresponded to a q^* - value of .01, indicating that only p values below the q^* - value should be viewed as significant results when controlling for multiple testing. After *FPR* corrections, the following comparisons were significant: More CSA-W had been previously convicted of a violent or sexual offense, CSA-W had a higher self-rated probability for future sexual victimization of children, more CSA-W had had the intention of travelling to another country in order to have sex with a child or had paid money for the sexual services of a child, and finally CSA-W had higher sex drive indexes.

As far as the differences between CSA-W and non-CSA-W are concerned, p values below 0.04 ($q^* = .04$) were considered to be significant after correcting for multiple testing. Thus it was found that compared to non-CSA-W, CSA-W were more likely to report having had sexually abusive experiences themselves prior to the age of 14, and had more often been convicted of property, violent, or sexual offenses. Furthermore, CSA-W were more likely to report having had sexual fantasies involving children, having used child pornography, and having intended to engage in child sex tourism as well as having thought about therapy because of sexual interest in children. As far as hypersexual behaviors were concerned, it was found that CSA-W spent more time thinking about sexuality and consuming pornography each day, and had a higher aggregated sex drive index compared to non-CSA-W (Table 3).

Please insert Table 3 here

The comparisons between detected and undetected CSA-W are displayed in Table 4. No differences occurred between the two groups concerning vocational ($p < .35$) and educational ($p < .77$) status. Again, the level of significance was corrected for multiple testing and revealed a q^* value of 0.01. After *FPR* correction, significantly more detected CSA-W reported having had sexually abusive experiences themselves during childhood as well as having more prior convictions for property or violent offenses than the undetected CSA-W. Detected CSA-W also indicated higher self-rated probabilities of committing future sexual offenses against children and were more likely to have paid a child for sexual services (child prostitution). As far as hypersexual behaviors or the aggregated sex drive index are concerned, no significant differences were found between detected and undetected CSA-W.

*** Please insert Table 4 here ***

DISCUSSION

The present study was motivated by the idea that CSA-W constitute a specific group that could be characterized in terms of personal factors and pedophilic sexual interests as well as sexually deviant, antisocial and hypersexual behaviors. We found that working with children was indeed significantly associated with self-reported child sexual abuse in men from the community, however predictive validity and, more specifically sensitivity, were low. Thus, the impact of a child-related work as an individual predictor for child sexual abuse seems to be quite limited (as based on this cross-sectional self-report study). Nevertheless, the combination of child-related work, anti-sociality, and pedophilic sexual interests explained more than one third of the variance of sexual offending against children, underpinning the

importance of assessing the differences between CSA-W and CSA not working with children. The group differences reported should thus be informative with regard to more specific risk assessment, therapy, or prevention approaches (Sullivan & Beech, 2004; Turner et al. 2014a).

CSA-W in the present study reported more previous violent and sexual pre-convictions, thereby contrasting previous findings with convicted or incarcerated offender samples that found the opposite, however, assessment methods differed considerably between studies (Sullivan & Beech, 2004; Turner et al., 2014a). Furthermore, current research suggests that sexual offenders rarely restrict their criminal activities to sexual offenses (Harris, Knight, Smallbone, & Dennison, 2011; Lussier, 2005). Moreover, CSA-W rated the probability that they would abuse another child in the future much higher than those CSA who did not work with children (these differences showed the highest effect sizes). This finding of a higher probability of future sexual offenses might indicate that CSA-W view themselves as having less well developed self-regulatory capacities and more impulsivity – two features that dovetail with an increased antisocial inclination. Nevertheless, the finding of higher pre-conviction rates in CSA-W seems to be at odds with professional or voluntary work that includes close and structured contact with children. A professional context of this nature usually requires a great number of prosocial attitudes and behaviors as well as well-developed social competences – characteristics that are not usually found in antisocial personalities (Firestone, Moulden, & Wexler, 2009; Moulden, Firestone, & Wexler, 2007).

Moreover, unlike in research on convicted child sexual abusers, no differences emerged between CSA-W and CSA concerning pedophilic sexual fantasies. However, in line with the literature, more than 60% of CSA-W and CSA reported having had fantasies of this nature as compared to less than 4% of the non-CSA-W (Dombert et al., 2016; Turner et al. 2014a ; Wurtele, Simons, & Moreno, 2014). This shows the importance of this risk factor in relation to the perpetration of sexual offenses against children regardless of child-related work activities. Additionally, CSA-W were more likely to report different kinds of pedophilic

sexual contact behaviors compared to CSA. Hence although both groups show increased indicators of pedophilic interests (in terms of more pedophilic fantasies), we think it can be hypothesized that CSA-W are particularly interested in actively gaining contact to children. The higher self-rated probability for sexually abusing children in the future further corroborates this notion and may reflect a stronger feeling of entitlement to children as sexual objects, which may ultimately foster a lifestyle that readily includes illegal acts against children (child sex tourism, use of child prostitution, etc.) akin to the antisocial inclination discussed above.

In line with previous research, no differences were found concerning the personal characteristics assessed (Sullivan & Beech, 2004). Furthermore, CSA-W and CSA not working with children did not differ concerning the single variables used to assess hypersexual behaviors. However, when adding up these hypersexuality variables in the sex drive index, CSA-W were more likely to exhibit higher values pointing towards a stronger involvement with sexual issues. At least, one could conclude that a higher sex drive is a factor that might set CSA-W apart from other CSA.

Interestingly, detected CSA-W showed more antisocial behaviors than undetected CSA-W (as indexed by property and violent pre-convictions). This indicates that detected CSA-W have a generally higher risk of offending, including sexual offending compared to so far undetected CSA-W. Another explanation for this finding could be that detected CSA-W are simply not as clever or otherwise socially adapted as undetected CSA-W and as a result are more likely to get convicted. However, the two groups did not differ concerning vocational and educational status, which speaks against the latter explanation. Furthermore, no differences concerning pedophilic sexual fantasies emerged between detected and undetected CSA-W but detected CSA-W exhibited more sexual deviant behaviors. This corroborates the well-established fact (Seto, 2008) that pedophilic sexual interests in combination with antisocial characteristics show the greatest risk for child sexual abuse since

thresholds against offending get lowered due to both pedophilic interest and opportunistic sexual inclinations at the same time.

In order to further elucidate any factors that might set some men who work with children at an increased risk for sexual offending, we also compared CSA-W with non-CSA-W. In doing so it was found that more CSA-W reported having had sexually abusive experiences themselves during their childhood than non-CSA-W. Multiple studies have reported that having experienced childhood sexual victimization is more strongly associated with sexual offending against children than with other forms of offences (Jespersen, Lalumière, & Seto, 2009; Nunes, Hermann, Renee Malcom, & Lavoie, 2013; Seto & Lalumière, 2010). However, it has to be stated that there are some investigations contradicting these findings (Marshall, Serran, & Cortoni, 2000; Romano & De Luca, 1996). A recent prospective study found a significant association between physical abuse during childhood and arrests for sex crimes during adulthood, yet, a history of childhood sexual abuse did not increase the risk for arrests for sex crimes (Widom & Massey, 2015). Due to the nature of the vague correlational link between own experiences of sexual abuse and risk of sexual offending against children, it has to be emphasized that only a very small proportion of all men who had experienced victimization themselves during childhood become sexual offenders later. Strikingly, as mentioned above, a considerable number of non-CSA-W also reported having had sexual fantasies with children and two percent even admitted having consumed child pornography in the past. Nevertheless, it seems as if the deviant sexual interests are perceived more ambivalent by CSA-W, since more CSA-W than non-CSA-W have thought about seeking therapeutic help because of their pedophilic sexual fantasies. However, this self-reported distress might also be due to more intense pedophilic sexual fantasies or to a greater awareness of the problematic nature of their own deviant sexual fantasies compared to non-CSA-W. Although these findings suggest that it might be worth trying to gain access to these behaviors during job interviews, the practical usefulness of such

screening items remains questionable, since it is highly unlikely that someone would disclose such fantasies or behaviors in such a context. Furthermore, CSA-W were more likely to have been previously convicted for a property or violent offense than non-CSA-W, indicating that criminal background checks, being a procedure free from impression management, might add useful information. Such background checks should therefore routinely consider not only previous sexual offending but also other convictions for criminal behavior: apart from the question of preventing child sexual abuse, it is debatable how much anti-sociality is to be tolerated in individuals working with children anyway. It should, however, be kept in mind that the prevalence of a criminal history in applicants for youth-serving institutions is less than 1%, and such low prevalences will empirically lead to a low sensitivity of any screening method (Abel et al., 2012; Brenner & Gefeller, 1997; Choice Point, 2008). Accordingly, the sensitivity of the combined set of risk factors (i.e. anti-sociality, pedophilic fantasies, sex drive, and contact with children at work) was as low as 0.24, meaning that only one in four CSA-W would be recognized correctly as such.

Compared to non-CSA-W, CSA-W seem to be spending more time each day viewing pornography, a factor that has shown a significant association with sexual offending recidivism in previous studies (Kingston et al., 2008). Furthermore, similar to the findings of Marshall and colleagues (Marshall et al., 2008), we found a higher sex drive index in CSA-W. Taken together it can be proposed that high antisociality, more pedophilic sexual interests as well as a high sex drive might facilitate sexual offending in some men with frequent contact with children. However, it has to be kept in mind that sex drive could not predict self-reported child sexual abuse in the logistic regression calling its usefulness as a risk factor into question (Klein et al. 2015). Moreover, as with the assessment of pedophilic sexual fantasies and behaviors, attempting to evaluate hypersexual behaviors or the strength of the individual sex drive is probably futile without the willing cooperation of an applicant during job interviews.

Most importantly, although we were able to show that professional or vocational contact with children is associated with a higher probability for self-reported child sexual abuse, the low sensitivity of this single risk indicator has to be kept in mind when interpreting this result. The low sensitivity causes that a large degree of true positives will be missed if working with children is used as a predictor. Thus, referring to working with children as a risk factor for sexual offending, even though we found a statistically significant association, could lead to prejudices against men applying for a child-related work or voluntary activity (Munk, Larsen, Leander, & Soerensen, 2013). At this stage we strongly advise against drawing any conclusions from this risk factor without taking into account such considerably better established risk factors as pedophilic interests and general antisociality.

Limitations and Future Research

First of all, the small number of participants allocated to our study groups, in particular the detected CSA-W group, limits the robustness and generalizability of our findings, at least with regard to the specific group comparisons. In addition, the sample sizes varied considerably between the study groups. Although it was suggested that *t*-tests as well as χ^2 -tests could be used to compare groups with unequal sample sizes, the statistical power of the tests is usually limited by the smaller sub-sample (Boneau, 1960; McHugh, 2013). In small samples (or those with low base rates) the power to detect statistical differences is rather low, meaning that only very pronounced differences will reach statistical significance. Hence, our risk associations can be conceived of as rather conservative estimations.

Putting our results into perspective, it has to be considered that they rely exclusively on cross-sectional self-report measures without any collateral data for triangulation (e.g., observer ratings, archival data, etc.). Although anonymity was assured, it must be taken into account that some participants may have answered in a socially desirable manner. However, in view of the large sample size, using completely anonymous and confidential self-report

measures was the only realistically practicable assessment method for such a socially despised phenomenon as child sexual abuse and pedophilic interest (Jahnke, Inhoff, & Hoyer, 2015; Jahnke, Schmidt, Geradt, & Hoyer, 2015). Furthermore, the practice of partialing out socially desirable responding dispositions has been heavily criticized on theoretical and empirical grounds due to the fact that in the process meaningful criterion variance might get eliminated (Uziel, 2010). Thus, although there was some potential for socially desirable responding we believe our online approach represents the best available assessment option, one that minimizes response bias while at the same time being acceptable in ethical terms. Of course it must at the same time be acknowledged that there could also have been a selection bias due to the possibility that men who have a history of sexual offending may have over-proportionately denied participation.

Importantly, we could not determine whether all the CSA-W abused their victims within a youth-serving institution. It is conceivable that offender-victim contact was established outside of the offender's youth-related work context. Also, we did not assess whether any of the CSA who did not work with children had ever before worked with children or had abused them in a work-related context. Furthermore, it has to be pointed out that when assessing child prostitution and child sex tourism we did not specify age of the abused children. Thus, it is possible that some of the participants referred to adolescents rather than children. As regards the distinction between detected and undetected CSA-W, we did not distinguish between the types of sexual offenses for which the detected CSA-W had been convicted, and thus it is possible that some of the detected CSA-W had been convicted because of a sexual offense against adults.

Future studies should assess the motives behind CSA-W choosing a position that provides them with close contact to children. It has been suggested that one group of CSA-W might actively seek a position that provides them with close contact to children, while in others the repeated contact with children combined with other psychological problems such as

impulsivity, intimacy deficits, or relationship instability might ultimately facilitate the abusive behavior (Marshall, Smallbone, & Marshall, 2014; Turner & Briken, 2015). Crucially, longitudinal information in terms of offending history as well as victim characteristics and the context and setting factors of child sexual abuse would allow for more detailed analyses of sexual victimization in youth-serving institutions.

Conclusions

Only by studying the unique characteristics of CSA-W taken from the community was it possible to identify those variables that might increase the validity of potential screening and prevention strategies focusing on child sexual abuse in youth-serving institutions. Factors that were previously identified as having sufficient relevance in order to be considered in hiring decisions include a negative family background, an applicant's own experiences of sexual abuse, sexual interest in children, emotional congruence with children, an impulsive lifestyle, problems with self-regulation, cognitive distortions concerning adult-child relationships, and previous sexual and non-sexual offending (Hanson & Price, 2004; Price et al., 2013).

Although our findings seem to support at least some of these suggestions, they have to be treated very cautiously because if misinterpreted they could lead to the stigmatization of a large number of innocent applicants. The fact that a male applies for a job that involves contact with children is as a single risk indicator not sensitive to the question as to whether he presents a future risk for sexually victimizing children. Although it can be hypothesized that men planning to sexually abuse the children with whom they work would lie outright in a pre-employment interview in response to items assessing their specific risk factors, asking these questions could still function as a warning that the particular institution takes its preventive responsibility seriously. In the end it can be suggested, in line with previous literature, that a balance between the applicants' personal rights and the strategies used by youth-serving institutions to determine which applicants they will and will not accept has to be found (Abel

et al., 2012; Price et al. 2013).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The present study was funded by the German Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ).

REFERENCES

- Abel, G. G., Wiegel, M., Jordan, A., Harlow, N., Hsu, Y.-S., & Martinez, M. (2012). Development and validation of classification models to identify hidden child molesters applying to child service organizations. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*, 1378–1389.
- Banse, R., Schmidt, A. F., & Clarbour, J. (2010). Indirect measures of sexual interest in child sex offenders: a multimethod approach. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37*, 319–335.
- Benjamini, Y. & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistics Society, 57*, 289–300.
- Boneau, A. C. (1960). The effects of violations of assumptions underlying the t test. *Psychological Bulletin, 57*, 49–64.
- Brenner, H., & Gefeller, O. (1997). Variation of sensitivity, specificity, likelihood ratios and predictive values with disease prevalence. *Statistics in Medicine, 16*, 981–991.
- Choice Point. (2008). *The importance of background screening for nonprofits: An updated briefing*. Alpharetta, Georgia: Choice Point.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Colton, M., Roberts, S., & Vanstone, M. (2010). Sexual abuse by men who work with children. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 19*, 345–364.
- Davis, J. (1971). *Elementary Survey Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Dombert, B., Schmidt, A. F., Banse, R., Briken, P., Hoyer, J., Neutze, J., & Osterheider, M. (2016). How common is males' self-reported sexual interest in prepubescent children? *The Journal of Sex Research, 53*, 214–223.

- Firestone, P., Moulden, H., & Wexler, A. (2009). Clerics who commit sexual offenses: offender, offense, and victim characteristics. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 18*, 442–454.
- Gallagher, B. (2000). The extent and nature of known cases of institutional child sexual abuse. *British Journal of Social Work, 30*, 795–817.
- Graham, F. J., Walters, G. D., Harris, D.A., & Knight, R.A. (2015). Is hypersexuality dimensional or categorical? Evidence from male and female college samples. *The Journal of Sex Research, 53*, 224-238.
- Hanson, R. K. & Harris, A. J. R. (2000). Where should we intervene? Dynamic Predictors of Sexual Offense Recidivism. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 27*, 6-35.
- Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual offenders: a meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*, 1154–1163.
- Hanson, R. K., & Price, S. (2004). *Sexual abuse screening procedures for positions of trust with children*. In R. K. Hanson, F. Pfäfflin, & M. Lütz (Eds.), *Sexual Abuse in The Catholic Church: Scientific and Legal Perspectives* (pp. 77–91). Rom: Liberia Editrice Vaticana.
- Harris, D. A., Knight, R. A., Smallbone, S., & Dennison, S. (2011). Postrelease specialization and versatility in sexual offenders referred for civil commitment. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 23*, 243-259.
- Holt, K., & Massey, C. (2013). Sexual preference or opportunity: an examination of situational factors by gender of victims of clergy abuse. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 25*, 606–621.
- Jahnke, S., Imhoff, R. & Hoyer, J. (2015). Stigmatization of people with pedophilia: Two

- comparative surveys. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 44, 21-34.
- Jahnke, S., Schmidt, A.F. Geradt, M. & Hoyer, J. (2015). Stigma-related stress and its correlates among men with sexual interest in children. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 44, 2173-2187.
- Kafka, M. P. (1991). Successful antidepressant treatment of nonparaphilic sexual addictions and paraphilias in men. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 52, 60–65.
- Kafka, M. P. (1997). Hypersexual desire in males: an operational definition and clinical implications for males with paraphilias and paraphilia-related disorders. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 26, 505–526.
- Kingston, D. A., & Bradford, J. M. (2013). Hypersexuality and Recidivism among Sexual Offenders. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity: The Journal of Treatment & Prevention*, 20, 91–105.
- Kingston, D. A., Fedoroff, P., Firestone, P., Curry, S., & Bradford, J. M. (2008). Pornography use and sexual aggression: the impact of frequency and type of pornography use on recidivism among sexual offenders. *Aggressive Behavior*, 34, 341–351.
- Klein, V., Schmidt, A. F., Turner, D., & Briken, P. (2015). Are sex drive and hypersexuality associated with pedophilic interest and child sexual abuse in a male community sample? *Plos One*, 10(7), e0129730.
- Kjellgren, C., Priebe, G. Svedin, C. G. , Långström, N. (2010). Sexually coercive behavior in male youth: population survey of general and specific risk factors. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39, 1161-1169.
- Langevin, R., Curnoe, S., & Bain, J. (2000). A study of clerics who commit sexual offenses: are they different from other sex offenders? *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 24, 535–545.
- Leys, C., Ley, C., Klein, O., Bernard, P., & Licata, L. (2013). Detecting outliers: Do not use

- standard deviation around the mean, use absolute deviation around the median. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 764–766.
- Lussier, P. (2005). The criminal activity of sexual offenders in adulthood: Revisiting the specialization debate. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 17, 269-292.
- 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, 353-369.
- Marshall, L. E., Marshall, W. L., Moulden, H. M., & Serran, G. (2008). The prevalence of sexual addiction in incarcerated sexual offenders and matched community nonoffenders. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 15, 271–283.
- Marshall, W. L., Serran, G. A., & Cortoni, F. A. (2000). Childhood attachments, sexual abuse, and their relationship to adult coping in child molesters. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 12, 17-26.
- Marshall, W. L., Smallbone, S., & Marshall, L. E. (2014). A critique of current child molester subcategories: a proposal for an alternative approach. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 21, 1–14.
- McHugh, M. L. (2013). The Chi-square test of independence. *Biochemia Medica*, 23, 143–149.
- Moulden, H. M., Firestone, P., & Wexler, A. F. (2007). Child care providers who commit sexual offences: a description of offender, offence, and victim characteristics. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51, 384–406.
- Munk, K., Larsen, P., Leander, E., & Soerensen, K. (2013). Fear of child sex abuse: Consequences for childcare personell in Denmark. *Nordic Psychology*, 65, 19-32.
- Neutze, J., Grundmann, D., Scherner, G., & Beier, K. M. (2012). Undetected and detected

- child sexual abuse and child pornography offenders. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 35, 168–175.
- Noble, W. S. (2009). How does multiple testing correction work? *Nature Biotechnology*, 27, 1135–1137.
- Nunes, K. L., Hermann, C., Renee Malcom, J., & Lavoie, K. (2013). Childhood sexual victimization, pedophilic interest, and sexual recidivism. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 37, 703–11.
- Osterheider, M., Banse, R., Briken, P., Goldbeck, L., Hoyer, J., Santilla, P., Turner, D., Eisenbarth, H. (2011). Frequency, etiological models and consequences of child and adolescent sexual abuse: Aims and goals of the german multi-site MiKADO project. *Sexual Offender Treatment*, 6(2).
- Parkinson, P. N., Oates, R. K., & Jayakody, A. (2012). Child sexual abuse in the Anglican Church of Australia. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 21, 553–570.
- Price, S. A., Hanson, R. K., & Tagliani, L. (2013). Screening procedures in the United Kingdom for positions of trust with children. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 19, 17–31.
- Romano, E. & De Luca, R. V. (1996). Characteristics of perpetrators with histories of sexual abuse. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 40, 147-156.
- Seto, M. C. (2008). *Pedophilia and sexual offending against children: Theory, assessment, and intervention*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Seto, M. C., & Lalumière, M. L. (2010). What is so special about male adolescent sexual offending? A review and test of explanations through meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 526–575.
- Spröber, N., Schneider, T., Rassenhofer, M., Seitz, A., Liebhardt, H., König, L., & Fegert, J.

- M. (2014). Child sexual abuse in religiously affiliated and secular institutions: a retrospective descriptive analysis of data provided by victims in a government-sponsored reappraisal program in Germany. *BMC Public Health, 14*, 282.
- Sullivan, J., & Beech, A. (2004). A comparative study of demographic data relating to intra- and extra-familial child sexual abusers and professional perpetrators. *Journal of Sexual Aggression: An International, Interdisciplinary Forum for Research, Theory and Practice, 10*, 39–50.
- Sullivan, J., Beech, A. R., Craig, L., & Gannon, T. (2011). Comparing intra-familial and extra-familial child sexual abusers with professionals who have sexually abused children with whom they work. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 55*, 56–74.
- Turner, D., & Briken, P. (2015). Child Sexual Abusers Working with Children - Characteristics and Risk Factors. *Sexual Offender Treatment, 10*(1).
- Turner, D., Rettenberger, M., Lohmann, L., Eher, R., & Briken, P. (2014a). Pedophilic Sexual Interests and Psychopathy in Child Sexual Abusers Working with Children. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 38*, 326–335.
- Turner, D., Rettenberger, M., Yoon, D., Klein, V., Eher, R., & Briken, P. (2014b). Risk assessment in child sexual abusers working with children. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, epub ahead.
- Uziel, L. (2010). Rethinking social desirability scales: From impression management to interpersonally oriented self-control. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*, 243–262.
- Webster, M. W., & Whitman, J. (2008). *Who's lending a hand? A national survey of nonprofit volunteer screening practices*. Washington, DC: The National Center for Victims in Crime.

Widom, C. S., & Massey C. (2015). A prospective examination of whether childhood sexual abuse predicts subsequent sexual offending. *JAMA pediatrics*, *169*, e143357.

Winters, J., Christoff, K., & Gorzalka, B. B. (2010). Dysregulated sexuality and high sexual desire: distinct constructs? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *39*, 1029–1043.

Wurtele, S. K., Simons, D., & Moreno, T. (2014). Sexual interest in children among an online sample of men and women: prevalence and correlates. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, *26*, 546–568.

Table 1

Age, occupational status, and education of the study groups

	CSA-W (<i>n</i> = 37)	CSA (<i>n</i> = 90)	Non-CSA-W (<i>n</i> = 816)
Age; <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)**	33.7 (0.7)	44.4 (12.6)	40.6 (14.2)
Occupational status ^a ; <i>n</i> (%) ^{ns}			
In training	7 (18.9%)	6 (6.8%)	127 (15.7%)
Employed	27 (73.0%)	66 (75.0%)	598 (73.8%)
Unemployed	2 (5.4%)	5 (5.7%)	21 (2.6%)
Retired	1 (2.7%)	11 (12.5%)	64 (7.9%)
Years in school ^a ; <i>n</i> (%) [*]			
Still in school	0	2 (2.3%)	3 (0.4%)
Graduated after 9 years	5 (13.5%)	17 (19.3%)	40 (4.9%)
Graduated after 10 years	10 (27.0%)	31 (35.2%)	166 (20.5%)
Graduated after 13 years	22 (59.5%)	37 (42.0%)	599 (74.0%)
No graduation	0	1 (1.1%)	2 (0.2%)

Note. CSA = child sexual abusers not working with children, CSA-W = child sexual abusers working with children, non-CSA-W = men who are working with children and have not previously sexually abused a child.

^{ns} = non significant $p > .05$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

^aData on occupational status and years in school were missing for two men of the CSA group and for six men in the non-CSA-W group.

Table 2

Hierarchical logistic regression for the prediction of self-reported child sexual abuse

Predictors	R^2	B	Exp(β)	CI 95%
Step 1	.03***			
Working with children		1.37***	3.93	2.62-5.91
Step 2	.38***			
Working with children		1.22***	3.39	2.03-5.65
Antisociality		1.34***	3.83	2.56-5.71
Pedophilic sexual fantasies		1.28***	3.61	3.09-4.21
Sex drive Index		0.22	1.25	0.94-1.66

Note. $N = 8,312$, $n_{CSA} = 118$, *** $p < .001$, CI 95% = confidence interval 95%.

Table 3

Group comparisons on risk factors

	CSA-W (<i>n</i> = 37) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) / <i>n</i> (%)	CSA (<i>n</i> = 90) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) / <i>n</i> (%)	Non-CSA-W (<i>n</i> = 816) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) / <i>n</i> (%)	<i>ES</i> _{CSA-W/CSA} ^a	95% <i>CI</i>	<i>ES</i> _{CSA-W/Non-CSA-W} ^a	95% <i>CI</i>
Personal characteristics							
Two-year relationship	28 (75.7%)	64 (71.1%)	647 (79.7%)	.05	-0.15-0.21	-.02	-0.11-.04
Own abusive experiences	15 (40.5%)	32 (36.0%)	47 (5.8%)	.04	-0.14-0.23	.27*	0.15-0.40
Antisocial behavior							
Previous conviction for property offense	7 (20.6%)	11 (13.6%)	23 (2.9%)	.09	-0.10-0.30	.19*	0.07-0.35
Previous conviction for violent offense	13 (38.2%)	8 (9.9%)	12 (1.5%)	.34*	0.12-0.52	.43*	0.25-0.58
Previous conviction for sexual offense	10 (29.4%)	9 (11.1%)	0	.23*	0.02-0.43	.53*	0.35-0.53
Alcohol during sexual assault	11 (33.3%)	18 (21.4%)	n/a	.12	-0.07-0.33	n/a	n/a
Probability of future sexual assaults (0 – 100)	41.8 (33.4)	14.4 (23.5)	n/a	1.03*	0.63-1.43	n/a	n/a
Pedophilic sexual fantasies							
Sexual fantasies involving children	26 (70.3%)	58 (64.4%)	29 (3.5%)	.06	-0.14-0.22	.55*	0.42-0.66
Sexual fantasies involving boys	18 (48.6%)	33 (36.7%)	7 (0.9%)	.11	-0.08-0.30	.58*	0.41-0.70
Sexual fantasies involving girls	24 (64.9%)	46 (51.1%)	28 (3.4%)	.13	-0.07-0.30	.52*	0.39-0.64
Deviant sexual behaviors							
Child pornography	19 (51.4%)	39 (43.8%)	16 (2.0%)	.07	-0.12-0.25	.51*	0.35-0.65
Intended child sex tourism	17 (45.9%)	16 (18.0%)	0	.29*	0.09-0.48	.67*	0.52-0.67

Child prostitution	15 (40.5%)	15 (16.9%)	n/a	.25*	0.05-0.45	n/a	n/a
Sexual behavior with boys	20 (54.1%)	38 (42.2%)	n/a	.11	-0.08-0.29	n/a	n/a
Sexual behavior with girls	30 (81.1%)	57 (63.3%)	n/a	.17	-0.02-0.31	n/a	n/a
Ever thought about therapy b/c of sexual interest in children	12 (36.4%)	13 (16.0%)	4 (11.1%) ^b	.22	0.01-0.43	.30*	0.03-0.48
Hypersexual behaviors							
Seven or more orgasms per week (hypersexuality)	3 (11.1%)	4 (5.4%)	138 (17.1%)	.10	-0.09-0.32	-.03	-0.07-0.06
Orgasms per week	3.6 (1.8)	3.0 (1.8)	3.5 (2.0)	.34	-0.06-0.74	.07	-0.33-0.47
Intensity of sexual desire	68.4 (21.5)	64.9 (23.6)	62.0 (21.3)	.16	-0.24-0.56	.30	-0.03-0.63
Time thinking about sexuality (min./day)	72.1 (47.3)	61.9 (44.6)	47.6 (37.5)	.22	-0.18-0.62	.65*	0.23-1.06
Time consuming pornography (min./day)	29.7 (27.6)	27.8 (23.6)	13.6 (19.8)	.07	-0.33-0.47	.80*	0.38-1.22
Sex Drive Index	0.5 (0.7)	0.1 (0.8)	-0.01 (0.7)	.54*	0.14-0.95	.70*	0.20-1.19

Note. All percentages displayed refer to the actual number of participants who had answered the single questions and thus do not in all cases correspond to whole number of participants in the subgroups.

95% *CI* = 95% confidence interval; CSA = child sexual abusers not working with children; CSA-W = child sexual abusers working with children; *ES* = effect size; n/a = not applicable; non-CSA-W = men who are working with children and have not previously sexually abused a child.

* $p < .05$ after correction for multiple testing.

^aCohen's *d* was provided as an effect measure for continuous variables ($d > 0.2$ small effect, $d > 0.5$ medium effect, $d > 0.8$ large effect; Cohen, 1988) and Cramer's *V* for dichotomous variables ($V > 0.1$ small effect, $V > 0.3$ medium effect, $V > 0.5$ large effect; Davis, 1971)

^bThis number refers to those non-CSA-W who admitted having sexual fantasies with children while not participating in any sexual behavior with children.

Table 4

Comparison between detected CSA-W and undetected CSA-W

	Detected ^a CSA-W (<i>n</i> = 10) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) / <i>n</i> (%)	Undetected CSA-W (<i>n</i> = 24) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) / <i>n</i> (%)	ES ^b	CI 95%
Personal characteristics				
Age	36.0 (10.6)	31.8 (9.1)	.44	-0.31-1.18
Two-year relationship	10 (100%)	16 (66.7%)	.36	-0.06-0.36
Own abusive experiences	8 (80.0%)	7 (29.2%)	.47*	0.06-0.68
Antisocial behavior				
Previous conviction for property offense	6 (60.0%)	1 (4.2%)	.63*	0.19-0.78
Previous conviction for violent offense	8 (80.0%)	5 (20.8%)	.56*	0.15-0.77
Alcohol during sexual assault	6 (60.0%)	5 (21.7%)	.37	-0.03-0.70
Probability of future offense	73.2 (13.5)	28.8 (30.4)	1.66*	0.83-2.5
Pedophilic sexual interests				
Sexual fantasies involving children	9 (90.0%)	16 (66.7%)	.24	-0.18-0.38
Sexual fantasies involving boys	7 (70.0%)	10 (41.7%)	.26	-0.14-0.53
Sexual fantasies involving girls	9 (90.0%)	10 (41.7%)	.44	0.05-0.57
Ever thought about therapy b/c of sexual interest in children	5 (50.0%)	7 (30.4%)	.19	-0.19-0.55
Deviant sexual behaviors				
Child pornography	8 (80.0%)	11 (45.8%)	.31	-0.09-0.53
Child prostitution	8 (80.0%)	6 (25.0%)	.51*	0.11-0.72
Child sex tourism	8 (80.0%)	9 (37.5%)	.39	-0.01-0.60
Sexual behavior with boys	8 (80.0%)	11 (45.8%)	.31	-0.09-0.53
Sexual behavior with girls	10 (100%)	17 (70.8%)	.33	-0.10-0.33
Hypersexual behaviors				
Seven or more orgasms per week (hypersexuality)	0 (0%)	3 (16.7%)	-.20	-0.20-0.26
Orgasms per week	3.4 (1.5)	3.8 (2.1)	-.18	-1.06-0.69
Intensity of sexual desire	71.7 (13.7)	67.6 (24.1)	.19	-0.55-0.93
Time thinking about sexuality (min./day)	93.6 (44.9)	69.2 (43.2)	.56	-0.34-1.45
Time consuming pornography (min./day)	15.0 (25.1)	35.1 (27.2)	-.76	-1.73-0.22

Sex Drive Index	0.3 (0.4)	0.6 (0.8)	-.49	-1.66-0.68
-----------------	-----------	-----------	------	------------

Note. 95% *CI* = 95% confidence interval; CSA = child sexual abusers not working with children; CSA-W = child sexual abusers working with children; *ES* = effect size; n/a = not applicable; non-CSA-W = men who are working with children and have not previously sexually abused a child.

* $p < .05$ after correction for multiple testing.

^aDetection status refers to any pre-convictions because of a sexual offense, including sexual offenses against adults.

^bCohen's *d* was provided as an effect measure for continuous variables ($d > 0.2$ small effect, $d > 0.5$ medium effect, $d > 0.8$ large effect; Cohen, 1988) and Cramer's *V* for dichotomous variables ($V > 0.1$ small effect, $V > 0.3$ medium effect, $V > 0.5$ large effect; Davis, 1971)