

H. H. Bonheur,<sup>1</sup> M.S.

## Psychodiagnostic Testing of Sex Offenders: A Comparative Study

---

**REFERENCE:** Bonheur, H. H., "Psychodiagnostic Testing of Sex Offenders: A Comparative Study," *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, JFSCA, Vol. 28, No. 1, Jan. 1983, pp. 49-60.

**ABSTRACT:** Two groups of offenders, one charged with sex crimes as well as with crimes of larceny, and the other charged with sex crimes only, are compared with respect to their demographic characteristics and their intelligence and diagnostic classification as determined via psychological testing.

**KEYWORDS:** psychiatry, criminalistics, criminal sex offenses

It is widely accepted that sexual assaults are motivated more as a response to defects/deficits in the personality makeup of the perpetrator of such crimes, than as an expression of his physiological drive toward sex. These defects/deficits are held to be the key determinants as to how, when, and against whom such assaults are likely to be directed by the offender, and why [1-3].

Obviously not all persons who commit crimes involving various forms of larceny, notably robbery and burglary, subject their victims also to one or another type of sexual abuse during the same criminal episode. Nor do all persons who commit sexual offenses exploit their victims further and "rip" them "off" of their valuables at some point during the commission of that offense. There is indeed a large segment of the sex offender population who refuse to take, or accept, even when urged upon them, monies or other valuables belonging to the person they have sexually violated.

But there are those individuals who do commit both types of crime, sexual and larcenous, successively against the same person during the same criminal episode. Despite of our much improved insights into the interconnections between psychological disturbances and criminal behavior, it still happens frequently that the unlawful acts of this type of offenders, as a group, are taken to be simply a function of their predatory orientations and life style. There are, of course, many among this group of offenders who are characterologically predatory in their outlook and habits, and for whom sexual assaults and various forms of larceny are simply ways for them to exploit and plunder other people who by dint of miscalculation or misfortune happen to cross paths with them.

There are, however, others among this type of offender population committing sexual and larcenous crime simultaneously, whose criminal escapades are not adequately explainable in terms of unbridled appetites for personal gratification and opportunities they may encounter at any given time. For example, such additional factors as feelings of anger and rage, or a

Received for publication 10 March 1982; revised manuscript received 22 June 1982; accepted for publication 29 June 1982.

<sup>1</sup>Senior psychologist, formerly, Forensic Psychiatry Clinic-Manhattan, New York State Supreme Court, New York; presently, Department of Mental Health, New York.

sense of inadequacy and inferiority are known to serve as powerful motives that also propel some such offenders toward their criminal acts.

Moreover, there are still those among this type of offender population whose criminal acts are essentially functions of their grossly disordered mental structures. For these persons, unlawful behavior is more a reaction to their mounting inner turmoil which may be rapidly eroding what little psychological balance and security they still retain.

The literature dealing with the interface between crime and psychology/psychiatry includes ample references to the psychodynamic forces that may be at the roots of criminal behavior [4]. However, there are comparatively few reports that focus specifically on personality differences among various subgroups within the overall sex offender population [5-7]. The present study aims to compare two groups of alleged sex offenders who were examined at a forensic psychiatry clinic, with respect to their personality classifications as determined by means of psychological tests.

More specifically, the intrapsychic forces that motivate an individual to commit sexual assaults notwithstanding, (be they a sense of inadequacy and helplessness, feelings of frustration and anger, affective hunger and need for human companionship, or random undifferentiated acting out of an archaic or a predatory personality) how do persons who commit sexual assaults and crimes of larceny, successively, during the same criminal episode against the same victim compare, with respect to their psychodiagnostic classification as determined by means of psychological test batteries, with those persons whose stated purpose and offenses against their victims are manifestly sex-related? This is the question that is being addressed in this paper.

To investigate this question, two groups of alleged sex offenders were selected from among the cases that were referred to the Forensic Psychiatry Clinic, New York State Supreme Court, for the Borough of Manhattan, during the years of 1973 to 1979, inclusive. This clinic receives referrals, generally, from the courts or from the probation department, and such referrals may come at any point during the legal proceedings, that is, at prepleading, trial, or before or after sentence phase of the judicial process.

The basic functions of this clinic include, first, to provide assessments of the psychological competence of an accused to adequately appreciate the implications of his court involvement and to participate effectively in his own defense and, second, to offer recommendations regarding dispositional planning in his case. Each defendant is evaluated by at least one psychiatrist or one psychologist or both. Those who are referred for competency determinations are usually evaluated by two psychiatrists, and in many instances by a psychologist as well. Since 1975 individuals under 22 years of age who are referred for reasons other than competency determination have received psychological testing as a matter of routine. As discussed elsewhere in this report, this practice has engendered one source of potential bias in this study.

### **Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to compare one group of defendants who are accused of committing sexual assaults and crimes of larceny, successively, against the same victim during the same criminal episode, with another group of offenders who are charged with committing sexual assaults independent of crimes for material profit, specifically with respect to their psychodiagnostic classifications as determined via psychological testing.

### **Method**

For purposes of an earlier study [8] this writer had previously screened the records of those defendants from the Supreme Courts he had evaluated during the years of 1973 to 1979, inclusive, in order to identify those persons who had been accused of at least one count of sex-

ual crime, and who had been given a battery of psychological tests consisting of no less than the Rorschach, the Bender Motor Gestalt, the House-Tree-Person, a word association test, and a sufficient<sup>2</sup> portion of a Wechsler Intelligence Scale to insure reliable intelligence quotient (I.Q.) scores. Sixty-four cases had been found to meet these two criteria.

The records of these 64 defendants had been reviewed and data pertaining to aspects of their background and personal habits have been extracted. Whenever possible, this data had been cross-checked against the information available elsewhere, that is, in Probation Department and psychiatric reports. I.Q. scores and the diagnosis arrived at in each case were also noted.

To be included in the present study a person must have been accused of an offense that had been targeted specifically against another person. Two cases were eliminated from this group of 64 defendants, as they were charged with crimes that had not victimized any one person in particular. One was accused of public lewdness, and the other of promoting prostitution. The remaining 62 defendants did satisfy this additional criterion in that in each case at least one person was left victimized in the wake of the alleged crime.

The 62 defendants were then separated into two groups based on whether or not they were accused of having committed some act of larceny, in addition to the sexual crime<sup>3</sup> they were charged with. Seventeen of these defendants did have such additional charges pending against them, and they are grouped under the heading of "Sample B" in this report. The remaining 45 did not have such additional charges contained in their indictments, and they are designated here as "Sample A."

No other criteria were used in the selection of these subjects, or in their assignment to one or the other of the two sample groups, and in each case names and other identifying information was omitted to insure the subject's privacy.

### **Current and Prior Arrests**

Sexual crimes charged against the subjects in each group are broken down in Table 1. In cases in which more than one type of sexual assault was charged against the same defendant, that defendant is listed in this table according to the more serious offense. Over 90% of the subjects in both groups stood charged with at least one sexual crime involving rape or sodomy, with the incidents of rape far exceeding those of sodomy. Two-thirds of the subjects in Sample A, and four-fifths of those in Sample B had at least one charge of rape pending against them.

In all but five cases the victims were females, ranging in age from preadolescence to 68 years old. In two instances, one from each sample group, the victims were male adults. In the other three cases, all from Sample A, the victims were boys 14 years old or younger.

Regarding the crimes for material gain also charged against the defendants comprising Sample B, over 88% in this group was accused of at least one charge of robbery (Table 2). A similar procedure was followed in constructing this table as that used for Table 1. That is, where a subject was charged with more than one type of larceny, that subject was classified according to the more serious of these offenses.

There were many in both sample groups who had other crimes charged against them in addition to the sexual and the nonsexual offenses gleaned for the purposes of the present study. These other crimes most often involved possession of a weapon or assault or both. Other than the offenses detailed in Tables 1 and 2, no other crimes charged against the subjects were taken into consideration in the present investigation.

<sup>2</sup>At least the comprehension, arithmetic, similarities, digit span, digit symbol, picture completion, block design, and picture arrangement subtests had to have been administered.

<sup>3</sup>As defined by the Penal Law of the State of New York in McKinney's *Consolidated Law of New York*, Book 39, Penal Law, Article 130, Sex Offenses, West Publishing Co., St. Paul, MN, 1975, pp. 444-491.

TABLE 1—*Current sexual offenses.*

	Sample A		Sample B		Samples A and B	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Rape	30	66.7	14	82.4	44	71.0
Sodomy	11	24.4	2	11.7	13	21.0
Sexual misconduct <sup>a</sup>	4	8.9	1	5.9	5	8.0
Total	45	100.0	17	100.0	62	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Includes also such other charges as sexual abuse, sexual molestation, and endangering welfare of a minor.

TABLE 2—*Sample B—current larceny charges.*

	No.	%
Robbery	15	88.2
Burglary	1	5.9
Grand larceny	1	5.9
Total	17	100.0

Nearly a fourth of the subjects from each sample group had no known record of prior arrests. All those from Sample B, and six persons from Sample A for whom the instant offense represented their first known arrest were under 19 years of age. Over three quarters of the subjects from each group had been arrested at least once before the instant offense. The number of arrests for the subjects in Sample A with prior court records ranged to as many as eleven times. For those in Sample B the highest number of known prior arrests was 20 (14 adult and 6 juvenile). The median number of prior arrests for each of the two sample groups falls at 5.5, and the type of charges in these prior arrests ranged from public intoxication and harassment to multiple episodes of rape, assault, and arson. Regarding those with prior arrests for sexual assaults, a slightly higher percentage of subjects in Sample B (46%) than those in Sample A (41%) had been previously accused of such crimes (Table 3).

### Description of the Samples

The subjects in both Samples A and B are males ranging in age from 15 to 59 (Table 4). Thirty-three of those in Sample A, and all but one of those in Sample B were under 28 years old. It needs to be noted here that before 1979 no 15 or 16 year olds were referred to this clinic. Such cases were routinely adjudicated in the juvenile courts. It was after September 1978 when changes in the New York State Criminal Procedure Laws took effect, allowing for some pre-seventeen adolescents accused of certain violent crimes to be tried in adult courts, that such referrals began to arrive at this clinic.

About 27% of the defendants in Sample A and 12% in Sample B reportedly had maintained a man and wife relationship with a woman at least once at some point in their lives. All others in both sample groups were reportedly unmarried (Table 5).

There is no significant difference obtained in comparing the two sample groups with respect to educational and occupational histories. Over 75% of the subjects in each group had completed less than twelve years of schooling, and two thirds or more in each sample had no marketable job skills (Tables 6 and 7).

TABLE 3—*Prior arrests.*

Offense	Sample A		Sample B		Samples A and B	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Nonsexual only	20	44.5	7	41.2	27	43.5
Sexual only	4	8.9	2	11.8	6	9.7
Sexual and nonsexual	10	22.2	4	23.5	14	22.6
None	11	24.4	4	23.5	15	24.2
Total	45	100.0	17	100.0	62	100.0

TABLE 4—*Classification by age.*

Age	Sample A		Sample B		Samples A and B	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
15-16	1	2.2	3	17.7	4	6.5
17-21	22	48.9	9	52.9	31	50.0
22-29	13	28.9	4	23.5	17	27.4
30-39	3	6.7	1	5.9	4	6.5
40-49	1	2.2	...	...	1	1.6
50-59	5	11.1	...	...	5	8.0
Total	45	100.0	17	100.0	62	100.0

TABLE 5—*Marital status.*

	Sample A		Sample B		Samples A and B	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Married <sup>a</sup>	4	8.9	1	5.9	5	8.1
No longer married <sup>b</sup>	8	17.8	1	5.9	9	14.5
Never married	33	73.3	15	88.2	48	77.4
Total	45	100.0	17	100.0	62	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Includes common-law and formal marriages.

<sup>b</sup>As the result of separation, divorce, or death of a spouse.

Nearly a quarter of the group in Sample A acknowledged having abused, at some point in their past, some form of drugs, alcohol, or both. This compares to more than three quarters of the individuals from Sample B who admitted to such abuses (Table 8).

Eleven of the subjects in Sample A, and none in Sample B, reportedly had suffered some central nervous system dysfunction at some point in their histories (Table 9). Eight of these had suffered trauma to the head (six as a result of having been struck by a car and two from gun shot wounds) that had rendered them unconscious for varying periods of time. Two others had histories of convulsive disorders.

Psychological testing produced signs of probable central nervous system dysfunction in five cases from Sample A (all five included among the eleven with histories of neurological disorders) and in one case from Sample B. However, in none of these six cases was the suggested organic disorder of such nature and magnitude as to allow for a condition of organicity to be used as the primary diagnosis.

TABLE 6—*Education.*

Level	Sample A		Sample B		Samples A and B	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Below 6th grade	4	8.9	...	...	4	6.5
7th to 9th grades	5	11.2	3	17.6	8	12.9
10th to 12th grades	24	53.3	8	47.0	32	51.6
Special schools <sup>a</sup>	2	4.4	2	11.8	4	6.5
High school diploma	4	8.9	2	11.8	6	9.6
Some college <sup>b</sup>	4	8.9	2	11.8	6	9.6
College/professional degree	2	4.4	...	...	2	3.2
Total	45	100.0	17	100.0	62	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Special programs for the intellectually limited or emotionally and behaviorally disordered or both.

<sup>b</sup>Ranging from few credits to having completed three and a half years and still attending.

TABLE 7—*Occupation.*

Type	Sample A		Sample B		Samples A and B	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Professional	1	2.2	...	...	1	1.6
Self-employed	1	2.2	1	5.9	2	3.2
Managerial	2	4.4	...	...	2	3.2
Clerical	4	8.9	1	5.9	5	8.1
Skilled	3	6.8	3	17.6	6	9.7
High school	2	4.4	2	11.8	4	6.5
Student college	1	2.2	...	...	1	1.6
Trade school	2	4.4	...	...	2	3.2
Unskilled	29	64.5	10	58.8	39	62.9
Total	45	100.0	17	100.0	62	100.0

TABLE 8—*Substance abuse.*<sup>a</sup>

Substances	Sample A		Sample B		Samples A and B	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Alcohol	7	15.6	2	11.8	9	14.5
Drugs <sup>b</sup>	1	2.2	5	29.4	6	9.7
Alcohol and drugs	3	6.7	6	35.3	9	14.5
None	34	75.5	4	23.5	38	61.3
Totals	45	100.0	17	100.0	62	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Marijuana users and "occasional/social" drinkers are not included as abusers.

<sup>b</sup>Including heroin, cocaine, barbiturates, and hallucinogens.

With respect to psychiatric history, 40% of the subjects in Sample A and 71% of those in Sample B acknowledged having had prior contacts with a mental health professional at some point in their pasts. Such contacts ranged from a few sessions with a school psychologist while in elementary school to repeated and prolonged periods of confinement on a psychiatric ward. Nearly half of the individuals in Sample B had received treatment in a

TABLE 9—*History of neurological disorders.*

	Sample A		Sample B		Samples A and B	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	11	24.4			11	17.7
No	34	75.6	17	100.0	51	82.3
Total	45	100.0	17	100.0	62	100.0

TABLE 10—*Psychiatric history.*

Type of Service	Sample A		Sample B		Samples A and B	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Inpatient only	11	24.4	5	29.4	16	25.8
Outpatient only	7	15.6	4	23.5	11	17.8
In- and out-patient	...	...	3	17.7	3	4.8
None	27	60.0	5	29.4	32	51.6
Total	45	100.0	17	100.0	62	100.0

residential setting at least once in their lives. This was the case in less than a quarter of the group in Sample A (Table 10).

The breakdown of the subjects with respect to their intellectual functioning, as measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scales appear in Tables 11 and 12. In interpreting these tables, it is important to note that they do not reflect an adequately complete picture of the subjects' intellectual functioning at the time they were tested. For instance, wide scatters characterized the subtest scores of a large number of the subjects in both group. Also, even though it is somewhat more evident, these tables nevertheless fail to highlight adequately the significant discrepancies that were obtained between the Verbal I.Q.s and the Performance I.Q.s in a very substantial portion of the sample populations. Nearly three quarters of the subjects in each sample group earned Verbal I.Q.s that were discrepant with their Performance I.Q.s by no less than six points, and to as much as 31 points. The ratio of cases with their Verbal I.Q.s being higher, to those with higher Performance scores was nearly even (14:16) for the Sample A population. For Sample B group the ratio was 1:2 (4:8) in favor of Performance I.Q.

Less than 65% of the subjects in Sample A, but over 82% of those in Sample B earned Performance Scale scores that fall within the 80 to 100 I.Q. range. This compares to 51 and 47% from each of the two groups, respectively, who had earned Verbal Scale scores that fell within this same I.Q. range.

Forty-nine (81%) subjects out of the combined 62 that comprise the two samples scored within or above the normal range with respect to their overall intelligence. Of the remaining 13 whose Full Scale I.Q.s fell within or below the borderline defective level, eight (six in Sample A and two in Sample B) scored within the normal limits on the Performance Scale, and one (in Sample A) on the Verbal Scale.

In only one case (from Sample A) were the attained scores on all three Scales (that is, Verbal, Performance, and Full) within the mildly defective range of intelligence. This subject had an extensive history of emotional and mental problems and was diagnosed as chronic schizophrenic by different clinicians.

Psychodiagnostic testing revealed that nearly 65% of the subjects in Sample B suffered

TABLE 11—*I.Q. scores.*

Wechsler Scales	Verbal			Performance			Full		
	Sample A	Sample B	Sample A	Sample B	Sample A	Sample B	Sample A	Sample B	
I. Q. Range	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
60-69	1	2.2	...	...	2	4.4	...	1	2.2
70-79	10	22.3	5	29.4	4	8.9	1	5.9	20.0
80-89	13	28.9	5	29.4	17	37.8	7	41.2	28.9
90-99	10	22.2	3	17.7	12	26.7	7	41.1	22.3
100-109	7	15.6	3	17.6	5	11.1	1	5.9	17.8
110-119	2	4.4	1	5.9	3	6.7	1	5.9	4.4
120-129	2	4.4	...	...	1	2.2	...	1	2.2
130-139	...	...	...	...	1	2.2	...	...	...
Total	45	100.0	17	100.0	45	100.0	17	100.0	100.0

TABLE 12—*Classification of intelligence.*

Wechsler Scales	Verbal			Performance			Full		
	Sample A	Sample B	Sample A	Sample B	Sample A	Sample B	Sample A	Sample B	
Classification	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Defective	1	2.2	...	...	2	4.4	...	1	2.2
Borderline	10	22.3	5	29.4	4	8.9	1	5.9	20.0
Dull normal	13	28.9	5	29.4	17	37.8	7	41.2	28.9
Average	17	37.8	6	35.3	17	37.8	8	47.0	40.1
Bright normal	2	4.4	1	5.9	3	6.7	1	5.9	4.4
Superior	2	4.4	...	...	1	2.2	...	1	2.2
Very superior	...	...	...	...	1	2.2	...	1	2.2
Total	45	100.0	17	100.0	45	100.0	17	100.0	100.0



from one or another form of schizophrenic disorder. This contrasts to about 38% in Sample A who had schizophrenia as their primary diagnosis (Table 13).

It should be mentioned at this point that the recently revised criteria introduced in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 3rd ed. (DMS III) [9] might conceivably alter these diagnoses, and reclassify some of them possibly as atypical psychosis or as a schizophreniform disorder. Some may even be labelled as one or another of the personality disorders, for example, schizotypal, borderline, or narcissistic. Nevertheless, the changes that may have to be made in the diagnostic labels do not alter the findings produced by psychological testing that these individuals are indeed suffering from mental disturbances variously manifested in such forms as indecisiveness, panic states, personalized reasoning and logic, impaired object and reality relatedness, identity problems, failure of self system integration, and weak and unstable defensive systems.

In Sample A 62% and in Sample B 35% were classified as personality disorders. Schizoid was the more frequent classification in Sample A, whereas passive-aggressive diagnosis was more prevalent in Sample B.

### Limitations

There are certain biases and limitations inherent in studies such as the one being reported on herein. The more obvious ones pertain to the sampling procedures and to the size of each sample group. The size of the samples, particularly that of Sample B is small in proportion to the known, and even more so in proportion to the officially derived estimates of the actual prevalence of sexual crimes in the United States. Statistics compiled by the New York Police Department [10] for example, reveal that on the average nearly 1200 complaints involving felony level sexual offenses were reported in the Borough of Manhattan alone during each of the seven years covered in this study. It is variously estimated by different law enforcement agencies that anywhere from an equal number, to as many as five times that number of such crimes go unreported each year.

The same New York Police Department statistics show that arrests were made in about 40 to 50% of the sex-related complaints received annually. While specific figures are not readily available, it is commonly recognized that not all those who are arrested are prosecuted (for example, for lack of evidence or legal/technical issues). And, even those who are prosecuted, many are convicted of charges other than the sexual crimes they were originally arrested on (for example, through plea bargaining).

Overall, only a very small percentage of sex offenders whose cases reach the courts are referred to the Forensic Psychiatry Clinic. The total number of examinations made annually at this clinic on Supreme Court cases hovered around the 1000 mark. Less than 20% of these cases involved sex crimes. Nearly an equal number of examinations were performed for the New York City Criminal Courts, but these were excluded from this study.

TABLE 13—*Diagnostic classification.*

	Sample A		Sample B		Samples A and B	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Schizophrenia	17	37.8	11	64.7	28	45.2
Schizoid	10	22.2	...	...	10	16.1
Passive-aggressive	8	17.8	4	23.5	12	19.4
Inadequate	9	20.0	1	5.9	10	16.1
Antisocial	..	...	1	5.9	1	1.6
Depressive	1	2.2	...	...	1	1.6
Total	45	100.0	17	100.0	62	100.0

The procedures used in making referrals to this clinic are inherently biased in themselves. That is, in a very large portion of the cases, suspected personality maladjustments (for example, by reason of prior psychiatric treatment, strange or inappropriate behavior, or bizarre or uncommon nature of the offense) are the bases for referring a defendant for a psychological/psychiatric workup at this clinic.

The sample groups may be unrepresentative of the general sex offender population also because not all persons who are referred to this clinic receive a psychological, as well as a psychiatric examination. From those who do, not all receive a full battery of psychological tests. Moreover, a substantial number of those who do receive a full battery of tests are young that is, under 22 years of age.

The step taken to insure uniformity of approach with respect to psychological testing, namely, drawing the subjects to be included in this investigation from among the cases that were examined by the same psychologist, tends to generate another source of potential bias, even though no deliberate efforts were made to determine in advance what cases were to be seen by which psychologist.

Defendants included in this study were selected on the basis of the charges contained in their indictments. Although implicit in this is that there must have been sufficient cause for a grand jury to pass up an indictment, this by no means, of course, constitutes sufficient evidence of the accused's guilt. There could have been those among the subjects who were not guilty as charged, or conceivably not guilty at all, and whose guilt or innocence was established at some point after their contact with this clinic.

Because of the foregoing actual or potential limitations, as well as for other reasons, the population used in this study needs to be viewed, first of all, as "alleged" sex offenders, and, secondly, of course, as not necessarily a true sampling of the sex offender population in the United States in general.

Finally, information about each defendant's background and personal habits were obtained, for the most part, from the defendant himself. While such information was cross-checked against the data obtained by other clinic personnel, for example, psychiatrists, and against that gathered by the Probation Department, such information could not be independently verified in all cases. Such information did not influence materially the central objective of this study, that is, comparison of the subjects with respect to their differential diagnoses, as such diagnoses were consistent with the norms and standards prevalent at the time they were made. However, since the advent of DMSIII and the prescribed changes contained therein with respect to, for example, the criteria for the diagnosis of schizophrenia, verification of background information takes on additional significance.

## Discussions

Comparison of the two groups of alleged sex offenders obtained no significant differences with respect to many of their demographic characteristics. The 62 subjects included in this study are typically young males (over 80% under 29 years old) with limited formal academic training (nearly 78% had not finished high school) and lacking in job skills (63% unskilled) and in work record. Nearly three quarters of these defendants had never married. This was undoubtedly caused in part to the relatively young ages of these subjects (51% of Sample A group and 71% of Sample B group were 21 years old or younger). In addition, however, it is likely that the inclination of many sex offenders to be loners, or to otherwise avoid or undermine close and enduring relationships with people also contributed to the relatively low incidents of marriage in the lives of these subjects.

Most subjects (76%) had been arrested at least once before their instant offense since reaching adulthood. More than two fifths of the sample groups had been charged with a sexual crime at least once previously. The offense most frequently contained in their current in-

dictments was rape (71%). The complainants/victims in these alleged crimes were overwhelmingly females ranging in age from prepubescence to over 70 years old.

At least with respect to the foregoing characteristics, the sample groups used in this study compare closely to the larger sex offender populations from which these subjects were drawn. For instance, New York Police Department statistics reveal that of the nearly 3000 arrests that were effected city-wide in cases involving sexual assault complaints in 1974 a majority of them were young (71% were 29 years old or under), single (75%), males (99%), and lacking in formal educational training, job skills, and work experience (70%). Rape was the most frequently cited charge in these arrests (73%), followed by sodomy (12%). A relatively small segment (23%) of the overall population arrested on sex-related charges were also accused of committing such additional crimes as robbery or burglary during the same criminal episode [11]. This latter proportion is consistent with that found among the defendants that comprise the sample groups used in the current study.

The characteristics that the subjects have been found to have in common notwithstanding, the two sample groups are revealed to differ notably in a number of respects. The group made up of those accused of crimes for profit, as well as of sexual assaults show a much higher rate of drug and alcohol consumption (77% versus 25%). Also, a significantly larger portion of this group (71% versus 40%) had histories of emotional and personality maladjustments of long standing duration that had brought them to the attention of mental health professionals. Indeed about a half of the defendants in this group had been confined to a residential setting, for varying periods of time, at least once in the past.

Personality and emotional problems and difficulties served as the major source of impediment to their intellectual development and functioning for most of the subjects much more so than such other factors as academic, experiential, or cultural deficits. While for most subjects a wide discrepancy was obtained between their verbal and nonverbal intelligence, among those who were accused of sexual and larceny crimes this discrepancy more often was in favor of their nonverbal intelligence. Proportionately, more of this type of offender were found to have settled on action, rather than words as their method of choice for coping. For example, 94% of this subject group earned nonverbal I.Q.s that fell within the normal range, whereas this was the case in about 82% of the group charged with sex crimes only. This is consistent with the fact that many such individuals commit one or the other of their crimes (usually their sexual assaults) impulsively and without premeditation.

Finally, the results of this study reveal a significantly higher rate of schizophrenic disorders among that group of sex offenders who were also accused of committing such additional crimes as robbery and burglary during the same criminal episode, than there is among offenders whose crimes were solely sex related. This finding has important implications for the management and treatment of such offenders. However, more studies of the sort being reported on in this paper are needed before such findings can be generalized to larger offender populations.

## References

- [1] Karpman, B., *The Sexual Offender and His Offenses: Etiology Pathology, Psychodynamics, and Treatment*, Julian Press, Inc., New York, 1963.
- [2] Groth, A. N., *Men Who Rape: The Psychology of the Offender*, Plenum Press, New York, 1979.
- [3] Amir, H., *Patterns of Forcible Rape*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1971.
- [4] Yochelson, S. and Samenow, S., *The Criminal Personality*, Jason Aronson, New York, 1967.
- [5] Armentrout, J. A. and Hauer, A. L., "MMPI's of Rapists of Adults, Rapists of Children, and Non-rapist Sex Offenders," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 34, No. 2, April 1978, pp. 330-332.
- [6] Perdue, W. C. and Lester, D., "Personality Characteristics of Rapists," *Perceptual Motor Skills*, Vol. 35, Oct. 1972, pp. 514-518.

- [7] Bonheur, H. and Rosner, R., "Sex Offenders: A Descriptive Analysis of Cases Studied at a Forensic Psychiatry Clinic," *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 25, No. 1, Jan. 1980, pp. 3-14.
- [8] Bonheur, H. and Rosner, R., "Sex Offenders: Diagnosis, Organicity, and Intelligence," *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 26, No. 4, Oct. 1981, pp. 782-793.
- [9] *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 3rd ed.*, American Psychiatric Association, Washington, DC, 1980.
- [10] "Annual Composites," Crime Analysis Unit, New York Police Department, Room 1202, One Police Plaza, New York, 1973-1979.
- [11] "Annual Report," Sex Crimes Analysis Unit, New York Police Department, 1974.

Address requests for reprints or additional information to  
Hooshang H. Bonheur  
Department of Mental Health  
100 Centre St.  
New York, NY 10013