_____ Research Report _____

Women Who Sexually Offend: An Assessment of the Descriptive Model of Female Sexual Offending

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.

2014 Nº R-334

Women Who Sexually Offend:
An Assessment of the Descriptive Model of Female Sexual Offending

Michael-Anthony Lutfy

&

Dena Derkzen

Correctional Service of Canada

August 2014

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Dr. Kelly Taylor and Kim Allenby for their initial work on this project, specifically interview development, participant selection, and assisting with interviews. Also, we would like to thank Anne Trinneer for her work in organizing and coding interviews. We would like to thank Dr. Theresa Gannon for developing the Descriptive Model of Female Sexual Offending (DMFSO) and her on-going collaboration efforts in this area of research. Finally, we would like to thank institutional staff who facilitated our data collection at our site visits. A special thank you is extended to the participants who were willing to share their stories with us.

Executive Summary

Key words: *women offenders, sexual offending*

Women who sexually offend represent less than 1% of the federal women offender population in Canada, and have received limited research attention. To assist in addressing this gap in the research, the current study was conducted to complement a previous profile of women sexual offenders (Allenby, Taylor, Cossette, & Fortin, 2012) and assessed the validity of the Descriptive Model of Female Sexual Offending (DMFSO; Gannon, Rose, & Ward, 2008; 2010; 2012) with a Canadian sample.

The DMFSO is a gender-specific offence process model that accounts for the contributory roles of cognitive, behavioural, affective, and contextual factors leading to a woman sexual offender's (WSO) index offence (Gannon et al., 2008; 2010; 2012). The DFMSO proposes three distinct pathways for WSOs: (1) Explicit-Approach, which characterizes offenders that explicitly conduct distal and proximal planning, approach offending, and can be motivated by sexual gratification, intimacy, revenge, and financial gain; (2) Directed-Avoidant offenders are directed and coerced by a co-offender, typically want to avoid offending, and generally experience negative affect; and (3) Implicit-Disorganized WSOs typically engage in implicit distal planning, display impulsive and disorganized offending behaviour, and can experience strong to fleeting positive affect, sometimes followed by post-offence negative affect.

Fourteen WSOs from all five federal women's correctional facilities participated in qualitative semi-structured interviews focused on their offence narratives. The interviews were coded using the DMFSO Preliminary Offence Pathway Checklist provided by Gannon, Rose, and Ward (2012). The DMFSO was replicable with a Canadian sample and appears to be a valid measure of WSO offending styles. In total, 50% (n = 7) of the sample was classified as Directed-Avoidant and 29 % as Explicit-Approach (n = 4). Implicit-Disorganized was only represented by one participant, with an additional two WSOs considered unclassified.

Due to difficulties encountered with the coding and rating protocol, exploratory follow-up analyses were conducted with modified coding criteria. The shift resulted in the Directed-Avoidant pathways being reduced to four participants (29%), Explicit-Approach increasing to five (35%), Implicit-Approach not changing (7%; n = 1), and the number of unclassified WSO increasing to four (29%). Upon further investigation, however, it is suggested that three of the unclassified WSOs shared enough similarity that they may represent a unique additional pathway. This newly-proposed pathway, Adopted-Approach, would be comprised of WSOs who co-offend, but unlike the Directed-Avoidant pathway, approach offending for intimacy or sexual gratification as well as adopt the planning and desired offence style of their co-offender. Further research is required to validate the newly-proposed Adopted-Approach pathway. In addition, the modifications to the DMFSO Checklist proposed in this study may make the Checklist appropriate as an assessment tool to inform treatment targets. Further examination of this possibility would also be necessary.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Introduction

Women who sexually offend represent less than 1% of the federal woman offender population in Canada (Allenby, Taylor, Cossette, & Fortin, 2012) and estimates across various jurisdictions place women who sexually offend at a ratio of 1 to 20 relative to men (Cortoni, Hanson, & Coache, 2010). Despite the small numbers, examining women sex offenders is important because sexual offending in women manifests differently than in men, thus suggesting that there is a gendered pathway to sexual offending (Blanchette & Taylor, 2010; Gannon, Rose, & Ward, 2008; 2010; 2012). The current study builds on research in the area by examining the applicability of a model of women's sexual offending (Gannon et al., 2008; 2010; 2012) to federal women offenders in Canada.

Women Who Commit Sexual Offences

Until recently, there has been limited research on the behaviour and offence cycles of women who sexually offend (WSOs). If research on men who sexually offend is considered to be in its adolescence, the development of theories explaining women who sexually offend is in its infancy (Harris, 2010). The most influential theory to date was developed by Mathews, Matthews, and Speltz (1989), who categorized women who commit sexual offences into three typologies according to their backgrounds, victims, motives, and accomplices. The first typology, Teacher/Lovers, characterizes women who act alone using their position of authority, such as age or role as a teacher, to abuse youth or children. Teacher/Lovers often define their offence as a relationship, raising their victims to the equal status of lover, and do not view the situation as harmful. The second typology described is Predisposed. These women abuse children within their family, often their own. Generally, these women were subject to a childhood of sexual abuse and perpetuated the cycle of abuse onto other young family members. The final typology is Male-Coerced. These women are highly dependent upon their male partners who are verbally and often physically abusive. The woman is threatened or coerced into participating and aiding the male partner in his sexual offences.

Syed and Williams (1996) built upon these typologies by distinguishing Male-Coerced and Male-Accompanied women according to their level of autonomy and whether they were genuinely threatened into participating. The category Angry/Impulsive was also added to describe women who are similar to the typology of sexually assaultive men who use sexual

assault as an act of humiliation or revenge (Syed & Williams, 1996).

Recently, the Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC's) Research Branch completed a descriptive profile of the women sexual offender subpopulation. Using electronic file information, Allenby et al. (2012) compiled a sample of 58 WSOs in the CSC offender population between 2001 and 2010. The WSOs were then classified using Mathews et al.'s (1989) typologies with Syed and Williams' (1996) augmentations. WSOs with male accomplices represented the largest proportion of the sample, with 40% (n = 23) classified as Male-Accompanied and 16% (n = 9) classified as Male-Coerced. Next, the Angry/Impulsive category represented 19% (n = 11) of the sample. An additional 7% (n = 4) and 5% (n = 3) of the sample were classified as Teacher/Lover and Predisposed respectively. The remaining 14% (n = 8) could not be classified within any one category.

Typologies such as those provided by Mathews et al. (1989) and Syed and Williams (1996) can provide insightful details and descriptive demographics of an offender population. However, their clinical utility, especially with small sample sizes, is limited (Harris, 2010). Placing individual WSOs into clear-cut categories can blur unique characteristics and under-represent potentially useful elements and characteristics that would further understanding of these women. Descriptive models of the offence process that are developed inductively, such as Gannon et al.'s (2008; 2010; 2012) Descriptive Model of Female[1] Sexual Offending (DMFSO), can provide the narrative experiences that would best inform treatment and intervention (Harris, 2010).

The Descriptive Model of Female Sexual Offending

To date, Gannon et al.'s, (2008; 2010; 2012) DMFSO model is the most comprehensive framework available to understand and describe the factors related to sexual offending for women. The DMFSO is a gender-specific offence process model developed utilizing a grounded theory analysis of women sexual offender narratives (Gannon et al., 2008; 2010; 2012). It is a temporal model that accounts for the contributory roles of cognitive, behavioural, affective, and contextual factors leading up to a WSO's index offence. The temporal sequence is divided into three main parts: (1) background factors; (2) pre-offence period, which includes risk factors, unstable lifestyle, and motivations in the year prior to the offence, in addition to the distal and

[1] Though the term "women" is typically preferred to denote that adults are being considered, Gannon et al.'s (2008) model used the term "female" and will be referred to using those authors' preferred language.

proximal planning associated with the offence itself; and (3) offence and post-offence period (Gannon el al., 2008; 2010; 2012).

Background factors. The first stage of the framework, background factors, examines a woman's positive and negative early life experiences with respect to her family environment, including, but not limited to, the presence or absence of abuse, social support, deviant influences of peers, and vulnerability factors such as maladaptive coping styles and poor mental health. Also examined are the presence of abusive relationships and the influence of life stressors (e.g., financial struggles, death of family member) during early adulthood and their associations with the woman's sexual offending.

Pre-offence period. The second stage, the pre-offence period, includes the affective, cognitive, and behavioural factors that increase the risk of a woman sexually offending. Gannon et al. (2008; 2010; 2012) argue that the risk factors (e.g., poor mental health, personality issues, maladaptive coping style, impoverished social support) resulting from a woman's early life experiences can further increase after the occurrence of a major life stressor, thereby resulting in an unstable lifestyle that increases her likelihood of offending.

Within the pre-offence period, two areas related to the current study are *goal establishment* and *goal-relevant planning*. The former reflects the primary motivations for offending and includes intimacy, sexual gratification, or instrumental reasons such as revenge/humiliation or financial gain. Also examined at this stage is the presence of *goal relevant distal and proximal planning.* Planning behaviours may be classified into one of the following: a) *Directed*: planning behaviour directed by another individual, commonly a coercive male co-offender; b) *Explicit*: detailed planning; or c) *Implicit*: no apparent planning acknowledged with behaviour commonly characterised by impulsivity.

Offence and post-offence period. The third stage, offence and post-offence period, focuses further on planning and motivation, and also examines the offence approach or offence style of the women. A woman may be characterized by an *operationalized approach* to offending, whereby she sexually offends in order to meet a desired goal such as financial gain, revenge, or humiliation. A *maternal approach* style describes a woman who has emotional ties to the victims, often young children, and attempts to coerce the victims. These women generally have insufficient coping mechanisms to prevent themselves from halting their offending behaviour. A *maternal avoidant* approach describes a woman who may coerce a victim and yet

may herself be coerced to perform these behaviours, and ultimately is not interested in offending on her own. Finally, an a*ggressive approach* is characterized by aggressive behaviour rather than a coercive approach.

Finally, offence consequences are considered. A woman's affect, either positive (e.g., excitement) or negative (e.g., shame, embarrassment) post-offence is assessed as an important offence consequence. Also considered is cognition; more specifically, a woman's cognitions and justifications related to her offending such as behaviours to minimize the impact of her offending or avoid thoughts related to the incident. Finally, post-offence behaviour is examined for the presence of actions that are performed to prevent detection (i.e., controlled behaviours).

Pathways. In their study, Gannon et al. (2010) interviewed 22 United Kingdom (U.K.) women with a history of sexual offending. Each woman's narrative was assessed on the items described above in addition to other items in the DMFSO. Of this sample, a small number of women were unclassifiable given limited information. After having considered the three offence stages, but most notably the pre-offence offence, and post-offence stages, a WSO was placed into one of three distinct pathways:

1) ***Explicit-Approach*.** This group exhibits a high level of explicit planning, both distal and proximal. Their goals vary and they can be motivated by sexual gratification, intimacy, revenge, or financial gain. Their victims are as assorted as their motivations, but this group represents the largest proportion of child abusers. Explicit-Approach offenders also exhibit effective self-regulation and experience moderate to strong positive affect associated with the abuse. They actively pursue or approach rather than avoid offending. Fifty percent (n = 9) of Gannon et al.'s (2010) original sample were classified as Explicit-Approach.

2) ***Directed-Avoidant*.** This pathway is characterized primarily by women who are instructed and coerced by a partner to participate in offending. These women typically exhibit dependent and passive personality traits and hold the opinions of their male partners in high esteem. Directed-Avoidant offenders generally exercise directed proximal planning but can progress toward explicit styles to please their co-offender(s). They experience high levels of negative affect, such as guilt and anxiety, and want to avoid offending. This group also offends the most against female victims and their own children. This pathway accounted for 28% (n = 5) of Gannon et al.'s (2010) original sample.

3) ***Implicit-Disorganized***. This group has the least cohesive characteristics. Their motives vary but are distinguished by their lack of planning or implicit distal planning. These women tend to describe themselves as not wanting to have offended, and offend due to situational self-regulation failure in an impulsive, disorganized fashion. Implicit-Disorganized offenders experience fleeting to strong positive affect, sometimes followed by post-offence negative affect. In Gannon et al.'s (2010), 22% (n = 4) of the sample were classified as Implicit-Disorganized.

While Gannon et al.'s, (2008; 2010; 2012) DMFSO model, very briefly summarized in Table 1, is the most comprehensive framework available to understand and describe the factors related to sexual offending for women, empirical research in this area is limited. Therefore, although DMFSO provides a significant framework upon which to build in order to continue knowledge accumulation in the area, there remains much to be examined with the field of women sexual offending.

Table 1

Pathways of Gannon et al.'s (2008; 2010; 2012) Descriptive Model of Female Sexual Offending

	Features		
Pathway	Planning	Motivation	Affect
Explicit-Approach	distal, explicit	sexual gratification, intimacy, revenge, financial gain	strong, positive
Directed-Avoidant	directed by co-offender	intimacy with or fear of co-offender	negative
Implicit-Disorganized	impulsive, implicit	varied, self-regulation failure	strong or fleeting, positive and negative

Current Study

Previous CSC research (Allenby et al., 2012) has provided demographic and descriptive information related to offence characteristics for Canadian WSOs. However, little is known about this subpopulation in terms of their offending pathways. Given this knowledge gap, the

principle aim of this study was to examine the implications and validity of Gannon et al.'s (2008; 2010; 2012) pathways to women sexual offending and DMFSO model in a sample of Canadian WSOs serving federal sentences.

Method

Participants

Fourteen (n = 14) women convicted of sexual offences were recruited from all five federal women's regional correctional facilities. Potential participants were identified by institutional staff and the researchers, followed by a file review of each individual's offence to ensure the participants met the criteria. A woman was considered to have sexually offended if she had:

a) been convicted of a sexual offence;

b) been convicted of a non-sexual offence for which there was sexual motivation; and/or,

c) admitted to a sexual offence for which she has not been convicted.

According to this definition, prostitution-related behaviours were not considered to be sexual offences.

The average age at admission for participants was 34 years (SD = 9). Aggregate sentence length was 4 years (SD = 2). The greatest proportion of women was classified at admission as divorced, separated, or widowed (43%), with an additional 29% married, and 29% single. With respect to ethnicity, the majority of women were Caucasian (93%). Relative to the population of women offenders incarcerated in Canada, this small group had a greater proportion of Caucasian offenders (93% vs. 54%) and a lower proportion of Aboriginal offenders (0% vs. 33%; Public Safety Canada, 2012).

Data Sources

In order to assess the applicability of the DFMSO to federal women sex offenders, data were obtained from two sources: interviews conducted directly with the women and the Offender Management System (OMS), CSC's automated offender database used to record, collect, and share information on offenders serving federal sentences.

Interviews. Qualitative semi-structured interviews, as outlined in Gannon et al. (2008), were used to collect offence narratives leading up to the index offence (See Appendix A for Interview Protocol). Interviews were conducted at the institutions in two cohorts. The initial seven interviews conducted in 2009 were included in a previous study (Gannon et al., submitted). The remaining seven interviews were conducted in 2011. Interviews were approximately 60 minutes in length; for each interview, an audio recording and/or notes were taken.

OMS data. In addition to the demographic data reported above, data pertaining to overall static and dynamic risk, reintegration potential, and motivation level were retrieved from OMS. Offenders are assessed as being of low, medium, or high static risk based on an assessment of factors associated with their criminal history, offence severity, and sex offence history. These static factors are fixed as they are based on historical factors and therefore cannot be altered by participating in correctional programs and interventions (CSC, 2012). Overall dynamic risk refers to an offender's criminogenic needs, which have been traditionally associated with correctional outcomes and are used to determine the level of intervention an offender requires. This variable is based upon the result of seven dynamic domains – employment, marital/family, associates and social interaction, substance abuse, community functioning, personal and emotional orientation, and attitudes – that are assessed and re-examined to assess treatment change. These needs are considered modifiable through program participation. Offenders are assessed as low, medium, or high risk based on an assessment of these criminogenic needs (CSC, 2012). Motivation is assessed as low, medium, or high, based on an offender's drive and willingness to complete the requirements of her correctional plan (CSC, 2012). Finally, reintegration potential is assessed as low, medium, or high and assesses the probability of an offender successfully reintegrating back to the community. Women offenders' initial reintegration potential is determined by their rating on the Custody Rating Scale (CRS), the overall static risk rating, and the overall dynamic risk rating (CSC, 2012). Reintegration potential can be updated throughout women's sentences based on parole officers' perception of changes in a woman's likelihood of successful community reintegration. A number of narrative reports included in the women's OMS files were also reviewed.

Procedure

Planned analyses. Two researchers separately coded each interview following the DMFSO Preliminary Offence Pathway Checklist provided by Gannon, Rose, and Ward (2012), a coding manual to assist in the identification of information related to the model. The checklist assesses five main areas of the DMFSO Pathways: 1) amount of positive affect; 2) distal planning; 3) proximal planning; 4) coercion; and 5) self-regulation style. Each area was rated on a scale of 0 to 4, with 4 indicating the characteristic was present to a greater extent. Amount of positive affect is rated by assessing the excitement, sexual gratification, intimacy, revenge, or anticipation of monetary gain achieved from goal establishment and the offence. Distal and

proximal planning are rated by examining the amount of planning leading up to the event, such as grooming, or if another person, such as a co- offender, planned the offence. Coercion refers to whether the woman reports having offended due to the threats or direction of another person. Finally, self-regulation style refers to the woman's ability to regulate her behaviour and whether the offence was impulsive and disorganized.

Offenders were then either assigned to one of the three DFMSO offence pathways or labelled as unclassified. OMS criminal profile descriptions were used for triangulation as well as to resolve classification disputes and mitigate impression management issues.

Additional exploratory analyses. After completing the initial analyses, challenges were identified in coding certain variables. It also became clear that it may be possible to propose an additional pathway to reflect the unique characteristics of some women whose offending and motivation did not seem to be fully captured by the three existing offence pathways of the DFMSO. As such, the coding approach was modified in order to allow for a series of additional analyses (see Appendix B).

With respect to coding, difficulties were encountered while attempting to rate positive affect and coercion. It was difficult to quantify and compare different types of affect (e.g., intimacy, sexual gratification) across participants. The WSOs may have also overstated the intensity of their negative affect due to cognitive distortions or impression management; indeed, triangulation based on OMS data suggested this inflation of negative affect did occur. Coercion was also difficult to rate, primarily due to the subjectivity inherent in the construct. In some cases, the level of perceived coercion reported by participants differed from what would be expected by an outside observer based on recounted events (e.g., participants reported similar levels of perceived coercion for behaviours ranging from a threat of death to being "bugged" to initiate offence planning). Difficulties in rating this construct were also compounded by the effects of impression management and cognitive distortion in the recounting of events.

Exploratory analyses also focused on the women's complete sexual offending cycles rather than only women's first offences. These analyses allowed for exploration of the extent to which the first offence obscured the dynamics of behaviour and attitudes towards sexual offending that can develop with continued offending (the lack of which is mentioned by Gannon et al. [2010; 2012] as a limitation of their research). Finally, additional analyses also reflected Gannon et al.'s (2010) emerging findings that the Background Factors stage was not predictive

of pathway classification by reducing the emphasis in this area.

In sum, in the modified approach used in exploratory analyses, the coding focus was on the pre-offence, offence, and post-offence stages of the model. Other modifications were the consideration of sexual offending that was not women's first offences, and a greater reliance on OMS file information (notably the criminal profile, the offender's version of the offence, and the psychiatric assessment, if available) to supplement that obtained from interviews.

The final series of exploratory analyses stemmed from the realization that the existing three DMFSO pathways may not fully capture the characteristics of certain WSOs, especially when considering the data obtained using the modified coding approach. As a result, the authors proposed and explored the possible existence of a fourth pathway, Adopted-Approach, which is explained more fully in the Discussion but which shares some characteristics with both the Directed-Avoidant and Explicit-Approach groups. Using thematic analysis of this qualitative data, possible commonalities or characteristics of these women were identified.

Results

Planned analyses

Risk, motivation, and reintegration potential. The majority of women who participated in the study were assessed as high on static and dynamic risk at intake (see Table 2). Reintegration potential ratings at intake were nearly split between low and moderate, while motivation for completing one's correctional plan was split between moderate and high motivation.

Table 2

Static Risk, Dynamic Risk, Reintegration Potential, and Motivation at Intake

Measure	*N* = 14 % (*n*)
Static Risk	
Low	7 (1)
Moderate	14 (2)
High	79 (11)
Dynamic Risk	
Low	0 (0)
Moderate	36 (5)
High	64 (9)
Reintegration Potential	
Low	50 (7)
Moderate	43 (6)
High	7 (1)
Motivation Level	
Low	0 (0)
Moderate	50 (7)
High	50 (7)

***DMFSO pathway identification*.** Overall, 86% (*n* = 12) of the sample was classified into one of the three distinct pathways (see Table 3). The classification agreement was 79% with a high inter-rater reliability of Kappa = .89.

Table 3

Percentage of Participants Classified within Each Descriptive Model of Female Sexual Offending (DMFSO) *Pathway*

DMFSO Pathway	Construct Rating	*N* = 12 % (*n*)
Directed-Avoidant		50 (7)
Positive Affect	Low	
Proximal and Distal Planning	Low	
Self-regulation	Not assessed[a]	
Coercion	Moderate to high	
Explicit- Approach		29 (4)
Positive Affect	Moderate to high	
Proximal and Distal Planning	Moderate to high	
Self-regulation	Moderate to high	
Coercion	Low	
Implicit-Disorganized		7 (1)
Positive Affect	Moderate to high	
Proximal and Distal Planning	Low	
Self-regulation	Low	
Coercion	Low	

Note: Percentages were based on full sample of 14 women; however, 2 participants were considered unclassified and their results were not included in this table. DMFSO = Descriptive Model of Female Sexual Offending.[a] In keeping with previous approaches, self-regulation was not assessed in women for whom moderate to high levels of coercion were present.

Two WSOs were considered unclassified (14%; *n* = 2). One participant had an unusual conviction and the other denied any knowledge of the offence at the time of occurrence. Offence pathways could not be established for either woman during the interview.

The pathway representing the largest proportion of our sample was Directed-Avoidant (50%; *n* = 7). This pathway included cases whereby women were coerced by a partner to participate in offending and experienced negative affect associated with their offences. WSOs within this category typically did not indicate any distal planning, and only a few admitted to coerced proximal planning (Participant B: “No, I never thought of it. It was really my ex, he was the one who ordered the whole thing in advance”). They expressed mostly negative affect, such

as anxiety, disgust, and guilt, during the offence (Participant E: "I felt very disgusted with myself. I felt very not comfortable, like, I was very uncomfortable"). However, one woman did indicate a high level of comfort and satisfaction associated with the abuse (Participant B: "Well, with everything that happened in my childhood, there's no doubt that at some point, love, you know you feel loved... I let myself get carried away by it. I felt good because I had what I wanted"). The majority experienced high levels of coercion and were threatened by their male partner, while some were harassed rather than threatened into compliance (Participant F: "At first I said no I didn't want them to come over, but then he kept bugging and bugging and that's when I said 'yeah okay'"). Directed-Avoidant yielded an inter-rater agreement of 86%.

Four WSOs (29%) were found to fit the Explicit-Approach pathway. In contrast to the Directed-Avoidant group, these women actively pursued offending rather than avoiding such actions. This group was also characterized by high levels of explicit distal and proximal planning. None of the women classified in the Explicit-Approach pathway gave permission to be recorded during their interviews; therefore, there are no direct quotations available. This category had the lowest level of agreement with only 50% concordance between raters.

Only one WSO was classified as Implicit-Disorganized (7%; $n = 1$). This WSO did not display any distal or proximal planning. (Participant D: "When I wear a nightgown I don't usually wear underwear with it, and [he] just reached over and started touching my vagina and I didn't do anything about it"). She also experienced positive affect from the encounters. Furthermore, she was aware that the sexual touching was abusive, and demonstrated limited capacity for self-regulation and subsequent failure ("Well, a lot of the incidents after that happened when I'd be taking baths. And, I just stopped allowing them in the bathroom when I was having a bath"). This pathway had the highest level of agreement with 100%, though this is likely due to there being only a single case.

Additional Exploratory Analyses

DMFSO pathway identification revisited. In the exploratory analyses, with a greater focus on pre-offence, offence, and post-offence information, an inclusion of offences other than the first offence for each woman, and a greater reliance on OMS file information, four WSOs were categorized differently (Table 4). The Implicit-Disorganized pathway did not vary and retained the same WSO (7%; $n = 1$). One WSO who could not initially be classified was moved to Explicit-Approach, joining the same four WSOs initially identified in this group and raising

the total to five (35%; *n* = 5). Although this woman (Participant C) had denied any knowledge or participation of the offence during her interview, she was forthright about the pathway information leading to the offence, which included explicit distal and proximal planning. Based on evidence present in her file describing her offence behaviour, she was classified as Explicit-Approach.

Table 4

Pathways Comparison between Preliminary and Exploratory Analyses

	Preliminary Analysis		Exploratory Analysis	
Pathway	% (*n*)	Participants	% (*n*)	Participants
Explicit-Approach	29 (4)	A, G, N, O	35 (5)	A, C, G, N, O
Implicit-Disorganized	7 (1)	D	7 (1)	D
Directed-Avoidant	50 (7)	B, E, F, H, K, L, M	29 (4)	H, K, L, M
Unclassified	14 (2)	C, I	29 (4)	B, E, F, I
Total	100 (14)		100 (14)	

The most noteworthy difference between the preliminary and exploratory analyses was in the Directed-Avoidant pathway. The Directed-Avoidant pathways was reduced to four from seven. The change in methodology, particularly extending the offence behaviour past the first offence, caused three participants to no longer fit the Directed-Avoidant pathway as appropriately as the other four. Their level of coercion, positive affect, and offence behaviour was no longer reflective of the Directed-Avoidant pathway when examined past the index offence. However, these WSOs did not follow the same pathway to their first offence as Explicit-Approach or Implicit-Approach offenders and, therefore, were considered Unclassified.

Overall, in the exploratory analyses, 71% (*n* = 10) of the sample was classified into one of the distinct pathways. Although the revised classification resulted in fewer WSOs being classified into pathways, the classification agreement was 100%.

The Adopted-Approach pathway. In a final series of exploratory analyses, the possible applicability of a newly-proposed fourth pathway, Adopted-Approach, was explored. This possible pathway could characterize a subgroup of women sex offenders who share some characteristics with those in the Directed-Avoidant and Explicit-Approach groups, but also appear to differ. According to our explorations, three women sex offenders seemed to be well-represented by this categorization. These women had all previously been classified as Directed-Avoidant in the preliminary analysis.

Reviews of interviews and file information resulted in the identification of the following characteristics that may be indicative of membership in this category, though further research would obviously be required to support the existence of this pathway:

- Adopted-Approach were motivated by intimacy or sexual gratification rather than coercion or threat. This is evident in their level of positive affect and goal establishment.
- Adopted-Approach appear more likely than Directed-Avoidant to deny any responsibility for the sexual abuse, blaming their behaviour on their co-offender rather than accepting their role in the abuse.
- Adopted-Approach WSOs exhibited limited empathy or minimized victim impact rather than expressing guilt and regret. None of our Directed-Avoidant sample exhibited victim empathy deficits.
- In the cases where the Adopted-Avoidant WSO voluntarily reported the offence to authorities, the disclosure was an act of revenge against their co-offender rather than intended to relieve guilt or to protect the victim.
- Adopted-Approach WSOs actively implemented "protective" measures, such as planning the offence and concealing evidence, to safeguard their ability to continue offending in the future.
- These WSOs frequently fabricated, exaggerated, minimized, or concealed events and offence behaviour during the interview that were often instrumental to their convictions or level of coercion.
- Psychiatric assessments of two of the three Adopted-Approach WSOs resulted in a diagnosis of pedophilia. None of the Directed-Avoidant WSOs in our sample who offended against children received such a diagnosis.

Discussion

To date, with few exceptions (see Allenby et al., 2012) limited research focused on Canadian federally-sentenced women sex offenders has been conducted. This study aimed to address the lack of data by applying the DFMSO, the most comprehensive current model of women's sexual offending, developed in the U.K., to a Canadian population. Although initial analyses produced promising results regarding the model's validity with this population, additional analyses suggested that the model may be improved by incorporating a new fourth pathway.

The DMFSO in a Canadian Context

Findings suggest that the DMFSO (Gannon et al., 2010; 2012) is generally a valid and reliable model of sexual offending for federally-sentenced women in Canada, with twelve of fourteen women being classified into one of the three DMFSO pathways. Within this sample, the Directed-Avoidant pathway was the most commonly represented, followed by the Explicit-Approach category and with relatively few women categorized as Implicit-Disorganized. While our application of Gannon et al.'s (2008; 2010; 2012)'s DMFSO model was successful overall, it did not seem to capture the full extent of motivations and offending patterns. Exploratory analyses using a slightly modified approach – including, for example, consideration of each woman's full pattern of sexual offending rather than only her first sexual offence – led to some women being classified to different pathways. In these analyses, Explicit-Approach became more common than Directed- Avoidant, and the number of unclassified women increased to four.

This redistribution, particularly for the Directed-Avoidant pathway, was not entirely unexpected given an earlier project in which Allenby et al. (2012) documented a large proportion of approach-style offenders among CSC's WSOs. Using Mathews et al. (1989) typologies, with Syed and Williams' (1996) augmentations, 40% (n = 23) of the WSO sample was classified as Male-Accompanied, 16% (n = 9) as Male-Coerced, and 7% (n = 4) as Teacher/Lovers. With the DMFSO, women classified as Male-Accompanied under Mathews et al. (1989) and Syed and Williams' (1996) typologies would be classified as either Explicit-Approach or Directed-Avoidant. There is no mechanism, however, other than personal judgement, for distinguishing Male-Accompanied offenders who wilfully misrepresent themselves as Directed-Avoidant (i.e., as offending in response to someone's coercion and not receiving positive affect from the

offending). Considering that women falling into the Directed-Avoidant group make no claims to having planned the offences, the distinction must be drawn at the level of positive affect and coercion, which, as previously mentioned, both posed significant challenges in coding. Indeed, three offenders originally classified as Directed-Avoidant based predominantly on interview were classified differently using the second approach; in other words, by relying on file information, the affect and coercion ratings changed sufficiently to result in a different pathway allocation.

As cautioned by Gannon et al. (2010; 2012), WSOs identified as Directed-Avoidant may change their offence behaviour and attitudes after extensive offending. Saradjian (1996, as cited in Gannon & Rose, 2008) identified four women who had not had child-related fantasies before offending reported having such fantasies after having been coerced into abusing a child. This subsample also subsequently offended alone. We suspect that the current DMFSO pathways do not sufficiently capture this type of offender.

Proposed Fourth Pathway: Adopted-Approach

As mentioned, the exploratory modifications to Gannon et al.'s (2008; 2010; 2012) approach to identifying WSOs pathways to sexual offending resulted in an increase in the number of women who were not classified. Specifically, three WSOs originally assigned to the Directed-Avoidant pathway joined the Unclassified category. However, detailed consideration of these three women's data suggested that they may have enough unique similarities to warrant their own pathway in the DMFSO. This proposed new pathway discriminates WSOs according to the degree of coercion involved in their offending, thereby reflecting the nuanced Male-Accompanied typology of Syed and Williams (1996). It is suggested that this new pathway may aid in identifying WSOs that present unique assessment and treatment needs.

Currently, Directed-Avoidant WSOs are characterized as either motivated by intimacy or fear-related goals, with a Maternal-Avoidant offence approach (Gannon et al., 2010). However, in our sample, many of the Directed-Avoidant WSOs who had intimacy-related offence goals exhibited an approach offence style and active offence behaviour. These WSOs also experienced high levels of positive affect in the form of intimacy with their co-offender or sexual gratification. However, given imprecision in rating coercion and positive affect, these WSOs are closer to Directed-Avoidant than to Explicit-Approach. Therefore, the fourth newly-proposed pathway, *Adopted-Approach*, is best understood in the ways it differs from Directed-Avoidant.

Adopted-Approach WSOs adopt the offence planning and desires of their co-offender. Unlike the Directed-Avoidant pathway, they require little direction or coercion, which may take the form of persuasion, nagging, or flattery. Shifting women who experience relatively mild coercion to this newly-proposed pathway would result in a narrowing of the existing Directed-Avoidant category, whereby coercion such as direct threats, a history of grooming or physical abuse by their co-offenders, or explicit threats against the victim, would be required. An implicit fear of being alone or disappointing their partner sexually would be insufficient to be categorized as an explicit threat, and would be more characteristic of Adopted-Approach.

Women classified as Adopted-Approach also actively participate in and approach offending. They experience some level of positive affect in the form of intimacy or sexual gratification. In contrast, Directed-Avoidant WSOs would not be expected to have positive affect but may experience low levels of intimacy. While both Adopted-Approach and Directed-Avoidant WSOs could exhibit the same type of offence behaviour after extensive co-offending, perhaps due to grooming, routine, or the development of sexual deviant interests, Directed-Avoidant WSOs would be distinguished by not developing positive affect nor beginning to offend alone.

The addition of an Adopted-Approach style pathway would make WSOs categorized as Explicit-Approach and those with co-offenders more similar. For instance, in some cases, a WSO could easily be placed in the Explicit-Approach pathway, especially when considering long-term offence behaviour, but according to her personal accounts, the sexual abuse would not have taken place without the influence of her co-offender. For such a woman, the Adopted-Approach category would reflect the unique role of the co-offender in driving offending. Table 5 presents some of the key features of the proposed fourth pathways, as well as the associated refinements to the Directed-Avoidant pathway.

Table 5

Pathways of Gannon et al.'s (2008; 2010; 2012) Descriptive Model of Female Sexual Offending, with the Addition of a Proposed Fourth Pathway

	Features		
Pathway	Planning	Motivation	Affect
Explicit-Approach	distal, explicit	sexual gratification, intimacy, revenge, financial gain	strong, positive
Directed-Avoidant	directed by co-offender	threats or coercion from co-offender	negative
Implicit-Disorganized	impulsive, implicit	varied, self-regulation failure	strong or fleeting, positive and negative
Adopted-Approach	adopted from co-offender	sexual gratification, intimacy	positive

Implications for Assessment and Treatment

Although WSOs' rates of recidivism are very low – estimated to be between 1% and 3% (Cortoni et al., 2010) – the pathways approach may be key to informing assessment and treatment, particularly when considering the distinctions between Explicit-Approach, Adopted-Approach, and Directed-Avoidant. While the relationship between pathways and attitudes has not yet been examined intuitively, Explicit-Approach and Adopted-Approach WSOs may be more likely to hold sexually deviant attitudes and therefore would benefit from a different focus during treatment. Directed-Avoidant WSOs seem the least likely group to hold sexually deviant attitudes, particularly when they demonstrate high levels of regret and empathy for their victims. When compared to WSOs who offend alone, Directed-Avoidant WSOs are the most likely to benefit from emotional management and relationship therapy as lack of assertiveness and unhealthy intimate relationships are a key component in their offence cycle. In this regard, Adopted-Approach WSOs would also benefit from this type of treatment.

Currently, the Women's Sex Offender Program is provided to eligible women with a sexually-related offence. This cognitive-behavioural therapy-based program includes many of the elements described as treatment targets for each of the pathways are included in the Women's Sex Offender Program, including self-regulation, relationships, and emotion management. Data collection is underway to assess the impact of WSOP on intra-individual change as well as subsequent offending.

Conclusion

Overall, the current study supports the DMFSO as a valid measure of women's sexual offending, as the degree of positive affect, coercion, planning, and self-regulation informed pathways and characteristics of WSOs. However, the DMFSO was not entirely successful in capturing the heterogeneous nature of WSO and a new fourth pathway to women's sexual offending was developed and proposed. This new pathway, the Adopted-Approach pathway, requires further validation. It is hoped that future research to validate or further refine the DFMSO, including the proposed additional pathway, could inform assessment and treatment goals related to women who offend sexually. It may even be possible for the augmented DMFSO Checklist to inform treatment targets.

References

Allenby, K., Taylor, K., Cossette, M., & Fortin, D. (2012). *A profile of women who sexually offend*. Research Report R-274. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.

Blanchette, K. & Taylor, K. (2010). A review of treatment initiatives for female sexual offenders. In T. Gannon & F. Cortoni (Eds.), *Female Sexual Offenders: Theories, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 31-52). West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Correctional Service of Canada (2012). *Commissioner's directive 705-6*: *Correctional planning and criminal profile*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Services of Canada.

Cortoni, F., Hanson, R., & Coache, M. (2010). The recidivism rates of female sexual offenders are low: A meta-analysis. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 22*, 387-401. doi: 10.1177/1079063210372142.

Gannon, T. & Rose, M. (2008). Female child sexual offenders: Towards integrating theory and practice. *Sexual Abuse, 20*, 352-374. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2008.07.002.

Gannon, T., Rose, M., & Ward, T. (2008). A descriptive model of the offense process for female sexual offenders. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13*, 442-461. doi: 10.1177/1079063208322495.

Gannon, T., Rose, M., & Ward, T. (2010). Pathways to female sexual offending: Approach or avoidance?. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 16*, 359-380. doi: 10.1080/10683160902754956.

Gannon, T., Rose, M., & Ward, T. (2012). A descriptive offence process model for female sexual offenders. In B. K. Schwartz (Ed.), *The Sex Offender: Current trends in policy and treatment practice VII* (pp. 1-19. Kingston, NJ: Civil Research Institute.

Gannon, T. A., Waugh, G., Taylor, K., Blanchette, K., O'Connor, A., Blake, E. et al. (submitted). Women who sexually offend display three main offense styles: A re-examination of the descriptive model of female sexual offending.

Harris, D. A. (2010). Theories of female sexual offending. In T. Gannon & F. Cortoni (Eds.), *Female Sexual Offenders: Theories, assessment, and treatment* (pp. 31-52). West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mathews, R., Matthews, J., & Speltz, K. (1989). *Female sexual offenders: An exploratory study.* Brandon, VT: The Safer Society Press.

Public Safety Canada. (2012). *Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview 2011-2012.* Ottawa, ON: Author.

Syed, F., & Williams, S. M. (1996). *Case studies of female sex offenders in the Correctional Service of Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.

Appendix A: Interview Protocol

Interviewer Number: _____

FSO INTERVIEW

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Throughout our time together I would like to ask you about your feelings, thoughts, and the experiences that you have had as they relate to your offending. I would like you to try to think of a recent situation in which you had sexual, or intimate contact with a victim. Or, if you can not recall the most recent, think of any one situation that you can remember in enough detail to speak about. I am interested in your thoughts, feelings and experiences before, during, and after this incident occurred.

There are no right answers, I am simply interested in hearing about your view of things. Please stop me at any time if you are feeling uncomfortable answering any of the questions. You do not have to answer any questions you don't want to, or talk about anything that makes you feel uncomfortable. We can stop the interview at any time and give you a break, or move on to talking about something you are more comfortable with.

Throughout the interview, there are six different sections I would like to discuss with you, then at the end you will have a chance to add anything you want that hasn't already been discussed.

First, before starting, I would like to ask you a couple of simple questions *(pick up from DEMO.3.).*

DEMO. 1. Date of interview: _____
DEMO. 2. Institution: _____

First, can you tell me
DEMO. 3. How long is your current sentence? _____ (years) and _____ (months);
and,
DEMO. 4. Is this your first federal offence?

No	Yes
0	1
❒	❒

DEMO. 5. How long have you been at this particular institutions: _____ (years) and _____ (months);

PART 1 – SOCIAL BACKGROUND

Thank you. Now, I would like to talk to you a bit about your background and childhood. These questions are important as we know that women with similar offences often have similar histories, or experiences during childhood.

1.1. During your childhood, where were you living and with who? *Look for information pertaining to home life (e.g., intact familial environment, foster home, on the streets) and the presence of family members (e.g., parents, stepparents, grandparents, foster family).*

Ages (__ to __)	**With Who**	**Where**	**Relationship**

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

1.2. *Based on response from the previous question (who participant grew up with) ask the participant to describe what her relationships were like with those people. These questions will help in understanding whether she was brought up in a positive or negative family environment.*

Can you describe how your relationship was with:

a) your parents*(/foster parents, or other parent-like figures)*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

b) your siblings (if any)

_____
_____
_____
_____

c) other present family members *(grandparents, extended family)*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

1.3. Now that we have talked a little about your family, I would like to know a bit more about **what your childhood was like**. If you think about your emotions, how would you describe how you felt throughout most of your childhood? *We're looking to ascertain how she feels about her childhood: Was it happy? Sad? Bad, tough? Lonely? Frustrated?*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

1.4. Now I would like you to think about the **time you spent in school**, what were these years like? *Probe about relationships with school friends, teachers, etc., and whether or not she was bullied or if she was bullying others – you may need to probe her about bullying experiences.*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

a) How would you describe your relationship with your school friends? *Probing this may ascertain her experiences with bullying.*

_____
_____
_____
_____

b) And your teachers? Or, other people in your life at this time?

_____
_____
_____
_____

If violence in the home has already been talked about with sufficient information to answer these questions, skip this part.

For the next couple questions I am going to ask you about any violence that may have occurred in your home, or any violence you may have experienced while growing up. There is no need for you to feel like you must go into detail, and if you feel uncomfortable talking about this you are not required to answer these questions.

I'm going to first ask about any violence or abuse you may have **witnessed** in your home growing up.

1.5. Do you recall ever **witnessing** any violence/abuse in your home when you were younger? *Look for whether or not she saw any violence/abuse in her home (e.g., between her parents, other family members). This is not asking about whether she experienced abuse herself.*

No	Yes
0	1
❒	❒

a) *If yes,* If you are comfortable talking about it, can you talk to me a bit about what types of abuse you **witnessed**? *Participant does not need to expand on details, we are merely looking for whether the abuse was physical, sexual, or emotional.*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

I am now going to ask you about your own **personal experiences** with any violence or abuse. Again, if you are not comfortable talking about this don't hesitate let me know, and we can stop and move on to the next question.

1.6. Did you **experience** any violence or abuse when you were a child?

No	Yes
0	1
❒	❒

a) Again, if you are comfortable talking about, can you talk to me a bit about the types of abuse you **experienced**? *Participant does not need to expand on details, we are merely looking for whether the abuse was physical, sexual, or emotional.*

_____
_____
_____
_____

_____
_____

1.7. For the next few questions I am going to ask you to think back to your first intimate/romantic relationship. ***Defining 'first intimate relationship'*** *– a close and trusting relationship in which there is emotional/physical intimacy and that stands out for the participant as really being the first of this kind. For this, we want to know about the romantic/intimate situations she was involved in when she was younger. If she can not pinpoint one specific "first" relationship, ask her to think about general romantic situations she had when she was younger.*

a) How old were you when you got involved in your first intimate relationship? *Does not need to be exact if she cannot remember, a rough idea of how old she was will suffice.*

9 or younger	1	❒
10 - 12	2	❒
13 - 15	3	❒
16 – 18	4	❒
18+	5	❒
Actual Age:_____		

b) How would you describe this relationship? *(Good, bad, happy, abusive, supportive, etc.) Inquire about how old the person she was involved with was, whether she was involved with someone who was in a position of trust, or if she received some benefit from the relationship (e.g., status, drugs)*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

1.8. Beyond your childhood years, did you ever **experience** violence in earlier romantic/intimate situations or relationships? *(This may have already been answered when talking about first intimate relationship)*

No	Yes
0	1
❒	❒

a) If yes, what types of abuse did you **experience** in these situations? *Participant does not need to expand on details, we are merely looking for whether the abuse was physical, sexual, or emotional.*

_____
_____
_____

_____
_____
_____

If the participant replied that she had been abused in either of the previous questions and is comfortable speaking about it:
1.9. Did you ever receive any **support or counselling** after the abuse you suffered?

No	Yes
0	1
❒	❒

a) *If yes,* Where did you receive your support/counselling? *(e.g., therapy, confronting the abuser, talking with friend/family)*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

PART 2 – 6 MONTHS PRIOR TO THE INCIDENT

In this next set of questions I am going to ask you about things that were going on in your life six months prior to the offence you were involved with. I would like you to think back to that time and remember what you can.

2.1. **Emotionally**, how were things going in your life six months before the incident happened? *How was she feeling at this time? Was she happy, sad, frustrated, anxious?*

_____
_____
_____
_____

Depending on answer to previous question, if required follow-up with these questions:

a) Can you recall what was going on in your life at this time, were there any **difficulties** you had to deal with? *E.g., death of a loved one, breakdown of a romantic relationship, parenting responsibilities.*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

b) What did you do to **cope** with these difficulties? *Did the participant have adequate/appropriate coping strategies? Look for anything that may suggest she was living a dysfunctional lifestyle at this time.*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

2.2. Were you **working** at this time? *Probe participant to expand about what she did for work and whether she was working in a legitimate job or if she was making money through criminal activity.*

No	Yes
0	1
❒	❒

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

_____

2.3. What about **leisure time** or any other interests? Can you describe to me what kinds of things you were doing with your time? *Look for ways the participant was spending her time outside of work, if she was employed or what she was doing if she was unemployed.*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

2.4. In the six months before the offence, were you involved in a **romantic relationship?**

No	Yes
0	1
❒	❒

a) If yes, how would you have described the relationship at that time? *Looking for whether or not participant had positive prosocial support, or not.*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

2.5. What about other relationships at this time? Can you describe to me what your family, and other relationships were like? *Probing for information as to the <u>social support system offender had</u> at this time (if there was one, if it was positive). These do not need to be limited to family but can also include peers/associates (were they supportive, prosocial, criminal).*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

PART 3 – DAYS LEADING TO THE INCIDENT

Ensure to check in with the participant and see how she is doing at this point. Ask her whether or not she is ready to carry on to the next section of questions.

In this next set of questions I am going to ask you about what was happening in the days leading up to the offence. If you could think about the same incident you were just thinking of, I would like you to think back to what was going on in the days before it occurred.

Consider 'days' as the two/three/four days before the offence happened

3.1. Can you describe to me how you were **feeling** in the days leading up to the incident?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

a) Had anything significant changed in your life recently that made you feel differently to how you were feeling 6 months before?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

3.2. In the days leading up to the incident, had you **thought about** committing an offence of this nature? *Looking for pre-mediation, planning, or whether or not the participant thought about the consequences.*

No	Yes
0	1
❒	❒

_____
_____
_____

a) If you did, how did you **feel** when you had these thoughts? *Did it excite you or make you anxious? Were you happy/unhappy?*

_____

PART 4 – THE DAY OF THE INCIDENT

Again, ensure that the participant is doing okay before moving on to this next section.

In this next set of questions I am going to ask you about things that were going on during the day of the offence. Thinking of the same incident we were previously talking about, I would like you to think about what was happening the day that it occurred.

4.1. Do you remember what you **were doing** in the hours before the incident happened?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

4.2. Can you recall how you were **feeling** on the day it occurred? *E.g., nervous, excited, bored.*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

a) Was there anything in particular going on that was **bothering you** that day? *This question can be asked depending on what she answered previously.*

_____
_____
_____

4.3. If you can think back to right before the incident occurred, I am going to ask you a few questions about what was going on at that time. Stop me if you are ever feeling uncomfortable discussing anything.

a) Can you remember what was going through your head right before the incident happened? Do you remember what you were **thinking** or if you were saying anything to yourself?

_____
_____
_____
_____

b) How did these thoughts make you **feel**? Or, how were you feeling immediately before the incident occurred? *E.g., scared to be thinking that, overwhelmed, anxious, excited..*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

PART 5 – WHEN THE INCIDENT WAS OCCURRING

Before carrying on, I want to thank you for sharing all that you have so far with me. I only have a couple more sections of questions to ask you. How are you doing so far? Are you ready to carry on to the next set of questions?

In these next few questions I am going to ask you about the incident as it was occurring. I would like you to think about the incident as it was happening and talk to me about what you can remember from that time.

5.1. Thinking about the incident, how did you come to be with, or make contact with the victim? *E.g., forced them, victim initiated, victim was accessible (e.g., through babysitting).*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

5.2. Think about the victim's initial response. How did the victim behave towards you immediately before the incident occurred?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

a) Were there things that the victim said or did to make you think he/she wanted to have sexual contact with you? What did you say/do?

_____
_____
_____

5.3. I am now going to ask you about what was going on **as the incident was happening**.

a) Can you describe to me how you **felt** as the incident was taking place?

_____
_____
_____
_____

b) What types of things were running through your head? What kind of things did you say to yourself as it was happening?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

c) Was there ever a moment while it was happening when you thought that **you should not be doing this?**

No	Yes
0	1
❒	❒

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

5.4. I'd like you to think about the victim as the situation was occurring. Can you describe to me **how the victim was behaving towards you**, or the situation as it was taking place? *This is to understand the victim's response to the offence. Depending on participant's answer, it will be categorized into one of three response styles (do not probe her on answering with one of these responses).*

Engaged	Submissive	Resistant
1	2	3
❒	❒	❒

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

5.5. *If not already mentioned*, was anyone else there while the incident was happening?

No	Yes
0	1
❒	❒

a) If there was, what was their role?

_____
_____
_____

PART 6 – AFTERWARDS / LOOKING BACK AT THE INCIDENT

We are nearly done, this will be the last section before we wrap up and I ask for any general or additional comments you may feel are important.

I am now going to ask you about how you were feeling and what you were thinking after the incident happened and your thoughts looking back on it now.

6.1. How did the incident end? *This may be the one incident, or if it has happened multiple times, how did the abusive relationship end (e.g., turned myself into police, co-accused stopped it, victim's death)?*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

a) How did you **feel** about it immediately afterwards?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

6.2. After it occurred, did you say or do anything to the victim?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

a) What about the victim? Did s/he say or do anything after?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

6.3. Now, I want to ask you about your thoughts and experiences of the incident now that it is over and you can look back on what happened.

a) What **effect** do you think **this had on the victim**? *Look both for short term (e.g., hurt, scared) and long term (e.g., long term psychological pain, fear of relationships) consequences.*

_____
_____
_____
_____

b) How harmful/serious do you feel the incident was?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

c) On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is not at all severe and 7 is extremely severe, how would you rank **the severity of your offence**?

Not at all severe			Moderately Severe			Extremely Severe
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

6.4. Were other people aware of the event? If they were, did they say anything to you afterwards? What did they say?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

a) How did their comments make you feel?

_____
_____
_____
_____

6.5. Looking back on the situation now, how do you **make sense of what happened**? *E.g., forced to do it, victim wanted it.*

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

a) What do you think **caused the situation** to happen?

_____
_____
_____
_____

b) Is there anything you would change or have done differently if you had the chance to? *If needs prompting:* We've talked a lot about your life, your childhood, the time before, during and after the incident… If you had the ability to, would there be anything you would change now?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

PART 7 - GENERAL

7.1. Before we finish, I want to give you an opportunity to add anything you feel may be important but that I did not ask.

Do you feel there is anything that we haven't already talked about that you would like to add, or say now?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

ASK HOW PARTICIPANT FEELS NOW THAT INTERVIEW IS OVER & IMMENSLEY THANK HER FOR HER TIME
& FOR SHARING THIS INFORMATION WITH YOU!

If thinking about the questions that were asked in this study makes you feel upset/sad/angry/frustrated/etc., you may wish to talk with someone. Please use the regular channels (such as notify your parole officer or a health care worker) available to you through your institution to access mental health care from a counsellor, psychologist or primary worker if you are feeling sad or upset as a result of participating in this study. If you would like my assistance in facilitating this, please let me know now and I can help arrange this.

THANK YOU!!!!

Appendix B: Refinement of Assessment Tool

To aid in identifying salient discriminable criteria, we have augmented the Preliminary Offence Pathway Checklist (see Gannon et al., 2012) by clarifying how to rate each criterion and adding three new assessment features. Gannon et al.'s (2012) initial five criteria of positive affect, distal planning, proximal planning, coercion present, and self-regulation have been retained. However, positive affect and coercion present have been revised. Most notably, positive affect has been aggregated across all offences. Gannon et al.'s (2012) criterion of amount of coercion present has been renamed co-offender's coercive behaviour. The subjectivity in rating coercion was so varied between our researchers that we have opted to rate the type of behaviour rather than just WSOs' interpretation of the level of coercion. Three new rating criteria (adoption of role, offence motive, and deceptive responses and attitudes), have been added to discern between the Adopted-Approach and Directed-Avoidant pathways. Finally, in an effort to make assessments less subjective, numerical values have been attributed to each criterion which can be summated and compared to scores associated with each pathway. These are only rated if the first offence was accompanied by a coercive co-offender.

Proposed Four-Pathway Checklist for Female Sexual Offenders

		None 0	Low 1	Moderate 2	High 3	Extreme 4	Unclass.
Positive Affect (*Aggregate for <u>all</u> offenses, and at goal establish-ment and planning substages)*	**None:** anxiety, fear, distress, etc. (during all offenses). **Rate**: excitement, sexual gratification, intimacy, revenge, monetary gain. **Low**: fleeting positive affect. **High**: satisfaction						
Distal Planning *(First offence)*	**None:** another person planning. **Low**: little planning, no planning. **High**: grooming, kidnapping, trafficking.						

Proximal Planning *(First offence)*	**None**: another person planning. **Low**: spontaneous. **High**: Detailed plan implemented.						
Co-offender's Coercive Behaviour *(First offence. Compare with file info*)	**None**: sole offender **Low**: physical threat, threats against victim **Moderate**: grooming, extortion, verbal abuse **High**: nagging, flattery, promise of enjoyment						
Self-Regulation *(Consider planning and offence behaviour)*	**None**: co-offender present. **Low**: impulsive, inability to control behaviour **High**: goal oriented, precise behaviour						
Continue only if **Coercive Behaviour score is 1 or greater.*							
Adoption of Role *(Aggregate offence behaviour and path to desistance)*	**None**: resistant, apprehensive **Low**: proximal planning under duress **High**: distal planning, victim recruitment/groom-ing, offends when co-offender not present.						
Offence Motive	**Low**: fear, threatened by partner, threats against victims **High**: intimacy with partner, please partner						

Deceptive Responses and Attitudes *(Compare interview with file info)*	**None**: matches file info, forthright **Low**: impression management, minimizes role. **High**: denies official version, fabricates events, exaggerates coercion level, accepts no blame, no victim empathy.						

Interpretation Guidelines **Total Score: _____**

Implicit-Disorganized: 1 - 8 Directed-Avoidant: 1 - 8 **Pathway: _____**
Explicit-Approach: 7 - 16 Adopted-Approach: 6 - 24

Coding Instructions

Positive affect rates affect across all offences. A score of '0' is to be assigned to any WSOs who only experienced negative affect. All types of positive affect (sexual gratification, intimacy, revenge) are to be considered equal and values are to be assigned according to their strength and if they were fleeting (low) or had lasting satisfaction (high).

Co-offender's coercive behaviour rates the type of behaviour rather than the just WSOs interpretation of the level of coercion. Unlike positive affect, this criterion only examines the first offence. This measure is inversely scored to accommodate the final summation score. WSOs that report their co-offender explicitly threatened them or the victim in some way are to receive a low score value. Grooming should also be considered coercive behaviour, receiving a low score. WSOs that report that their co-offender talked them into the offence with flattery or nagging receive a high value.

Adoption of role, *offence motive,* and *deceptive responses and attitudes* are only rated if the first offence was accompanied by a coercive co-offender. Adoption of role is an aggregate score of the WSOs offence behaviour and path to desistance. WSOs who are resistant and continue to be apprehensive towards offending, or disclose the abuse to authorities to protect the victim, receive a score of '0'. WSOs who adopt a minimal role in the abuse, such as proximal planning or photo-taking are to receive a low score. If a WSO readily adopts an active role in the offence, such as distal planning, grooming, victim recruitment, or offending alone, they receive a high score.

Offence motive distinguishes between WSOs who offend due to fear and those who offend for intimacy with their co-offender. This measure is inversely scored with low scores indicating a WSO motivated by threats and high scores indicating intimacy. *Deceptive responses and attitudes* is intended to be a "catch-all" category that does not relate solely to the pathway, but to the offenders attitudes and interview. All of the Adopted-Approach WSOs in our sample were initially categorized as Directed-Avoidant because we relied on interview responses only. These deceitful responses went beyond simple impression management and were intended to use their co-offender as a scapegoat and mislead the interviewer. Similar to Explicit-Approach

WSOs, Adopted-Approach WSOs rated the victim impact as very low and focused on their own perceived or fabricated victimization. Conversely, Directed-Avoidant WSOs seemed quite aware of the impact their role had on their victim(s) and exhibited minimal impression management.

WSOs who co-offend and minimize the impact on the victim may be exhibiting deviant sexual attitudes and should be scored moderate to high on *Deceptive responses and attitudes*. This measure is the most exploratory on the revised Checklist with the broadest and least defined focus. Not only can it aid in distinguishing between pathways, but this measure also gears the Checklist towards assessment and treatment.

All unreported or ambiguous responses should be rated as Unclassified which has no numerical value. Where possible, unclassified responses should be resolved by carefully examining official files or may garner a high rating on Deceptive responses, which would balance the final score.

Final scores for WSOs offending alone would be between 7 to 16 for Explicit-Approach and 1 to 8 for Implicit-Disorganized. Co-offending WSOs final scores would be between 1 to 8 for Directed-Avoidant and 6 to 24 for Adopted-Approach. There are overlaps in the intervals for Explicit-Approach and Implicit-Disorganized and again for Directed-Avoidant and Adopted-Approach. This is meant to highlight that there is currently no empirical research to justify rating ranges and that the final scores are only meant to narrow the possible pathways. Unclassified WSOs remain a possibility and this checklist does not offer any final score for such an outcome.

Future scales may be able to collapse distal and proximal planning into one planning score, with a high score relating to being distal and low being proximal. However, they were kept separate to increase the numerical gap between Explicit-Approach and Implicit-Disorganized offenders and to again demonstrate that this scale is still in preliminary stages.