

## ***Male Adolescents: Sexual Victimization and Subsequent Sexual Abuse***

**David L. Burton, M.S.W., Ph.D.**

**ABSTRACT:** Veneziano, Veneziano and LeGrand (2000) found support for the victim to victimizer hypothesis of sexual aggression with 74 sexually abusive youth. This project, a further step in examining this theory (Burton, 2000, Burton, Miller, & Shill, 2002) builds on their ideas with data from 179 adolescent sexual abusers, and supports their findings. In an examination of relationships, gender, modus operandi, and acts, the sexually abused youth were likely to repeat what was done to them. This project also offers a further analysis of how victimization accounts for a significant portion of the variance in perpetration by these youth. Implications for research and practice are offered.

**KEY WORDS:** Intergenerational Transmission; Social Learning Theory; Sexual Offender.

### **Introduction**

Between 0% and 80%<sup>1</sup> of adolescent sexual abusers have reportedly been sexually abused (Awad & Saunders, 1984; Cooper, Murphy & Haynes, 1996; Hunter & Figueredo, 2000; Ryan, Miyoshi, Metzner, Krugman & Fryer, 1996; Worling, 1995). Even the most conservative projections indicate that adolescent sexual abusers have been sexually victimized at three to four times the 10% rate found within the general male adolescent population (Watkins & Bentovim, 1992). Simi-

---

Address correspondence to David L. Burton, M.S.W., Ph.D., The University of Michigan, School of Social Work #3734, 1080 South University, Ann Arbor, MI 48109; e-mail: burtond@umich.edu.

<sup>1</sup>Rates of sexual victimization among adolescent sexual abusers vary substantially across studies, but are almost always found to be higher than the general population. Residential facility samples may also have youth with higher rates of sexual victimization history.

larly, even the low-end estimates are typically twice those reported for adult sexual abusers (Hanson & Slater, 1988).

While researchers continue to report different rates of sexual abuse among adolescent abusers, the majority of treatment programs in North America address sexual victimization of their clients. Specifically, 82.4% of 91 residential treatment programs and 89% of 118 community-based treatment programs (representing service provision to 5456 youth in the 1998 calendar year) utilize victimization/trauma resolution techniques in their treatment of adolescent sexual abusers (Burton & Smith-Darden, 2001). The use of this approach is apparently based on research findings and the clinical experience of those designing the programs, both of which find that many youth have been sexually abused and otherwise traumatized.

One approach that considers sexual victimization as part of the etiological explanation for sexual abuse is social learning theory. In an early illustrative case of social learning theory, Bandura and Walters (1963) included several youth who were acting out sexually. Since then, victim-to-victimizer explanations of sexually abusive behavior by adolescents have been discussed in the literature many times (Di-Censo, 1992; Faller, 1989; Freeman-Longo, 1986; Garland & Dougher, 1990; Ryan, 1986; Widom, 1989).

The social learning theory approach asserts that a sexually abusive youth may commit his *first* act due to a combination of: internalized social definitions that support sexual offending; and the receipt of anticipated rewards that they perceive their own offenders obtaining (Akers, 1998; Bandura, 1986); prior reinforcements for minor rule breaking (at home or in the community); and cognitive distortions regarding sexual behavior and potential victims (Abel, Becker & Cunningham-Rathner, 1984; Dodge & Tomlin, 1987; Short & Simeonsson, 1986). The youth may then *continue* to offend due to: an ongoing need to resolve sexual abuse trauma (Veneziano, Veneziano & LeGrand, 2000); conditioning processes related to sexual orgasm (Marshall & Eccles, 1993); a need to relieve anxiety driven by intrapsychic conflict (Groth, 1979); emotional disturbance reflective of a developmental crisis (Groth, 1977); or a possible addiction (Carnes, 1983). Additional incentive to continue sexually abusing others may also come from external sources such as friends (e.g. in the case of gang rape) or other factors.

In 1990 Garland and Dougher carefully examined the adolescent sexual abuser literature to develop a succinct evaluation of the empirical support of social learning theory as applied to sexually abusive

adolescents. This analysis resulted in several propositions for which Burton, Miller, and Shill (2001) recently found empirical support in a study that compared sexually victimized sexual abusers to sexually victimized non-sexual abusers. They reported that, in general, a group of sexual abusers had more severe childhood sexual victimization than their non-sexual abusing counterparts. They also found that certain characteristics of the youth's victimization were able to predict membership in the group of sexually abusive youth. Specifically, a youth was 23 times as likely to be in the sexually abusive group if the following conditions were present: the youth was abused by both men and women, his perpetrator was related to him, the perpetrator used a forceful modus operandi (MO), the youth was abused over several years, and the acts included penetration.

To further this study of social learning theory, a testable hypothesis is that sexually victimized abusive youth should repeat the behaviors they learned during their own victimization. Ryan (1986) and Freeman-Longo (1986) came to this conclusion in separate conceptual papers, both of which described the idea of the intergenerational transmission of sexually abusive behavior. DiCenso (1992) also agreed, as she succinctly stated that, "[Adolescent sexual abusers'] offenses should mirror their own victimization (p. 190)." She then reported that 77% of her sample of 42 adolescent sexual abusers repeated the acts that were done to them.

More recently, Veneziano, Veneziano and LeGrand (2000) reported an examination of this idea with 74 sexually abusive youth and found support for the basic proposition. Their analysis looked at the following questions: Did youth that were sexually victimized before age five subsequently sexually abuse someone who was under age five? Did youth abuse a person or persons of the same gender(s) as his own abuser(s)? Did youth abuse someone who had the same relationship status (relative or not) as his own abuser? Finally, did youth commit the same act committed against him (anal intercourse, fellatio or fondling)? In the questions of anal intercourse and fondling, they reported significant chi-square results; in all of their questions, odds ratios supported the idea that youth do indeed learn from, and tend to repeat, the characteristics of their own abuse. They did not evaluate modus operandi of their youth.

The current project builds on the work of Veneziano, Veneziano and LeGrand (2000) and furthers the investigation of how the victimization history of sexually abused male adolescent sexual abusers relates to their sexually abusive behavior. Similar to the above study, the

first research question explores how well the dimensions of the youth's sexual victimization (relationship, severity of act, gender and modus operandi) match these dimensions of their sexually abusive behaviors. Furthering the line of inquiry, the second question explores the degree to which the characteristics of the youths' victimization explains their sexually abusive acts.

## **Methodology**

### *Participants and Method*

This study is part of a large pencil and paper cross-sectional survey study reported upon previously. The larger study is an analysis of the causes (Burton, Miller, & Shill, 2002) and patterns (Burton, 2000) of sexual aggression by adolescent males. In each of three Midwest residential delinquency institutions, the administration, clinical teams and line staff were asked for approval for each boy to participate. Only 14 youth in total were not given approval to participate due to difficulties with behavior management or clinical concerns (i.e., asking the youth questions about trauma might upset current clinical work). Attempts were made to include as many sexually abusive youth as possible in these facilities. The surveys specifically asked about behaviors rather than for "sexual abuse" in order to meet this goal. While a possible 550 youth in total were asked to participate, 471 agreed to do so for the overall project sample. There was no way to determine differences between those who participated in the study and those that were not allowed, or did not wish, to participate.

For this report, the 179 male youth who admitted to sexual offenses and to being sexually victimized compose the sample. Forty-six percent of these youth were adjudicated for sexual offenses and the remainder for other offenses from armed robbery to murder. All of the youth admitted on the anonymous survey, both to having been sexually abused and to committing sexual offenses. Forty two percent of the youth were African Americans, 30.2% Anglo American, 5.6% Hispanic, 6.7% Native American and 15.5% were multiracial or other. The boys were an average of 16.97 years old ( $SD = 1.5$ ).

### *Procedures*

Surveys were administered in small housing unit-based groups of 10–24 youth. A staff member was available for any youth who felt the

need to process the material or discuss anything that was experienced emotionally while filling out the surveys. Very few youth asked for this debriefing ( $n = 2$ ). The youth were given a pizza party as compensation for their participation.

### *Materials*

After the completion of several pilot tests, demographic data were collected along with a survey based upon the Sexual Abuse Exposure Questionnaire (SAEQ), (Ryan, Rodriguez, Rowan & Foy, 1992). This instrument was used to assess the type(s) and nature of sexual victimization experienced. Reliability testing for this instrument yielded an alpha of .86, with an 8-week test-retest agreement for a small sample of 79% (Burton & Fleming, 1998).

A similar form was designed to assess the youths' sexual abuse of others. This instrument was named the self-report sexual aggression scale (SERSAS). Reliability testing for this instrument yielded an alpha of .88, with an 8-week test-retest agreement for a small sample of 82% (Burton & Fleming, 1998).

Data entry was verified by a random check across all instruments of 10% of the data. Less than 0.01 % error was found. SPSS was used for data entry and analysis.

Social desirability was assessed using a measure designed for adult sexual offenders (Kroner & Weekes, 1996). None of the variables in this report covary with the scales from this measure; therefore, the social desirability scale results were not included as covariates in any of the following analyses.

## **Results**

Four dimensions of the youths' sexual victimization are compared to the same characteristics of the youths' sexually abusive behavior: 1) gender (male, female or both male and female), 2) relationship (relative, friend/neighbor or stranger) 3) modus operandi (favors, games, babysitting of the victim(s), threats or physical force), and 4) severity of acts (exhibitionism, fondling or penetration).

Univariate analysis reveals that relatives were the largest category of perpetrators (73%) and victims (59%) for the youth. Surprisingly, females were most likely to be reported as sexual abusers of the youth (71%), but not surprisingly, they were also the most often reported victims of the youth (86%). Most of the youth (85%) reported having

been victimized by a favors, games or babysitting MO, while 85% of them used the same MO. A large percentage of the youth (90%) were victimized by exhibitionism, while 82% abused others in this fashion. Eighty-nine percent were abused by penetration and 77% abused others with acts of penetration.

Following the example of Veneziano, Veneziano and LeGrand (2000), both odds ratios and chi-square analyses were completed in each comparison. It is important to recognize that many youth were abused by several different people in several different relationships. Similarly, some of the youth sexually abused several people in several relationships to them. Therefore, in all of the tables that follow, youth may be counted more than once except in the case of gender. In this table, the youth are placed in exclusive categories according to which gender(s) abused them and which gender(s) they abused.

In terms of relationship, results show that youth were likely to abuse the same type of person who abused them. As seen in Table 1, a youth who was sexually abused by a parent was 1.36 times more likely to sexually abuse a parent than a youth who was not sexually abused by a parent. For this sub-group, a chi-square is not reported due to the small numbers of youth who were sexually abused by and who then sexually abused their parents and the resultant problems of small cell size, which this produced. A youth who was sexually abused by a non-parental relative was 2.95 times more likely to sexually abuse a relative than a youth who was not sexually abused by a relative. A youth who was sexually abused by a friend or neighbor was 4.54 times more likely to sexually abuse a friend or neighbor than a youth who was not sexually abused by a friend or neighbor. Finally, a youth who was sexually abused by a stranger was 2.87 times more likely to sexually abuse a stranger than a youth who was not sexually abused by a stranger. All of these relationships, with the exception of gender, for which chi-square was not computed, were significant at the .001 level using chi-square analyses.

In terms of gender, youth were also more likely to victimize the gender(s) of the person(s) who abused them. As can be seen in Table 2, a youth who was sexually abused by a female was 3.89 times more likely to sexually abuse a female than a youth who was not sexually abused by a female. A youth who was sexually abused by a male was 6.05 times more likely to sexually abuse a male than a youth who was not sexually abused by a male. A youth who was sexually abused by both genders was 1.88 times more likely to sexually abuse both genders than a youth that was not sexually abused by both genders. All of these relationships were significant using chi-square analyses.

**TABLE 1**  
**Relationships Between Whom the Youth Was Abused by and Whom the Youth Abused**

	Sexually Abused a Parent		Did Not Sexually Abuse a Parent		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused by a Parent	1	.01	27	.15	1.36	
Not Sexually Abused by a Parent	4	.02	147	.82		
	Sexually Abused a Relative		Did Not Sexually Abuse a Relative		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused by a Relative	69	.39	34	.19	2.95	12.18***
Not Sexually Abused by a Relative	31	.17	45	.25		
	Sexually Abused a Friend/Neighbor		Did Not Sexually Abuse a Friend/Neighbor		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused by a Friend/Neighbor	74	.41	34	.19		

**TABLE 1** (Continued)

	Abused a Friend/ Neighbor		Did Not Sexually Abuse a Friend/ Neighbor		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Not Sexually Abused by a Friend/ Neighbor	23	.13	48	.27	4.54	22.52***
	Sexually Abused a Stranger		Did Not Sexually Abuse a Stranger		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused by a Stranger	38	.21	30	.17		
Not Sexually Abused by a Stranger	34	.19	77	.43	2.87	11.18***

\*p = .05; \*\*p < .05; \*\*\*p ≤ .001.

As Table 3 shows, youth were likely to use the MO of their own perpetrator(s). A youth who was sexually abused with favors, games or babysitting was 9.22 times more likely to use these same methods than a youth who was not sexually abused with favors, games or babysitting. A youth who was sexually abused with threats, against him and/or others, was 3.88 times more likely to use threats with his own victim(s) than a youth who was not sexually abused with threats. Finally, a youth who was sexually abused with direct force was 3.95 times more likely to sexually abuse using direct force than a youth who was not sexually abused in this manner. All of these relationships were significant using chi square analyses.



**TABLE 2**  
**Relationships Between the Gender of the Youth's Victimizer**  
**and the Gender of the Youth's Victim**

	Sexually Abused Female(s)		Did Not Sexually Abuse Female(s)		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused by Female(s)	116	.65	11	.06		
Not Sexually Abused by Female(s)	38	.21	14	.08	3.89	10.24***

  

	Sexually Abused Male(s)		Did Not Sexually Abuse Male(s)		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused by Male(s)	57	.32	66	.37		
Not Sexually Abused by Male(s)	7	.04	49	.27	6.05	19.19***

  

	Sexually Abused Both Male(s) and Female(s)		Did Not Sexually Abuse Both Male(s) and Female(s)		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused by Both Male(s) and Female(s)	32	.18	51	.28		

**TABLE 2** (Continued)

	Sexually Abused Both Male(s) and Female(s)		Did Not Sexually Abuse Both Male(s) and Female(s)		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Not Sexually Abused by Both Male(s) and Female(s)	24	.13	72	.40	1.88	3.80*

\* $p = .05$ ; \*\* $p < .05$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq .001$ .

In terms of actual sexually abusive behaviors, youth who experienced various acts were somewhat more likely to repeat them than youth who did not experience those same acts, as can be seen in Table 4. A youth who was a victim of exhibitionism was .91 times more likely to commit exhibitionism than a youth who did not suffer from exhibitionism. This was not a significant association. A youth who was fondled was 2.14 times more likely to fondle than a youth that was not fondled. Similar to exhibitionism, this also was not a significant association. Lastly, a youth who was sexually penetrated<sup>2</sup> was 4.13 times more likely to penetrate<sup>3</sup> a victim than a youth who was not sexually penetrated. This finding was significant.

Using bivariate linear regression, the second analysis attempted to determine how much variance the characteristics of the youths' victimization accounted for their sexually abusive behavior (Table 5). In this case, after much consideration of the use of dummy coding and other alternatives, and given the field's knowledge at this time and a previous analysis of part of this data (Burton, Miller & Shill, 2001), each characteristic was given a three-level code for each variable, ranging from 1 (the least severe) to 3 (the most severe): relationship was coded as 1 = stranger, 2 = friend/neighbor and 3 = relative; gender

<sup>2</sup>Penetration of the boys includes anal or oral penetration.

<sup>3</sup>Penetration of girls includes anal, oral or vaginal penetration.

**TABLE 3**  
**Relationships Between the Modus Operandi of the Youths' Victimizers and the Youths' Own Modus Operandi**

	Sexually Abused Others Using a Favors, Games or Babysitting MO		Did Not Sexually Abuse Others Using a Favors, Games or Babysitting MO		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused With a Favors, Games or Babysitting MO	139	.78	14	.08		
Not Sexually Abused With a Favors, Games or Babysitting MO	14	.08	13	.07	9.22	18.06***

  

	Sexually Abused Others Using Threats		Did Not Sexually Abuse Others Using Threats		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused With Threats	33	.18	36	.20		
Not Sexually Abused With Threats	21	.12	89	.50	3.88	16.62***

**TABLE 3** (Continued)

	Sexually Abused Others With Direct Force		Did Not Sexually Abuse Others With Direct Force		Odds Ratio	Chi- Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused With Direct Force	46	.26	37	.21		
Not Sexually Abused With Direct Force	23	.13	73	.41	3.95	18.06***

\* $p = .05$ ; \*\* $p < .05$ ; \*\*\* $p \leq .001$ .

was coded as 1 = females, 2 = males, and 3 = males and females; MO was coded as 1 = favors games or babysat, 2 = threats, 3 = direct force and act was coded as 1 = exhibitionism, 2 = fondling, and 3 = penetration. Then, for both the victimization of the youth and the perpetration by the youth, the codes were summed so that the youth had a possibility of a 4–12 victimization score ( $M = 9.92$ ,  $SD = 1.85$ ). The youth also had a possibility of a 4–12 perpetration score ( $M = 9.05$ ,  $SD = 2.11$ ). These two variables had a significant correlation ( $r = .50$ ,  $N = 140$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Victimization accounted for 25.4% of the variation in perpetration ( $F = 46.89$ , 1,  $N = 179$   $p = .000$ ).

## Discussion

The current analyses found support for the first research question. DiCenso's proposition that the youths' sexually abusive behavior tends to mirror what was done to them is usually true for this sample. In agreement with Veneziano, Veneziano, and LeGrand (2000), this study found support for a victim-to-victimizer hypothesis in the odds ratios. While they studied age, this project considered MO and did not report on age. Similar to Veneziano, Veneziano and LeGrand (2000), the current analyses included gender, relationship, and acts. While,

**TABLE 4**  
**Relationships Between the Acts of Youths' Victimization and  
 the Youths' Own Sexually Abusive Behaviors**

	Committed Exhibitionism		Did Not Commit Exhibitionism		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused With Exhibitionism	132	.74	15	.08		
Not Sexually Abused With Exhibitionism	29	.16	3	.02	.91	.02
	Committed Fondling		Did Not Commit Fondling		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused With Fondling	116	.65	17	.09		
Not Sexually Abused With Fondling	35	.20	11	.06	2.14	3.2
	Committed Penetration		Did Not Commit Penetration		Odds Ratio	Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%		
Sexually Abused With Penetration	128	.72	10	.06		
Not Sexually Abused With Penetration	31	.17	10	.06	4.13	9.36**

\*p = .05; \*\*p < .05; \*\*\*p ≤ .001.

TABLE 5

Table Linear Regression Summary of the Prediction of Perpetration by Victimization

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	3.350	.841	
Victimization	.570	.083	.504*

\* $p < .001$ .

Veneziano, Veneziano and LeGrand found support for this theory in odds ratios, they found significant results using chi-square analyses for anal intercourse and fondling. In the current study, significance using chi-square analysis was found in all of the analyses except for victimization by, and commission of, exhibitionism and fondling. The sample size of this study is larger than that of the Veneziano, Veneziano, and LeGrand (2000) study, which may account for some of the relationships reaching significance.

The second analysis found that a significant amount of the variance in perpetration, as determined by the trichotomously coded variables, was accounted for by victimization. There are at least two issues in such an analysis. First, the components of victimization are correlated. For example, men are more likely to use force than women; they are also more likely to penetrate than women (Miller, 1999). This problem, in a way, argues for a method of combining the characteristics into some sort of variable that accounts for potential multicollinearity. This leads to the second issue: How does one weight these characteristics? Is penetration with a friendly MO by a stranger truly worse than fondling by force by a father? Additionally, can we even guess what the victim might experience as worse, given the great variation in resiliency of victims and their reaction to sexual abuse (Kendall-Tackett, Williams & Finkelhor, 1993)? Nonetheless, we must take the first steps toward understanding these relationships in order to further understand the etiology of sexual abuse, and to develop preventive interventions. If we can determine which acts are worse, perhaps when a child is known to have been more seriously sexually

abused, we can target more intense treatments in order to diffuse some of the impact of the sexual trauma. Of note, when evaluating the regression co-efficients in Table 5, it is clear that the youth do not do all of what is done to them; on an overall basis, they do not commit acts as severe as the ones committed against them.

The fact that the relationships in this study are not fully explained by the victim-to-victimizer theory may be explained by the fact that many of the variables in this study are affected by situational context. If the youth has a younger sister living in his house, perhaps even sleeping in a shared room, then he has immediate access to her. Similarly, this is the case if he is her occasional caretaker. Size, role or age may be an issue; a youth may not be large enough to use force with available victims that match the characteristics of those who abused him. The youth are younger than many of their perpetrators so the age of the youth when he offends cannot be the age of his own perpetrator.

The imperfect relationship between characteristics of a youth's victimization and victimizing may also be explained by the fact that the youth was caught and incarcerated. He may have been in a progressive pattern (Hunter, 1994), now halted by incarceration, which may have eventually matched or exceeded what he experienced. Each of these explanations must affect the youth's ability to copy what was done to him. It cannot be determined if a youth would repeat exactly what happened to him if he had the opportunity to do so.

Practice implications of this research support the field's work with trauma and victimization, as discussed previously (Burton & Smith-Darden, 2001). In the same national survey of treatment programs for sexual abusers, Burton and Smith-Darden report that 79% of 209 residentially- and community-based programs for adolescent sexual abusers claimed a cognitive-behavioral/relapse prevention approach to working with juvenile sexual offenders. Given this paradigm, cognitive-behavioral techniques for trauma resolution are a good fit and are indeed frequently used with these youth. Supporting this practice base, research has repeatedly reported empirical evidence for such techniques with survivors of sexual assault (Anderson, Stewart, Dancu, Hughs & West, 1988; Clarke & Llewelyn, 1994; Foa, Rothblum, Riggs & Murdock, 1991; Foa, Hearst-Ikeda & Perry, 1995; Nis-hith, Pallavi, Hearst, Mueser & Foa, 1995; Resick & Schninke, 1992; Sharpe, Tarrier & Rotundo, 1994; Shapiro, 1989). All of these studies reported decreased symptoms of depression, anxiety, and Post Trau-

matic Stress Disorder (PTSD) as described in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders—fourth edition (DSM-IV) (American Psychological Association, 1994).

Models of treatment that may be particularly relevant for adolescent sexual abusers include techniques for working with PTSD as expressed with anger (Novaco & Chemtoub, 1998), disassociation (Wagner & Linehan, 1998), substance abuse (Ruzak, Polusny & Abueg, 1998), trauma related guilt (Kubany & Manke, 1995) and, most relevant to this project, a focus on sexual victimization (Briere, 1997, Brom, Kleber & Defares, 1989; Lanktree & Briere, 1995; McCann & Pearlman, 1990; Meadows & Foa, 1998, 1999, 2000).

A second conceptual approach, although not empirically validated, may be found in the psychodynamic literature with writers who discuss the concept of identification with the aggressor and the psychodynamic and/or psychoanalytic methods of resolution of this problem in regards to sexual offenses (Miller, 1998; Shabad, 1997) and to adolescent sexual offenders in general (Woods, 1997). Attraction to, and identification with, aggressors may indeed be part of the complex learning process for sexually abused sexual abusers. However, in the North American survey of treatment programs Burton and Smith-Darden (2001) report that none of the 217 programs for adolescent male sexual offenders claimed either a psychoanalytic or a psychodynamic model. Hence, this approach may not be the best fit for those working with this population. In part this lack of psychodynamic and psychoanalytic models choice may be because most of these clients are mandated for treatment and may not be a good match for insight oriented therapies. Additionally, nearly all of the empirical literature which finds that treatment for sexually abusive youth is effective (Alexander, 1994; Worling & Curwen, 2000) is based on cognitive-behavioral programs.

Even with the models that exist for treatment of sexual abuse and related symptoms, empirically validated models for treatment of trauma for sexual abusers and comparisons of the success rates of programs that treat trauma versus those that do not, have not yet been reported upon. Such practice research is needed.

There are a number of limitations to carefully consider in this project. First, this is a convenience sample, albeit purposive. Second, the imperfect measure used in the second analysis must be considered, and the findings must be interpreted carefully. Third, in some cases the youth's own victimization may have included direction by others to be abusive. This may result in the youth reporting some abuse of



another that was actually part of his own victimization. It was impossible to tell which of the youths' behaviors were self-initiated versus those that were directed by others. Fourth, while the youth were told several times, both orally and in writing, that the project was interested only in sexual acts that were coercive or forced, they may have misunderstood or misrepresented their sexual experiences with females. This seems likely, but the contrary must also be considered. Perhaps there are more instances of sexual abuse of these youth involving women than previously reported (Burton, Miller & Shill, 2001). Clearly, a longitudinal analysis of the development of sexually abusive behaviors would be methodologically ideal, even if expensive and time consuming.

Further research, which goes beyond the current victim-to-victimizer theory, is needed. It will be important to learn about other paths of transmission of knowledge regarding sexual and sexually abusive behavior for both sexually victimized adolescents who abuse, and for non-victimized youth who sexually abuse. Early exposure to explicit hard core pornography and to child pornography seem to be promising avenues of further research (Leguizamo, 2000). More research is also needed on the motivations, cognitive schema as the processes of learning, and retention and production of learned behaviors. As learning also does not occur in a vacuum, genetics may be involved in youths' difficult behaviors, and how they learn may also be affected by basic abilities (Rowe, 1994), suggesting a need for twin studies.

### **Acknowledgments**

This project was funded by the Office of the Vice President of Research of the University of Michigan. The author would like to express appreciation to all of the youth in the study for their time and effort. This project was supported by W. J. Maxey Boy's Training School (Whitmore Lake, Michigan), Boysville (Clinton and Saginaw, Michigan) and Lutheran Home (Bay City, Michigan). Appreciation is extended to Michael Fleming, Stacey Frisinger, Anne Burton, Tom Restrick, Linda Schwartz, Judith Block and Carl Hagstrom and all the graduate students who interviewed the youth. The author would also like to thank César Valdez, Rachel Schatz, and Drs. William Birdsall and William Meezan for their reading of earlier drafts of this paper and for assistance with the analysis.

## References

- Abel, G., Becker, J., & Cunningham-Rathner, J. (1984). Complications, consent, and cognitions in sex between children and adults. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 7, 89–103.
- Abel, G., Osborne, C. & Twigg, D. (1993). Sexual assault through the life span: Adult offenders with juvenile histories. In Barbaree, H., Marshall, W. & Hudson, S. (eds.), *The juvenile sex offender*. The Guilford Press: New York, 104–117.
- Akers, R. (1998). *Social learning and social structure*. Northeastern University Press: Boston.
- Alexander, M. (1999) Sexual offender treatment revisited. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment*, 11(2) 101–116.
- American Psychological Association (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (fourth edition)*. Author: Washington, D.C.
- Anderson, B., Stewart, B. D., Dancu, C., & et al. (1988). Efficacy of cognitive behavior therapy and systematic desensitization in the treatment of rape trauma. *Behavior Therapy*, 19(3), 403–420.
- Awad, G., Saunders, E., & Levine, J. (1984). A clinical study of male adolescent sexual offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. (28)1, 105–116.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundation of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.
- Briere, J. (1997). Treating adults severely abused as children: The self-trauma model. D. A. In Wolfe (Ed.), *New directions in prevention and treatment across the lifespan* (Vol. 4, pp. 177–204). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Brom, D., Kleber, R. J., & Defares, P. B. (1989). Brief psychotherapy for posttraumatic stress disorders. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 57(5), 607–612.
- Burton, D. (2000). Were adolescent sexual offenders children with sexual behavior problems? *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 12(1), 37–48.
- Burton, D. & Fleming, M (1998) Psychometric examination of the sex offender evaluation instrument. Poster for the Annual National Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers Conference, Vancouver, CA.
- Burton, D., Miller, D. & Shill, C.T. (2002). A social learning theory comparison of the sexual victimization of adolescent sexual offenders and non-sexual offending male delinquents. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 26(9), 893–907.
- Burton, D., Nesmith, A. & Badten, L. (1997). Clinician's views of sexually aggressive children: A theoretical exploration. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 21, 157–170.
- Burton, D. & Smith-Darden, J. (2001). The 2000 Safer Society Survey Report. Safer Society Press, Rutland Vermont.
- Carnes, P. (1983). *Out of the shadows: Understanding sexual addiction*. Minneapolis: CompCare Publications.
- Clarke, S., & Llewelyn, S. (1994). Personal constructs of survivors of childhood sexual abuse receiving cognitive analytic therapy. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 67(3), 273–289.
- Cooper, C. L., Murphy, W. D., & Haynes, M. R. (1996). Characteristics of abused and nonabused adolescent sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 8, 105–119.
- DiCenso, C. (1992). The adolescent sexual offender: Victim and perpetrator. In Viano, E. (ed.), *Critical Issues in Victimology: International Perspectives* (pp. 190–200). Springer: New York.
- Dodge, K. A., & Tomlin, A. M. (1987). Utilization of self-schemas as a mechanism of interpretational bias in aggressive children. *Social Cognition*, 5, 280–300.
- Faller, K. (1989). Why sexual abuse? An exploration of the intergenerational hypothesis. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 13(4), 543–548.

- Foa, E. B., Hearst-Ikeda, D., & Perry, K. J. (1995). Evaluation of a brief cognitive-behavioral program for the prevention of chronic PTSD in recent assault victims. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 63*(6), 948–955.
- Foa, E. B., Rothbaum, B. O., Riggs, D. S., & Murdock, T. B. (1991). Treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder in rape victims: A comparison between cognitive-behavioral procedures and counseling. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 59*(5), 715–723.
- Follette, V. M. (Ed.) (1988). *Cognitive-behavioral therapies for trauma* (pp. 191–225). New York: Guilford Press.
- Freeman-Longo, R. (1986). The impact of sexual victimization on males. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 10*(3), 411–414.
- Garland, R. & Dougher, M. (1990). The abused/abuser hypothesis of child sexual abuse: A critical review of theory and research. In J. Fierman (Ed.), *Pedophilia: Biosocial Dimensions* (pp. 488–509). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Groth, A. N. (1977). The adolescent sexual offender and his prey. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 21*, 249–254.
- Groth, A. N. (1979). Sexual trauma in the life histories of rapists and child molesters. *Victimology: An International Journal, 4*, 10–16.
- Hanson, R. & Slater, S. (1988). Sexual Victimization in the history of child sexual abusers: A review. *Annals of Sex Research, 1*(1), 485–499.
- Hunter, J. (1994, November). *Etiology of adolescent sexual offending*. Paper presented at the 13<sup>th</sup> Annual Research and Treatment Conference, The Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, San Francisco.
- Hunter, J. & Figueredo, A. (2000) The influence of personality and history of sexual victimization in the prediction of juvenile perpetrated child molestation. *Behavior Modification, 24*(2), 241–263.
- Kendall-Tackett, K. A., Williams, L. M., & Finkelhor, D. (1993). Impact of sexual abuse on children: A review and synthesis of recent empirical studies. *Psychological Bulletin, 113*, 164–180.
- Kroner, D. G. & Weekes, J. R. (1996). Balanced inventory of desirable responding: Factor structure, reliability, and validity with an offender sample. *Personality & Individual Differences, 21*(3), 323–333.
- Kubany, E. S., & Manke, F. P. (1995). Cognitive therapy for trauma-related guilt: Conceptual bases and treatment outlines. *Cognitive & Behavioral Practice, 2*(1), 27–61.
- Lanktree, C. B., & Briere, J. (1995). Outcome of therapy for sexually abused children: A repeated measures study. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 19*(9), 1145–1155.
- Leguizamo, A. (2000). *Differences in object relations between sexual offenders and sexual offending delinquents*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Marshall, W. & Eccles, A. (1993). Pavlovian conditioning processes in adolescent sex offenders. In Barbaree, H, Marshall, W. & Hudson, S. (eds.), *The juvenile sex offender*. The Guilford Press: New York, 118–142.
- Marshall, W., Hudson, S., & Hodgkinson, S. (1993). The importance of attachment bonds in the development of juvenile sex offending. In Barbaree, H, Marshall, W. & Hudson, S. (eds.), *The juvenile sex offender*. The Guilford Press: New York, 164–181.
- McCann, I. L., & Pearlman, L. A. (1990). *Psychological trauma and the adult survivor: Theory, therapy, and transformation*. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner/Mazel.
- Meadows, E. A., & Foa, E. B. (1998). Intrusion, arousal, and avoidance: Sexual trauma survivors. In Follette, V.M. (Ed.), *Cognitive-behavioral therapies for trauma* (pp. 100–123). New York: Guilford Press.
- Meadows, E. A., & Foa, E. B. (1999). Cognitive-behavioral treatment of traumatized adults. P. A. Saigh (Ed.), *Posttraumatic stress disorder: A comprehensive text*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Meadows, E. A., & Foa, E. B. (2000). Cognitive behavioral treatment for PTSD. A. Y.

- Shalev (Ed.), *International handbook of human response to trauma* (pp. 337–346). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Miller, D. L. (1999) Women's reported victimization of adolescent males. Unpublished paper, University of Michigan.
- Miller, J. (1998). An exploration of the defensive processes of introjecting and identifying with the aggressor. *Psychodynamic Counseling*, (4)1, 55–70.
- Novaco, R. & Chemtob, C. (1998) Anger and trauma: Consequences, assessment and treatment. In Follette, V., Ruzek, J. & Abueg, F. (Eds.), *Cognitive-behavioral therapies for trauma* (pp. 162–190). New York: Guilford Press.
- Resick, P. A., & Schnicke, M. K. (1992). Cognitive processing therapy for sexual assault victims. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 60(5), 748–756.
- Rowe, D. (1994). *The limits of family influence: Genes experience and behavior*. Guilford: New York.
- Ruzak, J., Polusny, M. & Abueg, F. (1998). Assessment and treatment of concurrent posttraumatic stress disorder and substance abuse. In Follette, V., Ruzek, J. & Abueg, F. (Eds.), *Cognitive-behavioral therapies for trauma* (pp. 226–255). New York: Guilford Press.
- Ryan, G. (1989). Victim to victimizer: Rethinking victim treatment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 4, 325–341.
- Ryan, G., Miyoshi, T., Metzner, J., Krugman, R., Fryer, G., (1996). Trends in a national sample of sexually abusive youths. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 35(1) Jan 1996, 17–25.
- Ryan, G., Hagler, S., Short, S., & Eck, B. (1995) Treatment for sexually abusive youth: Program description. Working draft, Larkspur, CO: Griffith Center. As cited in Ryan, G. & Lane, S. (eds.) (1997). *Juvenile sexual offending: Causes, consequences and correction*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
- Ryan, S., Rodriguez, J., Anderson, R., & Foy, D. (1992). *Psychometric analysis of the sexual abuse exposure questionnaire (SAEQ)*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
- Shabad, P. (1997). Trauma and innocence: From childhood and back again. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis*, 33(3), 345–366.
- Shapiro, F. (1989). Efficacy of the eye movement desensitization procedure in the treatment of traumatic memories. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 2(2), 199–223.
- Sharpe, L., Tarrier, N., & Rotundo, N. (1994). Treatment of delayed post-traumatic stress disorder following sexual abuse: A case example. *Behavioural & Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 22(3), 233–242.
- Short, R. J., & Simeonsson, R. J. (1986). Social cognition and aggression in delinquent adolescent males. *Adolescence*, 21, 159–176.
- Veneziano, Veneziano & LeGrand (2000). The relationship between adolescent sex offender behaviors and victim characteristics with prior victimization. *Violence and Victims*, 15(4), 363–374.
- Wagner, A. W., & Linehan, M. M. (1988). Dissociative behavior. In Follette, V., Ruzek, J., & Abueg, F. (Eds.), *Cognitive-behavioral therapies for trauma* (pp. 226–255). New York: Guilford Press.
- Watkins, B., & Bentovim, A. (1992). The sexual abuse of male children and adolescents: A review of current research. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 33, 197–248.
- Widom, C. (1989). Does violence beget violence? A critical examination of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 3–28.
- Woods, J. (1997). Breaking the cycle of abuse and abusing: Individual psychotherapy for juvenile sexual offenders. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, (2)3, 379–392.
- Worling, J. R. (1995). Sexual abuse histories of adolescent male sex offenders: Differences on the basis of the age and gender of their victims. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 104, 610–613.
- Worling, J. R., & Curwen, T. (2000). Adolescent sexual offender recidivism: Success of specialized treatment and implications for risk prediction. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 24(7), 965–982.