

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Student Theses

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Spring 6-2022

Identification of Sexual Grooming Behaviors in Male and Female Perpetrators

Stephanie Mignogna

CUNY John Jay College, stephanie.mignogna@jjay.cuny.edu

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_etds/238

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE
PERPETRATORS

Identification of Sexual Grooming Behaviors in Male and Female Perpetrators

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Art in Forensic Psychology
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
City University of New York

Stephanie Mignogna

May 2022

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Abstract

It is estimated up to 12% of all sexual abuse is perpetrated by females. However, little is known regarding the tactics that women use to perpetuate the abuse. There is evidence that almost all cases of child sexual abuse involve grooming and that female perpetrators may also engage in sexual grooming to perpetrate the abuse. Identification of sexual grooming behaviors can prevent abuse before it occurs however, previous research has found that individuals are poor at identifying sexual grooming behaviors before they occur. Using an experimental vignette design, this study compared the ability to identify sexual grooming behaviors when the perpetrator was either male or female. Participants were randomly assigned one of four vignettes which portrayed a student-teacher scenario where the teacher was either exhibiting sexual grooming behaviors or not and was either a male or a female. Results reveal that participants were significantly more likely to recognize sexual grooming behaviors if the perpetrator was male. Overall, these results suggest that the gender of the perpetrator may influence the detection of sexual grooming behaviors. These results will be discussed as they pertain to sexual violence prevention.

Keywords: Female sex offenders, grooming, child sexual abuse

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Identification of Sexual Grooming Behaviors in Male and Female Perpetrators

In 1997, Mary Kay Letourneau, a 30-year-old married schoolteacher, was found guilty of two counts of second-degree child-rape after she had sexual intercourse with one of her 11-year-old students (Associated Press, 1997). This case shocked the United States (U.S.), as it was presumed that women do not sexually abuse children (Denov, 2001). While male sex offenders make up most of the sex offender convictions, female sex offenders make up about 2.2% of sex offender convictions globally (Cortoni et al., 2017). However, this is likely an underestimate of the true prevalence as self-report findings suggest that nearly 12% of perpetrators are women (Cortoni et al., 2017). While sex crimes in general are notoriously underreported (Schönbucher et al., 2012), female perpetrated abuse may be even less likely to be reported due to assumed female cultural roles i.e., “women would never sexually offend” (Denov, 2001; Wijkman, Bijleveld, & Hendriks, 2010).

Comparatively little research has been done on women who perpetrated sex-crimes compared to male perpetrated sex-crimes. Christensen (2018) suggests that the lack of research is due to perceived low rates of offending, combined with the belief that females are caregivers and nurturers and not perpetrators. In addition, female perpetrated sex crimes with male victims are often dismissed due to sex-role stereotypes and rape-myths (Doherty & Anderson, 2004; Sleath & Bull, 2009). These stereotypes and rape myths include that all men instigate most instances of sexual intercourse hence they cannot really be victimized, that males are strong enough to “cope” with rape, if the male has an erection he cannot be raped or he “enjoyed” it and being raped is a form of de-masculization (Budd et al., 2017; Sleath & Bull, 2009). These stereotypes and societal messages may discourage male victims from speaking up about their

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

abuse, especially if the perpetrator was a woman. Additionally, even if they do report the crime, male victims of female perpetrated sex crimes may not also be believed by others (Groth & Burgess, 1980).

Female sex offenders

In examining the characteristics of women who sexually offend, Ganon and colleagues (2008) found that they were often victims of physical, sexual and emotional abuse and had poor family relations growing up (the most common profile of a female who sexually offends is a White woman in her 20's or 30's)(Faller, 1987, 1995; Farrell, 1988; Lewis & Stanley, 2000; Rosencrans; 1997; Vandiver, 2006; Vandiver & Kercher, 2004; Vandiver & Walker, 2002). Additionally, in comparison to their male counterparts, female sex offenders are more likely to have a prior history of drug offenses and property offenses, be the primary caretaker of a child and to be currently experiencing physical or sexual abuse (Bloom et al., 2003; Hardyman & Van Voorhis, 2004).

Multiple typologies of female sex offenders have been established. In a broader sense, female sex offenders can be broken down into “solo offenders” or “co-offenders” (Vandiver & Kercher, 2004). While there are further conceptualizations of female offender typologies, there is currently no accepted standard. However, many of the female typologies that have been conceptualized over the past several decades share commonalities. Some typologies with similarities include the *heterosexual nurturer* conceptualized by Vandiver & Kercher (2004) and *teacher-lover* conceptualized by Robertiello & Terry (2007). Both of these typologies view victimization as a relationship but the *teacher-lover* specifically involves a teacher and a student. Criminally prone *hebephiles* from Sandler & Freeman (2007) and *female sexual predators* conceptualized by Vandiver & Kercher (2007) share the commonalities of offending against

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

child victims and having an extensive criminal background. *Homosexual criminal subtypes* (Vandiver & Kercher, 2007) and *psychologically disturbed offenders* from Wikiman et al. (2010) share the similarities of offending against a victim for their own gain or due to past sexual assault trauma. *Young adult child molesters* from Sandler & Freeman (2007) and *young adult child exploiters* and *noncriminal homosexuals* from Vandiver and Kercher (2007) share the commonalities of offending against prepubescent children. Other typologies that have been mentioned in previous literature but that have little overlap across studies include the *aggressive homosexual offender* from Vandiver and Kercher (2004) who offends against adults, *young assaulters* conceptualized Wijman, Bijleveld & Hendrix (2010) who are young adults that fondle male children, *rapists* who specifically use penetration and *passive-mothers* who are bystanders when their husbands are victimizing their children (Wijman, Bijleveld & Hendrix, 2010).

Female grooming behaviors

It is estimated that almost all child sexual abuse involves at least some elements of sexual grooming (Winters & Jeglic, 2021). Grooming is a method used by offenders to access, gain the trust of and manipulate their victims for future sexual abuse (McAliden, 2006). Recently, a content validated model of child sexual grooming – the Sexual Grooming Model (SGM) was developed and consists of five stages: 1. Victim selection, 2. Gaining access and isolating a child, 3. Trust development, 4. Desensitization to sexual and physical content and 5. Maintenance following the abuse (Winters et al., 2020). According to the SGM, the grooming process begins with victim selection (Winters & Jeglic, 2017; Winters et al., 2020). Offenders' victims are commonly vulnerable with characteristics including being insecure, naïve, troubled, living in single parent households and lack parental supervision (Elliott, Browne, & Kilcoyne, 1995; Finkelhor, 2007; Olson et al., 2007). In the next phase of grooming, the offender gains access to

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

the victim usually by means of familial, institutional, or community-based settings (Craven, Brown & Gilchrist, 2006; McAliden, 2006). The following step is emotional recruiting which is when the offender gains trust of both the victim and potentially their family. The offender engages the child by getting to know their interests, being helpful, sharing secrets and giving the child attention/gifts (McAliden, 2006). The final phase before the assault begins is desensitization to physical touch and sexual content (Winters & Jeglic, 2017). The offender begins initiating physical touch in seemingly innocent ways to desensitize the child to touch. As this stage progresses, the physical touch becomes increasingly sexual. In addition to content validating the model with experts in the field, Winters et al., (2020) identified 42 behaviors that were indicative of sexual grooming such as an adult doing activities alone with children, separating the child from their family/peers, favoritism, frequent communication with child, gift-giving and frequent compliments (see Winters et al., 2020 for a full description)

There have not been any studies so far that specifically address grooming behaviors in females who sexually abuse children. However, since sexual grooming occurs in many cases of male perpetrated sexual abuse, it is also theorized that grooming behaviors are also employed in female perpetrated sexual abuse (Ford, 2006; Johansson-Love & Fremouw, 2009; Kaylor et al., 2021). It has been postulated that there are two types of female sexual abusers that may use grooming tactics: the teacher and the sex trafficker (Kaylor et al., 2021).

In one study of female-perpetrated sexual abuse, it was found that 61% of the sex crime perpetrated by females took place within educational institutions (Darling et al, 2018). Abuse in educational institutions can be difficult to recognize as it is not the environment one might expect it to occur (Giguere & Bumby, 2007; Moulden et al., 2007). In this setting, the teacher-lover typology involves female perpetrators using their position of power to continue abusing their

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

student and heterosexual nurturers view their sexual abuse towards a child to be a real, romantic relationship.

On the surface, many grooming behaviors mimic normal adult child interaction, but it is the intent behind them that makes it deviant (Knoll, 2010; McAlinden, 2013). Some signs of female sexual grooming with a student can include excessive time spent alone, spending time outside of class, obvious favoritism, befriending students' parents, giving gifts, inappropriate outside communication, flirtatious behavior, driving a student around and other students suspect something is occurring or make jokes about it (Shakeshaft, 2004; Sutton, 2004).

Identification of grooming behaviors

While sex offenders are generally a heterogeneous group, it is particularly shocking to a community when discovering a sex offender was successful, in a position of trust and well-liked (Darling, Hackett & Jamie, 2018; van Dam, 2011). This can result in blame and rage as the community wonders what signs they missed and how they didn't recognize the abusive behaviors before the children were victimized. While there is public information on how to identify child sex offenders and grooming behaviors, there is little research to see if the public can actually identify sexual grooming behaviors (U.S Department of Justice, 2020). The existing literature on child grooming identification is restricted to male offenders. Winters and Jeglic (2016) found that about 63% of individuals could recognize some inappropriate behaviors before the abuse occurs, most of them being behaviors that related to physical touch or desensitization to physical touch. However, Winters and Jeglic (2017) found that participants were particularly poor at identifying grooming behaviors that did not involve physical touch.

Despite the limited research on female grooming identification, there is existing research measuring the attitudes towards female sex offenders in the general population and in students. A

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

study by Gakhal & Brown (2011) found that the public holds a significantly negative attitude toward female sex offenders. Interestingly enough, students in this study held attitudes “within range” insinuating their attitudes are undecided. This in turn could not only mean students are undecided about these offenders but may have difficulty identifying them in the first place. It is possible that due to the participants’ undecided attitude indicates the public is not familiar with female sex offenders or perhaps some do not believe them to be “real”. Additionally, Sahlstrom & Jeglic (2008), found that when measuring public attitudes of juvenile sex offenders, female-perpetrated sex offender crimes were viewed as more serious than male-perpetrated sex offenses. These results deviated from previous findings indicating that female perpetrators were less responsible and less guilty for committing sex offenses (Rodgers & Davies, 2007). These results may indicate attitudes towards female sex offenders, are mixed or are changing.

This study also found that negative perceptions of juvenile sex offenders were consistent across participant’s gender and the offender’s gender (Sahlstrom & Jeglic, 2008). These results could be interpreted as once an individual is aware that an offender is engaging in a sex crime, they are still viewed negatively regardless of the perpetrator’s gender. These studies collectively suggest there are gaps in several areas; a. Identification of female grooming behaviors in general and b. Attitudes towards female sex offenders are mixed and whether previously held biases impact the ability to identify female grooming behaviors and offenders.

Current study

There has been no previous research exploring the identification of grooming behaviors when the offense is perpetrated by a female. The current study extends Winters & Jeglic’s (2017) work by also investigating identification behaviors in female perpetrators, as well as male perpetrators. Further exploring undecided attitudes of female sex offenders as discussed in Gakhal & Brown

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

(2011), whether individuals can identify sexual grooming behaviors at all. This study has two aims. The first is to assess the detection of grooming behaviors using an educator- student scenario. The second aim is to determine whether there are differences in the ability to detect grooming behaviors by the gender of the perpetrator. It is hypothesized that participants will be best at identifying male grooming behaviors as opposed to female grooming behaviors. It is also hypothesized that even though participants will be able to detect male grooming behaviors better than females, detection of grooming behaviors in general will not be significant.

Methods and participants

Participants were recruited through amazon's mTurk to participate in a study examining public perceptions of different occupations. Deception was used as advertising this study as a study about sex offender may have influenced participants after. Participants read the consent and were asked to print it out for their records. Participants were then randomly assigned one of four possible vignette conditions to read. Participants were instructed to read the vignette and were then redirected towards a survey which asked participants to use likelihood ratings on statements related to the teacher in the vignette. There was an attention check question to dis-qualify any bots or participants who were not paying attention. Finally, a demographic questionnaire and a fill-in question on whether participants knew of sexual grooming, was given at the end. A debriefing form was then given to participants explaining the use of deception and why it was necessary to gauge more accurate responses. Completion of this activity took about 30 minutes and participants were compensated with \$1.00.

The total number of responses received were 475 adults. However, 87 had incomplete answers, 3 had fill-in answers that did not make logical sense, 38 who finished in under five minutes and 20 who failed the attention check question. The final sample consisted of 328 adults

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

of which 212 identified as male ($n=212$; 64.6%), 115 identified as female ($n=115$; 35.1%) and one transgender individual ($n=1$; 0.3%) The average age of the sample was 34.58 ($SD=8.86$).

Most of the participants identified as White ($n=269$; 82.0%), but ($n=25$; 7.6%) identified as Black, ($n=19$; 5.8%) identified as Asian or Asian American, ($n=9$; 2.7%) identified as Latinx or Hispanic, and ($n=4$; 1.2%) identified as other. See Table 1.

Materials

Sexual grooming vignettes

Participants were randomly assigned to one of four grooming vignettes (see Appendix A). The vignettes were previously developed by Winters and Jeglic (2016) and involved a coach and Robbie, an 8-year-old boy. Winters and Jeglic's (2016) vignettes were modified to fit the aims of the current study as follows: a. Eight -year-old Robbie was changed to 15-year-old Rob, b. The addition of a female perpetrator, Jane and c. Changed the perpetrator's job from a sports' coach to a teacher. The victim's age was changed as female perpetrators are more likely to victimize teenage boys and are more commonly observed in an organizational setting (Knoll, 2010; Shakeshaft, 2004). The revision for the vignettes was reviewed for content validity by one of the original developers.

Each vignette describes a teacher, John for male and Jane for female, and their student 15-year-old Rob. For the Grooming Male condition, John is Rob's English teacher and engages in common grooming behaviors implemented by child molesters (desensitization to touch, selecting a vulnerable victim, gaining a child's trust and gaining access) (Lanning, 2010). In the Grooming Female condition, the grooming behaviors are presented in the exact same way as the Grooming Male condition except the gender of the teacher is now changed to female and her name is Jane. For the Non-Grooming Male condition, the vignette includes the male teacher John

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

but has an absence of grooming behaviors. Finally, for the Non-Grooming female condition, there was also an absence of grooming behaviors, and the gender of the teacher is now female.

Likelihood ratings

Participants in all the conditions will be asked to rate how likely John or Jane is to engage in specific behaviors and are based upon the scales used in the Winters & Jeglic 2016 study. The scale is between 1-100, with 0= definitely true and 100 = definitely not true. There are 22 statements in all, with 20 filler statements. An example of a filler question is “John or Jane is an alcoholic”. The two statements of interest are “John or Jane is a child molester” and “Jane or John will sexually abuse Rob”.

Demographic questionnaire

Participants were asked to provide their gender, age, race at the end of the survey. This questionnaire also included whether they have heard of sexual grooming at all and were asked to write out their response if they knew its definition.

Results

Means and standard deviations for each scale by condition are presented in Table 1. Each condition had two responses missing from each, ($N=326$). To assess if there were differences in the ability to detect whether the teacher was a child molester, and that Rob would be sexually abused by grooming condition (grooming/non-grooming) and perpetrator gender (male/female) two 2x2 ANOVAs were performed.

An ANOVA was conducted that examined the effect of vignette conditions and probability of sexual abuse ratings and had a total of ($N=326$) respondents . The mean ratings for each condition were $n=50.61$ ($SD=31.414$) for Male Grooming, $n=32.58$ ($SD=28.278$) for Female Grooming, $n=30.18$ ($SD=31.983$) for Male Non-Grooming and $n=35.65$ ($SD=34.640$) for

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Female Non-Grooming (See Table 2). There was a statistically significant main effect between vignette groups and the probability that the adult in the vignette would sexually abuse Rob ($F=6.830, p<.001, \eta^2=0.60$) (See Table 3). A Tukey's Post Hoc Test was conducted to examine individual significance between vignette conditions. There was statistical significance among Male Grooming and Female Grooming ($p=.003$), Male Grooming and Male Non-Grooming ($p<.001$) and Male Grooming and Female Non-Grooming ($p=.010$). There were no differences found between Female Grooming and Non-Male Grooming ($p=.968$), Female Grooming and Non-Female Grooming ($p=.968$) and Non-Grooming and Female Non-Grooming ($p=.677$) See Table 4).

Another ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of vignette conditions and child molester ratings with ($N=326$) respondents . The average ratings for this condition was $n=52.52$ ($SD=31.099$) for Male Grooming, $n=37.07$ ($SD=29.922$) for Female Grooming, $n=32.73$ ($SD=31.691$) for Male Non-Grooming and $n=40.05$ ($SD=32.779$) for Female Non-Grooming (See Table 5). There is statistical significance between vignettes and child molester ratings with a medium effect size ($F=5.975, p<.001, \eta^2=0.53$) (Table 6). A Tukey's Post Hoc Test examined significance between vignette conditions. Statistical significance was found between Male Grooming and Female Grooming ($p=.014$), Male Grooming and Male Non-Grooming ($p<.001$) and Male Grooming and Female Non-Grooming ($p=.043$). There were no differences found among Female Grooming and Male Non-Grooming ($p=.837$), Female Grooming and Female Non-Grooming ($p=.932$) and Male Non-Grooming and Female Non-Grooming ($p=.830$). (See Table 7).

Univariate analysis of variance was then performed to examine the effects of grooming vignettes and gender. For the Child molester ratings, there was only a main effect for grooming

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

conditions ($p=0.017$). Additionally, there was an interaction effect between gender and grooming ($p=.001$). There was no significant effect for child molester ratings and gender ($p=.248$). (See Table 8). A Univariate analysis was also performed for the ratings of the probability of sexual abuse. A main effect was found for the grooming conditions ($p=.015$). There was also an interaction effect between gender and grooming ($p=.001$). (See Table 9) However, there was no statistical significance for gender among the sexual abuse Rob condition ($p=.078$). Additionally it was found that about 14% of participants knew what sexual grooming was (See Table 10).

Discussion

Previous research in sexual grooming behaviors have found that the identification of grooming behaviors have been difficult to recognize (Craven, 2006; Lanning, 2010). Additionally, previous studies have failed to explore recognition outcomes of female perpetrators. The decision of the school setting in the vignette was based on the fact, previous vignettes have not used this setting and many cases of female sexual abuse take place in an educational setting (Darling et al., 2018; McAlinden, 2006). This study specifically wanted to explore whether participants can recognize grooming behaviors in a school setting, and whether the gender of the perpetrator is a mitigating factor in recognition. While we found that overall, individuals were more likely to detect sexual grooming behaviors, there were significantly less likely to identify sexual grooming behaviors when the perpetrator was a woman.

As hypothesized, the results of the study suggest that people can better recognize sexual grooming behaviors in male perpetrators better than female perpetrators. In both prompts in the study, “the teacher will sexually abuse the student” and “the teacher is a child molester”, the participants in the Male Grooming conditions, were more likely to identify the sexual grooming behaviors as being indicative of sexual abuse.

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Additionally, our findings also reveal the combined effects of grooming condition and gender have a significant impact on whether individuals can identify grooming behaviors. In other words, if presented with a scenario of grooming, individuals were more likely able to identify if the adult is a child molester but only if grooming behaviors are present, and the perpetrator is male. Additionally, our results presented only about 14% of individuals accurately knew what sexual grooming was. While this number is small, the outcome is anticipated because since grooming behaviors have been historically difficult to identify, it makes sense that most people do not know what it is to begin with.

While the results of identification of grooming behaviors in male and overall is a significant stepping-stone in community protection, the failure to detect female grooming behaviors speaks to gender biases when thinking about sexual violence. However, these results are not novel as previous studies have suggested that these attitudes on female perpetrators are widely held. Some of these assumptions of female predators may be explained by sex-role stereotypes (women are naturally nurturers etc.), victims not being taken seriously and perceived low-rates of offending (Christensen, 2018; Doherty & Anderson, 2004; Sleath & Bull, 2009; Groth & Burgess, 1980). However the poor recognition of sexual grooming in general was expected given past findings (Winters & Jeglic, 2016; Winters & Jeglic, 2017).

We did find that individuals were more likely to identify the abuse when grooming behaviors were included. However, this principle does not apply to gender as the gender of the perpetrator alone (male vs. female) does not impact identification of grooming behaviors. Only the combination of the two factors together and the grooming factor alone, are significant in identifying grooming behaviors. While these findings are important, individuals are still not relatively good at identifying grooming behaviors overall and in previous research (McAliden,

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

2006; Jeglic and Winters, 2016). With the combination effect of grooming and gender being a determining factor in identifying sexual grooming behaviors, this can overall make identification of sexual predators difficult. This may be interpreted as individuals must be faced with “ideal conditions” of both grooming behaviors and gender to determine that an adult may be a sexual predator. While this information may be discouraging, it is important to address as the gaps in identification of grooming behaviors to identify how best to target sexual violence prevention education efforts. With the few studies that exist regarding sexual grooming detection, our findings seem to both be supported and conflicted with past studies. Our findings are similar with those of Winters & Jeglic (2016) which also found that people can identify select grooming behaviors. However, in that study, female perpetrators were not included and isolated individual grooming behaviors to see which individual behaviors could be recognized. Between the results of our study and their study, we now have supporting evidence that sexual grooming behaviors may be detectable in male perpetrators. However, our results differ from the findings in Winters & Jeglic (2017) which found that people cannot recognize sexual grooming behaviors. This study also only included perpetrators of the male gender. Since these studies have produced various results and there is overall limited research in the area, it demonstrates more research needs to be conducted within sexual grooming detection to get a clearer picture.

Limitations

There are several limitations to the current study. While this population was diverse in gender, race and was taken throughout the United States, this population fails to target specific occupations or populations of individuals who are more likely to be exposed to child sexually grooming such as school staff and parents. Another limitation of this study is the grooming scenarios represented are hypothetical, written down and read. This is different from seeing these

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

behaviors and interactions in person and in real-time. We cannot assume the modality of the scenario has no impact on recognition for sexual grooming. We cannot 100% accurately portray the grooming process to participants. This is because the sexual grooming process is done slowly and insidiously. In this vignette, the sexual grooming behaviors were listed as one scenario after another. It is possible that different modalities of grooming scenarios may lead to more accurate results. Additionally, while these vignettes incorporated sexual grooming behaviors from the validated SGM, the vignettes themselves have not been validated.

Another limitation of this study was the vignette was only set in a school setting. Since many sexual grooming cases occur in educational settings, perhaps it might have been easier for the participants to identify sexual grooming behaviors. In the future, changing the setting of the vignettes may produce more variation in grooming-detection results. Additionally, it's important to note that grooming behaviors can mimic healthy adult child interactions. For example, offering to babysit or hugging a child. At face value, the intentions and nuances of the interaction may be difficult to distinguish for some. Therefore, individuals must pay attention to the frequency of these interactions and monitor other behaviors such as isolation, special treatment etc. One final limitation of this study is we did not look at the participant's gender and how it may affect grooming behavior identification. If there were significant gender differences, that could potentially provide evidence to further explore why that may be.

Conclusions and Implications

The present study found that individuals can identify sexual grooming behaviors, but only if the perpetrators is male. Given that up to 12% of all sexual abuse may be perpetrated by women, more needs to be done to educate parents, teachers, educational staff, and community members regarding sexual grooming behaviors in general and female perpetrated sexual abuse specifically.

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Education can be provided in different forms like school assemblies, pamphlets or even be integrated into safety curriculum for students and school staff members. Specifically, curriculum involving the education of female perpetrators. This curriculum would include their prevalence, what settings grooming occurs in and how to spot potential grooming behaviors specifically in female perpetrators. Continuing such education, as it extends to female perpetrators, can assist in keeping schools and the community safe and informed.

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

References

Abbiati, M., Mezzo, B., Waeny-Desponds, J., Minervini, J., Mormont, C., & Gravier, B. (2014).

Victimization in childhood of male sex offenders: relationship between violence experienced and subsequent offenses through discourse analysis. *Victims & Offenders*, 9(2), 234–254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2014.881763>

Arbanas, G., Marinovic, P., & Buzina, N. (2020). Psychiatric and forensic characteristics of sex offenders with child and with adult victims. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 306624–306624X20944673.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X20944673>

Associated Press. (1997) Teacher who had sex with sixth-grade student is sentenced to six months in jail including 100 days already served. AP News.

<https://apnews.com/article/4e657d6faa7ce556c02cfe33fca317ae>

Associated Press. (2005). Teacher goes to jail for sleeping with student. NBC News.

<https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna8925268>

Bloom, B., Owen, B., & Covington, S. (2003). Gender-responsive strategies: Research, practice, and guiding principles for women offenders. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Budd, K., Bierie, D., & Williams, K. (2017). Deconstructing incidents of female perpetrated sex crimes: Comparing female sexual offender groupings. *Sexual Abuse*, 29(3), 267–290.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063215594376>

Christensen, L. S. (2018). Professionals' perceptions of female child sexual offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518785377>

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

- Cortoni, F., Babchishin, K. M., & Rat, C. (2017). The proportion of sexual offenders who are female is higher than thought: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 44*(2), 145-162.
- Craven, S., Brown, S., & Gilchrist, E. (2006). Sexual grooming of children: Review of literature and theoretical considerations. *Journal of sexual aggression, 12*(3), 287-299.
- Darling, A., Hackett, S., & Jamie, K. (2018). Female sex offenders who abuse children whilst working in organisational contexts: offending, conviction and sentencing. *The Journal of Sexual Aggression, 24*(2), 196–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2018.1476601>
- Denov, M. (2001). A culture of denial: Exploring professional perspectives on female sex offending. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 43*, 303-329.
- Districts should appoint teacher-led teams to train staff about professional boundaries. (2006). *Educator's Guide to Controlling Sexual Harassment, 14*(2), 2, 5.
- Doherty, K., & Anderson, I. (2004). Making sense of male rape: Constructions of gender, sexuality and experience of rape victims. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 14*, 85–103.
- Douglas, E. M., & Finkelhor, D. (2005). Childhood sexual abuse fact sheet. Crimes Against Children Research Center. Retrieved from <http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/factsheet/pdf/CSA-FS20.pdf>
- Doyle, D., Ogloff, J., & Thomas, S. (2011). Designated as dangerous: Characteristics of sex offenders subject to post-sentence orders in Australia. *Australian Psychologist, 46*(1), 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-9544.2010.00006.x>
- Dubé, R., & Hébert, M. (1988). Sexual abuse of children under 12 years of age: A review of 511 cases. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 12*(3), 321–330. doi:10.1016/0145-2134(88)90045-2

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

- Elliott, M., Browne, K., and Kilcoyne, J. (1995). Child sexual abuse prevention: What offenders tell us." *Child Abuse and Neglect* 19(5), 579–594. doi:10.1016/0145-2134(95)00017-3
- Faller, K. C. (1988). The spectrum of sexual abuse in daycare: An exploratory study. *Journal of Family Violence*, 3(4), 283-298.
- Faller, K. C. (1995). A clinical sample of women who have sexually abused children. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 4(3), 13-29.
- Farrell, L. T. (1988). Factors that affect a victim's self-disclosure in father-daughter incest. *Child Welfare*, 67(5), 462-468.
- Fergusson, D., McLeod, G., & Horwood, L. (2013). Childhood sexual abuse and adult developmental outcomes: Findings from a 30-year longitudinal study in New Zealand. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 37(9), 664–674.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.03.013>
- Finkelhor, David. (1994). Current information on the scope and nature of child sexual abuse. *The Future of Children* 4(2):31–53. doi:10.2307/1602522
- Ford, H. (2006). *Women who sexually abuse children*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Freeman, N., & Sandler, J. (2008). Female and male sex offenders: A comparison of recidivism patterns and risk factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(10), 1394–1413.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508314304>
- Fromuth, M. E., Burkhart, B. R., & Webb-Jones, C. (1991). Hidden child molestation: An investigation of adolescent perpetrators in a nonclinical sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 6, 376-384.
- Gannon, T. A., Rose, M. R., & Ward, T. (2008). A descriptive model of the offense process for female sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse*, 20(3), 352-374.

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

- Gakhal, B., & Brown, S. (2011). A comparison of the general public's, forensic professionals' and students' attitudes towards female sex offenders. *The Journal of Sexual Aggression*, *17(1)*, 105–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2010.540678>
- Giguere, R., & Bumby, K. (2007). Female sex offenders. *Washington, DC: Center for Sex Offender Management. A project of the Office of Justice Programs, US Department of Justice.*
- Groth, A. N., & Burgess, A. W. (1980). Male rape: offenders and victims. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *137(7)*:806–810.
- Hardyman, P. L., & Van Voorhis, P. (2004). Developing gender-specific classification systems for women offenders. Washington, DC: National Institute Corrections
- Jespersen, A., Lalumière, M., & Seto, M. (2009). Sexual abuse history among adult sex offenders and non-sex offenders: A meta-analysis. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *33(3)*, 179–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2008.07.004>
- Johansson-Love, J., & Fremouw, W. (2009). Female sex offenders: A controlled comparison of offender and victim/crime characteristics. *Journal of Family Violence*, *24(6)*, 367-376.
- Kaylor, L. E, Winters, G. M., & Jeglic, E. L. (2021). Exploring Sexual Grooming in Female Perpetrated Child Sexual Abuse. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 1–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2021.1994505>
- Knoll, J. (2010). Teacher sexual misconduct: Grooming patterns and female offenders. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, *19(4)*, 371–386. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2010.495047>
- Lanning, K. V. (2010). *Child molesters: A behavioral analysis for professional investigating the sexual exploitation of children* (5th ed.). Maryland, United States: National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Levenson, J., Willis, G., & Prescott, D. (2016). Adverse childhood experiences in the lives of male sex offenders: Implications for trauma-informed care. *Sexual Abuse, 28*(4),

340–359. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063214535819>

. Lewis, C. F., & Stanley, C. R. (2000). Women accused of sexual offenses. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 8*, 73-81.

McAlinden, A. (2006). 'Setting 'em up: Personal, familial and institutional grooming in the sexual abuse of children. *Social & Legal Studies, 15*(3), 339–362. doi:[10.1177/](https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663906066613)

[0964663906066613](https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663906066613)

Moulden, H.M., Firestone, P., & Wexler, A.F. (2007). Child care providers who commit sexual offenses: A description of offender, offence, and victim characteristics. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 51*(4), 384-406.

Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 51(4), 384-406.

Olson, Loreen N., Joy L. Daggs, Barbara L. Ellevold, and Teddy K. K. Rogers. (2007).

"Entrapping the innocent: Toward a theory of child sexual predators' luring communication. *Communication Theory 17*(3):231–251.

doi:[10.1111/j.1468-2885.2007.00294.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2007.00294.x)

Robertiello, G., & Terry, K.J. (2007). Can we profile sex offenders? A review of sex offender typologies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*, 508-518.

Robins, S. L. (2000). Protecting our students. Ontario, Canada: Ministry of the Attorney General.

Rogers, P., & Davies, M. (2007). Perceptions of victims and perpetrators in a depicted child sexual abuse case: Gender and age factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(5),

566-584.

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Rosencrans, B. (1997). *The last secret: Daughters sexually abused by mothers*. Orwell, VT: Safer Society Press.

Sahlstrom, K., & Jeglic, E. (2008). Factors affecting attitudes toward juvenile sex offenders. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 17*(2), 180–196.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10538710801916705>

Sandler, J. C., & Freeman, N. J. (2007). Topology of female sex offenders: A test of Vandiver and Kercher. *Sexual Abuse, 19*(2), 73-89.

Schönbucher, V., Maier, T., Mohler-Kuo, M., Schnyder, U., & Landolt, M. (2012). Disclosure of child sexual abuse by adolescents: A qualitative in-depth study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(17), 3486–3513. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512445380>

Shakeshaft, C. (2004). *Educator sexual misconduct: A synthesis of existing literature* (U.S. Department of Education Document No. 2004-09). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

. Sleath, E., & Bull, R. (2009). Male rape victim and perpetrator blaming. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6*, 969–988.

Sutton, L. (2004). Preventing educator sexual misconduct. *School Business Affairs, 9–10*. Retrieved November 7, 2009, from http://asbointl.org/asbo/files/ccLibraryFiles/FILENAME/000000001301/SBA_Dec04_Educator_Sexual_Misconduct.pdf

U.S. Department of Justice. (2002). *Crime in the United States 2001*. Washington, DC: Federal Bureau of Investigation.

U.S. Department of Justice
(2020) <https://www.nsopw.gov/en/SafetyAndEducation/HowToIdentify>

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

- van Dam, C. (2001). *Identifying child molesters: Preventing child sexual abuse by recognizing the patterns of offenders*. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press.
- Vandiver, D. M. (2006). Female sex offenders: A comparison of solo offenders and co-offenders. *Violence and Victims, 21*(3), 339-354.
- Vandiver, D. M., & Kercher, G. (2004). Offender and victim characteristics of registered female sexual offenders in Texas: A proposed typology of female sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 16*(2), 121-137.
- Vandiver, D. M., & Walker, J. T. (2002). Female sex offenders: An overview and analysis of 40 cases. *Criminal Justice Review, 27*(2), 284-300.
- Williams, R., Gillespie, S. M., Elliott, I. A., & Eldridge, H. J. (2019). Characteristics of female solo and female co-offenders and male solo sexual offenders against children. *Sexual Abuse, 31*(2), 151–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063217724767>
- Wijkman, M., Bijleveld, C., & Hendriks, J. (2010). Women don't do such things! Characteristics of female sex offenders and offender types. *Sexual Abuse, 22*(2), 135-156.
- Winters, G., & Jeglic, E. (2016). I knew it all along: The sexual grooming behaviors of child molesters and the hindsight bias. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 25*(1), 20–36.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2015.1108945>
- Winters, G., & Jeglic, E. (2017). Stages of sexual grooming: Recognizing potentially predatory behaviors of child molesters. *Deviant Behavior, 38*(6), 724–733.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2016.1197656>
- Winters, G. M., Jeglic, E. L., & Kaylor, L. E. (2020). Validation of the sexual grooming model of child sexual abusers. *Journal of child sexual abuse, 1-21*.

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Table 1 Demographics

		N	Percent
Gender	Male	212	64.6
	Female	115	35.1
	Transgender	1	.03
	Total	328	100
Race/Ethnicity	White	269	82
	Caucasian		
	Black or African American	25	7.6
	Hispanic/Latinx	9	2.7
	Asian or Asian American	19	5.8
	Native American or Alaskan Native	4	1.2
	Other	2	.6
	Total	328	100

Table 2 Age Demographics

	Mean	SD
Age	34.58	8.86
Total	328	

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Table 2 Average ratings for “teach will sexually abuse Rob”

Vignette	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Male Grooming	50.61	31.424	85
Female Grooming	32.58	28.278	69
Male Non-Grooming	30.18	31.983	79
Female Non-Grooming	33.65	34.640	93
Total			326

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Table 3 for ANOVA for "Will sexually abuse Rob"

	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	20837.924	3	6945.975	6.830	<.001*
Within Groups	327453.809	322	016.937		
Total	348291.733	325			

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Table 4 Multiple Comparison Tukey's Post Hoc on "Will sexually abuse Rob"

		95% Confidence Interval				
(I) Vignette	(J) Vignette Mean	Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Male Grooming	Female Grooming	18.032*	5.167	.003	4.69	31.38
	Male Non-Grooming	20.435*	4.984	<.001	7.56	33.30
	Female Non-Grooming	14.967*	4.785	.010	2.61	27.32
Female Grooming	Male Grooming	-18.032*	5.167	.003	-31.38	-4.69
	Male Non-Grooming	-2.402	5.255	.968	-11.17	15.97
	Female Non-Grooming	-3.065	5.067	.930	-16.15	10.02
Male Non-Grooming	Male Grooming	-20.435	4.984	<.001	-33.30	-7.56
	Female Grooming	-2.402	5.255	.968	-15.97	11.17
	Female Non-Grooming	-5.468	4.879	.677	-18.07	7.13
Female Non-Grooming	Male Grooming	-14.967	4.785	.010	-27.32	-2.61
	Female Grooming	3.065	5.067	.930	-10.02	16.15
	Male Non-Grooming	5.468	4.879	.677	-7.13	18.07

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Table 5 Descriptives of ‘The teacher is a child molestor’

Vignette	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Male Grooming	52.52	31.099	85
Female Grooming	37.07	29.922	70
Male Non-Grooming	32.73	31.691	78
Female Non-Grooming	40.05	32.779	93
Total			326

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Table 6 ANOVA for “The teacher is a child molestor”

	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	20873.924	3	6945.975	6.830	<.001*
Within Groups	327352.809	322	016.937		
Total	34291.733	325			

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Table 7 Multiple Comparison for “The teacher is a child molestor”

(I) Vignette	(J) Vignette Mean	Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Male Grooming	Female Grooming	15.446*	5.082	.14	2.32	28.57
	Male Non-Grooming	19.787*	4.937	<.001	7.04	32.54
	Female Non-Grooming	12.464*	4.725	.043	.26	24.67
Female Grooming	Male Grooming	-15.446*	5.082	.14	-28.57	-2.32
	Male Non-Grooming	4.341	5.184	.837	-9.05	17.73
	Female Non-Grooming	-2.982	4.982	.932	-15.85	9.88
Male Non-Grooming	Male Grooming	-19.787*	4.937	<.001	-32.54	-7.04
	Female Grooming	-4.341	5.184	.837	-17.73	9.05
	Female Non-Grooming	-7.323	4.834	.430	-19.81	5.16
Female Non-Grooming	Male Grooming	-12.464*	4.725	.043	-24.67	-.26
	Female Grooming	2.982	4.982	.932	-9.88	15.85
	Male Non-Grooming	7.323	4.834	.430	-5.136	19.81

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Table 8 Univariate analysis of variance on "Teacher is a child molestor"

Source	Type III Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Corrected Model	17770.477*	3	5923.492	5.975	<.001
Intercept	531303.199	1	531303.199	535.954	<.001
GenderVig	1329.745	1	1329.745	1.341	.248
GroomingVig	5690.690	1	5690.690	5.741	.017
GenderVig *Grooming Vig	10447.348	1	10447.384	10.539	.001
Error	319205.944	322			
Total	882607.000	326			
Corrected Total	336976.420	325			

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Table 9 Univariate analysis of variance on "The teacher will sexually abuse Rob"

Source	Type III Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Corrected Model	20837.924*	3	6945.975	6.830	<.001
Intercept	447067.730	1	447067.730	439.622	<.001
GenderVig	3178.216	1	3178.216	3.125	.078
GroomingVig	6073.997	1	6073.997	5.873	.001
GenderVig *Grooming Vig	11118.746	1	11118.746	10.934	.001
Error	327453.809	322			
Total	808531.000	326			
Corrected Total	348291.733	325			

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Table 9 Descriptive of "Heard of sexual grooming"

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	47	14.3	14.3	14.3
	No	281	85.7	85.7	100.0
	Total	328	100.0	100.0	

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Appendix A

Description of Variable Conditions

Grooming male: Mary Smith is a 35-year-old, divorced mother living in Amity, Massachusetts. She is a server at a local restaurant, and often takes on extra shifts to earn money to support her family. Mary has a 15-year-old son named Rob, who is a student at Amity High School. Rob does not perform well academically and often gets low grades. Rob is not very confident and has low self-esteem. He has few friends and is rarely included in activities with his peers. Rob doesn't know his father and rarely gets to see his mom because she is always at work. He is often left alone at home after school. He generally feels unwanted and unloved by the people in his life and he tends to be very compliant and trusting of others. Rob seeks the attention of peers and adults in his life, which has resulted in him getting into trouble occasionally at home and school.

John, is an English teacher at Amity High School. John and his wife moved to the community three years ago when he heard about a teaching job. He told the principal that he loves to work with kids. John also volunteers on the weekends at the Boys and Girls club where he organizes and chaperones outings and camping trips for the kids. John enjoys spending time at the local arcade where he often meets up with kids from the school. John sees that Rob is struggling so he offers to help him out. John often stays after school with Rob to tutor him in English to help his grades and to keep him company.

Parents consider John to be a great teacher and overall nice guy who really shows that he cares about his students. In his short time in Amity, John has really become a respected member of the community. Before classes start, John talks to Rob and a few other kids about video games and comics. As class begins, many students participant in the lesson and are eager to learn. John encourages most of the kids to participant, especially Rob, and tells him that he is really special and that he cares about him. John even buys candy or other small gifts with his own money for Rob and some of his other favorite students and sneaks them a treat if he feels like they could it. He will often text Rob during the week to check in on him and chat about their shared interests; he makes sure to compliment Rob on the accomplishment he has made in and his schoolwork.

John makes sure his students improve in their reading and writing skills and he often sits next to his students patting their back and encouraging their progress. After school in the hallway, if students start horsing around, John will often join in on the banter. He loves to tell the students jokes, and the students particularly like the ones that include sexual innuendos. John likes to end each class on a high note so he loves to hug students as they leave the classroom. After class, John often continues to talk to some boys and often facilitates "locker room talk" where he asks the boys about who they are dating and shares with them his sexual experiences with his own girlfriends in the past. He tells the boys that as their mentor, he hopes he can help teach them about healthy sex education in a more informal setting compared to the classroom.

John likes to have class secrets as he says it builds trust. He tells the kids "what happens in the classroom, stays in the classroom" and then laughs at his own joke. The town of Amity is happy to have John as a member of the community as he really cares about the kids. He often tells Rob and some of the other kids that he loves them and that they are special; he gives each student a

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

custom pen with their name on it to symbolize their bond. He says that he hopes nothing breaks them apart. The school values his dedication to the kids and their education. Everyone looks forward to seeing what John will contribute to the community in the future.

Grooming Female: Mary Smith is a 35-year-old, divorced mother living in Amity, Massachusetts. She is a server at a local restaurant, and often takes on extra shifts to earn money to support her family. Mary has a 15-year-old son named Rob, who is a student at Amity High School. Rob does not perform well academically and often gets low grades. Rob is not very confident and has low self-esteem. He has few friends and is rarely included in activities with his peers. Rob doesn't know his father and rarely gets to see his mom because she is always at work. He is often left alone at home after school. He generally feels unwanted and unloved by the people in his life and he tends to be very compliant and trusting of others. Rob seeks the attention of peers and adults in his life, which has resulted in him getting into trouble occasionally at home and school.

Jane, is an English teacher at the Amity High School. Jane and her husband moved to the community three years ago when she heard about a teaching job. She told the principal that she loves to work with kids. Jane also volunteers on the weekends at the Boys and Girls club where she organizes and chaperones outings and camping trips for the kids. Jane enjoys spending time at the local arcade where she often meets up with kids from the school. Jane sees that Mary is struggling so she offers to help her out. Jane often stays after school with Rob to tutor him in English to help his grades and to keep him company.

Parents consider Jane to be a great teacher and overall nice woman who really shows that she cares about the children. In her short time in Amity, Jane has really become a respected member of the community. Before classes start, Jane talks to Rob and a few other kids about video games and comics. As class begins, many students participant in the lesson and are eager to learn. Jane encourages most of the kids to participant, especially Rob, and tells him that he is really special and that she cares about him. Jane even buys candy or other small gifts with her own money for Rob and some of her other favorite students if she feels like they could use a treat. She will often call Rob during the week to check in on him and talk about their shared interests; she makes sure to compliment Rob on the accomplishment he has made in and his schoolwork.

Jane makes sure her students improve in their reading and writing skills and she often sits next to her students patting their back and encouraging their progress. After school in the hallway, if students start horsing around, Jane will often join in on the banter. She loves to tell the students jokes, and the students particularly like the ones that include sexual innuendos. Jane likes to end each class on a high note so she loves to hug students as they leave the classroom. After class, Jane often continues to talk to some boys and often facilitates "locker room talk" where she asks the boys about who they are dating and shares with them her sexual experiences with her own boyfriends in the past. She tells the boys that as their mentor, she hopes he can help teach them about healthy sex education in a more informal setting compared to the classroom.

Jane likes to have class secrets as she says it builds trust. She tells the kids "what happens in the classroom, stays in the classroom" and then laughs at her own joke. The town of Amity is happy to have Jane as a member of the community as she really cares about the kids. She often tells

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

Rob and some of the other kids that she loves them and that they are special; she gives each student a custom pencil with their name on it to symbolize their bond. She says that she hopes nothing breaks them apart. The school values her dedication to the children and their education. Everyone looks forward to seeing what Jane will contribute to the community in the future.

Non-Grooming Male: Mary Smith is a 35-year-old, happily married mother living in Amity, Massachusetts. She is a server at a local restaurant, and only works the lunch shift so she can be home for the family. Mary has a 15-year-old son named Rob, who is a student at Amity High School and is a top student and a star baseball player on the high school team. Rob is very confident and has high self-esteem. He has a lot of friends and is always engaging in activities with his friends. After school, he goes to baseball practice or games and then does his homework and hangs out with friends. He feels wanted and loved by the people in his life and he tends to be very assertive and cooperative with others. The peers and adults in his life pay attention to him, and he has never gotten into trouble at home or at school.

John, is an English teacher at Amity High School. John and his wife moved to the community three years ago when he heard about a teaching job. He told the principal that he loves to work with kids. John also volunteers at a retirement home on the weekends and organizes games for the old folks to play. John loves going out to dinner with his wife and playing golf where he often meets up with old friends. John sees that Rob is struggling so he offers to help him out. John often stays after school with Rob and other children to tutor them in English to help their grades.

Parents consider John to be a great teacher and overall nice guy who really shows that he cares about his students. In his short time in Amity, John has really become a respected member of the community. Before classes start, John has the class read silently while he grades papers. As class begins, it is clear the kids are all eager to participate and really enjoy the class. John encourages all the kids to participate and, tells all of them that are putting in great effort and he avoids playing favorites. John even organized a corporate sponsorship to purchase new video equipment for the class so they integrate the latest technology into their projects. He has meetings with parents each semester and asks if they have any concerns about the child's behavior or class performance; he makes sure to tell the parents the positive things the students accomplished as well.

John makes sure the students improve on their reading and writing by giving them demonstrations on the chalk board. After school in the hallway, if the kids start horsing around John reminds them that this is inappropriate behavior and the kids stop. The students love jokes, and the kids particularly like the ones that include sexual innuendos; John immediately shuts down these conversations stating that they are inappropriate for the classroom and violate school policy. The students often facilitate "locker room talk" where the students talk about whether they have crushes. After class, John tells his students they did a great job and wishes them a wonderful day. John tells the students that as a teacher and mentor, he hopes he can foster a lifelong love of literature.

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

John likes to have class cheers as he says it builds trust. He tells the kids “read, write and never quit” and then the students cheer. The town of Amity is happy to have John as a member of the community as he has fit in well. He often tells his wife he loves her and that she is special; he gives her a necklace to symbolize their bond. He says that he hopes nothing breaks them apart. The school values his dedication his job and the community. Everyone looks forward to seeing what John will contribute to the community in the future.

Non-Grooming Female: Mary Smith is a 35-year-old, happily married mother living in Amity, Massachusetts. She is a server at a local restaurant, and only works the lunch shift so she can be home for the family. Mary has an 15-year-old son named Rob, who is a student at Berry Hill High School and is on the Shark’s baseball team at a nearby college. Rob is faster and stronger than the other boys so he gets a lot of playing time. Rob is very confident and has high self-esteem. He has a lot of friends and is always included in activities with his peers. After school he does his homework with his mom and loves to practice baseball with his father. He feels wanted and loved by the people in his life and he tends to be very assertive and cooperative with others. The peers and adults in his life pay attention to him, and he has never gotten into trouble at home and school.

Jane is an English teacher at Amity High School. Jane and her husband moved to the community three years ago when she heard about a teaching job. She told the principal that she loves to work with kids. Jane also volunteers at a retirement home on the weekends and organizes games for the old folks to play. Jane loves going out to dinner with her husband and playing golf where she often meets up with old friends. Jane sees that Rob is struggling so she offers to help him out. Jane often stays after school with Rob and other children to tutor them in English to help their grades.

Parents consider Jane to be a great teacher and overall nice woman who really shows that she cares about her students. In her short time in Amity, Jane has really become a respected member of the community. Before classes start, Jane has the class read silently while she grades papers. As class begins, it is clear the kids are all eager to participate and really enjoy the class. Jane encourages all the kids to participate and, tells all of them that are putting in great effort and she avoids playing favorites. Jane even organized a corporate sponsorship to purchase new video equipment for the class, so they integrate the latest technology into their projects. She has meetings with parents each semester and asks if they have any concerns about the child’s behavior or class performance; she makes sure to tell the parents the positive things the students accomplished as well.

Jane makes sure the students improve on their reading and writing by giving them demonstrations on the chalk board. After school in the hallway, if the kids start horsing around Jane reminds them that this is inappropriate behavior and the kids stop. The students love jokes, and the kids particularly like the ones that include sexual innuendos; Jane immediately shuts down these conversations stating that they are inappropriate for the classroom and violate school policy. The students often facilitate “locker room talk” where the students talk about whether

IDENTIFICATION OF SEXUAL GROOMING BEHAVIORS IN MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATORS

they have crushes. After class, Jane tells her students they did a great job and wishes them a wonderful day. Jane tells the students that as a teacher and mentor, she hopes she can foster a lifelong love of literature .

Jane likes to have class cheers as she says it builds trust. She tells the kids “read, write and never quit” and then the students cheer. The town of Amity is happy to have Jane as a member of the community as she has fit in well. She often tells her husband she loves him and that he is special; she gives him a necklace to symbolize their bond. She says that she hopes nothing breaks them apart. The school values her dedication her job and the community. Everyone looks forward to seeing what Jane will contribute to the community in the future.