**EFA whole sample**

Bartlett’s test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) indicated that the correlation matrix was not random (χ2(136) = 2277882.76, p < .001), but KMO values (Kaiser, 1974) were below the minimum standard for conducting FA (.50), overall and for 10 of the 17 items (Appendix A), thus indicating that the correlation matrix was not well suited for factor analysis. Due to the non-normality (Mardia’s multivariate skew and kurtosis with p < .001) and the ordinal nature of the items, a polychoric correlation matrix was used as input for EFA.

Parallel analysis suggested 3 factors when based on components, and 6 factors when based on factors. According to the scree plots, 1-4 factors were possible. Therefore, six- to two-factor solutions were sequentially examined. The six-factor-solution produced an empty factor. For all other models, significant χ2-Tests (p < .001) indicated that the factor solutions did not fit the data well, while SRMR values [0.02, 0.06] were good to acceptable. The five-factor-solution produced factors on criminal sexual deviance (7 items on sexual activity with a child, with an animal, or without consent), on sexual activity with a young person (4 items), on traffic offences (2 items), on sexual behaviour (1 item: having sex with a prostitute), and on violent offences (2 items), while one item on watching porn in public did not load on any factor. In all other solutions, violent offenses and traffic offenses loaded on a common “non-sexual offences” factor. However, internal consistency was low for traffic offences factor (r = .19), the violent offences factor (3 = 0.30), or the overall non-sexual offences factor (α = .48, ω = .51). In the four-factor solution, the fourth factor was not well interpretable. The three-factor-solution differentiated between criminal sexual deviance (7 items), sexual activity with a young person (4 items), and non-sexual offences (4 items), while two items on watching porn in public and having sex with a prostitute did not load. The two-factor-solution only differentiated between sexual (12 items) and non-sexual behaviours (4 items), while one item on watching porn in public did not load.

Overall, the 5-factor solution was considered best interpretable and most consistent with theoretical considerations and empirical results (e.g., Lehmann et al., in press). Accordingly, the criminal sexual deviance factor accounted for 37% of the common variance, sexual activity with a young person accounted for 19% (traffic offences: 9%, sexual behavior and violent offences 8% each; overall 81%). Internal consistencies for the criminal sexual deviance factor (α = ω = .77) and for the sexual activity with a young person factor (α = .80, ω = .83) were good. Therefore, the 7-item-scale “criminal sexual behavior” as well as individual items on proclivities to engage in deviant behavior were used as criteria in further analyses. The 4-item-scale “sexual activity with a young person” was used as criterion only for participants whose specified age range for “young persons” included values in the range of hebephilic age preferences (i.e., < 15 years; n = 1402; 613 males, 747 females).

## EFA without young person items (whole sample)

Bartlett’s test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) indicated that the correlation matrix was not random (χ2(136) = 125729.09, p < .001), but KMO values (Kaiser, 1974) were below the minimum standard for conducting FA (.50), overall and for all 17 items (Appendix ?), thus indicating that the correlation matrix was not well suited for factor analysis. Due to the non-normality (Mardia’s multivariate skew and kurtosis with p < .001) and the ordinal nature of the items, a polychoric correlation matrix was used as input for EFA.

Parallel analysis suggested 2 factors when based on components, and 5 factors when based on factors. According to the scree plots, 1-4 factors were possible. Therefore, five- to two-factor solutions were sequentially examined. For all models, significant χ2-Tests (p < .001) indicated that the factor solutions did not fit the data well, while SRMR values [0.01, 0.07] were good to acceptable. The five-factor-solution produced factors on sexual deviance (7 items on sexual activity with a child, with an animal, or without consent), on traffic offences (2 items), on violent offences (2 items), on sexual behaviour (1 item: sexual behaviour with a prostitute), and watching porn in public (1 item). The 4-factor solution was similar, only the item on watching porn in public did not load. The three-factor-solution differentiated between criminal sexual behaviours (7 items), other offences (4 item on traffic/violent offences), and other sexual behaviour (2 items on having sex with a prostitute and watching porn in public). The two-factor-solution differentiated only between sexual behaviours (8 items), and non-sexual behaviours (4 items), while the item on sexual behaviour with a prostitute did not load.

Overall, the 5-factor solution was considered best interpretable and most consistent with theoretical considerations and empirical results (e.g., Lehmann et al., in press). Accordingly, the sexual deviance factor accounted for 46% of the common variance (traffic offences: 11%, violent offences: 10%, sexual behavior 10%, watching porn in public 4%; overall 81%). The internal consistency was good for the sexual deviance factor (α = ω =.78), but not acceptable for the traffic offences (Φ = .19) and violent offences (Φ = .30) factor. Therefore, the 7-item-scale “criminal sexual behavior” as well as individual items on proclivities to engage in deviant behavior were used as criteria in further analyses. The 4-item-scale “sexual activity with a young person” (α = .82, ω = .84) was used as criterion only with participants whose specified age range for “young persons” included values in the range of hebephilic age preferences (i.e., < 15 years; n = 1402; 613 males, 747 females).

## EFA without young person items (males only)

Bartlett’s test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) indicated that the correlation matrix was not random (χ2(78) = 68035.02, p < .001), but KMO values (Kaiser, 1974) were below the minimum standard for conducting FA (.50), overall and for 16 of the 17 items (Appendix ?), thus indicating that the correlation matrix was not well suited for factor analysis. Due to the non-normality (Mardia’s multivariate skew and kurtosis with p < .001) and the ordinal nature of the items, a polychoric correlation matrix was used as input for EFA.

Parallel analysis suggested 3 factors when based on components, and 6 factors when based on factors. According to the scree plots, 1-4 factors were possible. Therefore, six- to two-factor solutions were sequentially examined. For all models, significant χ2-Tests (p < .001) indicated that the factor solutions did not fit the data well, while SRMR values [0.01, 0.06] were good to acceptable. The six-factor-solution produced factors on criminal sexual deviance (6 items on sexual activity with a child, and without consent), on traffic offences (2 items), on violent offences (2 items), and three 1-item factors on sexual activity with an animal, a prostitute, and watching porn in public. For solutions with less than 6 factors, the item on sexual behavior with an animal loaded on the criminal sexual deviance factor, and the other solutions differed only in whether items on watching porn in public and sexual activity with a prostitute each constituted a factor. The two-factor-solution differentiated only between criminal sexual behaviours (7 items), and all other behaviours (5 items), while the item on watching porn in public did not load.

Overall, the 5-factor solution was considered best interpretable and most consistent with theoretical considerations and empirical results (e.g., Lehmann et al., in press). Accordingly, the sexual deviance factor accounted for 44% of the common variance (traffic offences: 9%, violent offences: 8%, sexual behavior 7%, watching porn in public 6%; overall 78%). The internal consistency was good for the sexual deviance factor (α = ω =.78), but not acceptable for the traffic offences (Φ = .19) and violent offences (Φ = .30) factor. Therefore, the 7-item-scale “criminal sexual behavior” as well as individual items on proclivities to engage in deviant behavior were used as criteria in further analyses. The 4-item-scale “sexual activity with a young person” (α = .82, ω = .84) was used as criterion only with participants whose specified age range for “young persons” included values in the range of hebephilic age preferences (i.e., < 15 years; n = 1402; 613 males, 747 females).

**Table r whole sample**

*Spearman Correlation Coefficients and Internal Consistencies of Motivational Factors and the Proclivity to Engage in Criminal Sexual Behaviour (7-Item-Scale).*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. |
| 1. Attraction to children | *α =* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Sex drive | .14\*\*  .08\*\* | *--* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Compulsive sex. | .15\*\*  (.09\*\*) | .27\*\*  (.22\*\*) | *α = .* | . |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Probl. porn use | .17\*\*  (.13\*\*) | .44\*\*  (.45\*\*) | .50\*\*  (.41\*\*) | *α = .* |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Mating effort | -.01  (-.00) | .01  (.02) | .16\*\*  (.17\*\*) | -.02  (-.02) | *α = .* |  |  |  |
| 1. Social anxiety | .04  (.03) | .12\*\*  (.08\*\*) | .12\*\*  (.10\*\*) | .20\*\*  (.19\*\*) | -.25\*\*  (-.25\*\*) | -- |  |  |
| 1. Loneliness | .04\*  (.04\*) | .08\*\*  (.04\*) | .20\*\*  (.18\*\*) | .22\*\*  (.19\*\*) | -.19\*\*  (-.18\*\*) | .47\*\*  (.46\*\*) | -- |  |
| 1. Mating value | -.05\*  (-.05\*) | -.06\*\*  (-.01) | .00  (.03) | -.12\*\*  (-.10\*\*) | .22\*\*  (.22\*\*) | -.38\*\*  (-.36\*\*) | -.29\*\*  (-.27\*\*) | -- |
| 1. Proclivity crim. sexual deviance | .63\*\*  (.49\*\*) | .19\*\*  (.10\*\*) | .17\*\*  (.12\*\*) | .20\*\*  (.14\*\*) | .02  (.03) | .05\*  (.04\*) | .05\*  (.04\*) | -.06\*\*  (-.06\*\*) |

*Note.* \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01.