

Assessment of Internet Sex Offenders

ROGER KENNINGTON

Independent Consultant

NOTA September 2017

TERMINOLOGY:

- Child Sexual Abuse Images
- Child Sexual Exploitation Material
- Child Pornography (legal / research)

CEOP (2012)

- 18,887 reports of child sexual exploitation
- > 8,000 UK-based transactions of Child Sexual Exploitation Material (CSEM)
- Two-fold increase on previous year

SETO ET AL 2015

ANONYMOUS SURVEY RE
'PROBLEMATIC INTERNET PORN USE'

21% REPORTED "CONSUMING CHILD
PORNOGRAPHY

-Sensation seeking

-Sexual interest

Not necessarily typical population

2009

99 CSA images posted on hacked website

76 hours 12 MILLION hits

144,000 IP addresses

170 countries

(Australian Fed Police 2009)

STOP IT NOW:

45 000 hits on self help site

9 million (!) hits on self help film

How many have also committed 'offline' offences?

Seto et al 2010: Meta analysis k=21 n=4,464

- 12% also had convictions for contact sex offences
- Self report data: 55% admitted offline offences
- Higher estimates in criminal justice and correctional samples
- Highest in "clinically referred" samples

SETO & EKE 2015 Child Pornography Risk Tool (CPORT)

Reoffence type	CP only 135 (47%)	Non sex offences 90 (32%)	Contact SO 61 (21%)
Violence (inc SO)	6 (4%)	9 (10%)	8 (13%)
Contact Sex	4 (3%)	3 (3%)	5 (8%)
CP offence	10 (7%)	11 (12%)	13 (21%)
Any sexual offence	16 (12%)	12 (13%)	17 (28%)
Any reoffence	33 (24%)	44 (49%)	33 (54%)

- Are we talking about a different type of sex offender?

LOW RISK

**..... BUT ARE THEY
LOW ENOUGH?**

WHAT IS RISK?

•Probability

•Frequency

•Immediacy

•Consequences

STATIC MEASURES EXAGGERATE RISK

E.G RM 2000, Static 99 etc

Previous sex convictions / charges

General criminal convictions

Age

No relationships

Stranger victim

Non contact offences

Male victim

STATIC MEASURES EXAGGERATE RISK

E.G RM 2000, Static 99 etc

Previous sex convictions / charges

General criminal convictions

Age

No relationships

Stranger victim

Non contact offences

Male victim

STATIC MEASURES EXAGGERATE RISK

E.G RM 2000, Static 99 etc

Previous sex convictions / charges

General criminal convictions

Age

No relationships

Stranger victim

Non contact offences

Male victim

?

Re H 'The Raincoat Test'

1) On the balance of probabilities

..... something has happened

2).. and because of that....

3) .. a child is likely to suffer significant harm

Re H ‘The Raincoat Test’ (Nicholls LJ)

“... Likely is being used in the sense of a real possibility

.. a possibility that cannot sensibly be ignored....

...having regard for the nature and gravity of the feared harm in the particular case”

-RISK

-SUITABILITY

Category A Images involving penetrative sexual activity and/or images involving sexual activity with an animal or sadism

Category B Images involving non-penetrative sexual activity

Category C Other indecent images not falling within categories A or B

S.A.P. / Oliver Scale

- Level 1: Nudity or erotic posing with no sexual activity
- -Level 2: Sexual activity between children or solo masturbation
- -Level 3: Non penetrative sexual activity between adult(s) and child (ren)
- -Level 4: Penetrative sexual activity between adult(s) and child(ren)
- -Level 5: Sadism or bestiality
- *Now replaced but may get historical cases.*

- Level on scale does not predict **PROBABILITY** of reoffending
- Question as to whether it affects severity

Online Disinhibition Effect (Suller, 2004)

CHAT ROOMS:

Many give real details.. also late teens young adult / charismatic etc

Sex talk .. inciting behaviours e.g. on web cams... ask to send photos .. 'flattery'

Arrange meetings...

Sex introduced to discussions quickly (highly sexualised) (89% in 1st contact)

Victims generally 12 to 15 y.o. ...

16% sexualised user names

Mean discussion time 9.5 days (range 1-74 days)

Most targets girls

Explicit conversations of child and offenders sexual life and behaviours

Winters et al 2017 , De Hart et al 2017 (in JSA) Kloess et al 2017 (in SAJRT).

VIEWING
'MAKING'

CHATTING
EXCHANGING

GROOMING

CONTACT

ONLINE



OFFLINE



McCarthy 2010 84% went from

Contact to Non Contact

Cooper et al (2004)

“Triple A”

-Accessibility

-Affordability

-Anonymity (Apparent!)

?Addictiveness

TYPOLOGIES

HENSHAW ET AL 2017 identified 6 different ones
(and missed some!)

“qualitative small possibly biased samples....
.... not subject to empirical evaluation”

Classification is in the mind of the classifier

Delmonico and Griffin classification:

- Recreational

- Discovery

- Predisposed

- Lifelong Compulsives

MERDIAN ET AL 2013

-CONTACT DRIVEN

-FANTASY DRIVEN

-COLLECTORS (But why CAI)

-PREFERENTIAL VS SITUATIONAL / OPPORTUNISTIC

DOMAINS

SEXUAL INTEREST

Sexual preoccupation*

Sexual preference for children*

Sexualised violence*

DISTORTED ATTITUDES*

Adversarial sexual attitudes

Sexual / General entitlement

Child abuse supportive beliefs

Women deceitful

SOC & EMOTIONAL FN /

RELATIONAL STYLE

Dysfunctional Self Eval

Distorted Intimacy / Em Cong*

Lacks em int rel w adults*

Grievance thinking*

Callous

SELF MANAGEMENT

Lifestyle impulsivity*

Poor cognitive problem solving*

Poor emotional control

Resistance to supervision**

Differences for Internet Offenders

Babchishin et al (2011), 2014 meta analyses, CPORT

Issues:

- Different Samples

- How well were contact offenders screened out?

- How were factors measured?

DIFFERENCES DO NOT AT THIS STAGE

***PREDICT* PROGRESSSION**

(CPORT)

Sexual Interest

High sexual interest in pedo / hebe philia

(Dunkelfeld: mostly hebephilic 12-13 yo)

Mixed offenders most pedo hilic / hebephilic

I net only more pedo hebephilic than contact only

High sexual preoccupation (sometimes distressingly intrusive)

Attitudes

Fewer generalised child abuse
supportive attitudes

More distortions re own victim

Mixed offenders had more empathy
deficits

Relational Style

(some studies only and complex relationship)

- Increased Emotional Loneliness
- Decreased Emotional Congruence
- Increased Introversion
- Decreased Intimacy
- Decreased Callousness

Self Management

- Lower Impulsivity
- Lower Moods
- Lower Emotional Regulation
- But NB anecdotal reports of self harm on arrest.

SO.. HOW DIFFERENT ARE THEY?

Differences in DRFs are generally patchy except wrt:

Increased Sexual interest (**mixed offenders** most deviant)

Factors associated with ANTI SOCIALITY
(e.g. other convictions, generalised empathy deficits)

Socio affective / relational deficits (some studies)

Motivation / Facilitation model

‘Not a million miles from Finkelhor’:

- Motivation

- Disinhibition

FINKELHOR' S FOUR PRECONDITIONS

1 MOTIVATION TO OFFEND

- Arousal to inappropriate stimuli
- Emotional congruence
- Blockage in relationships

2 OVERCOMING INTERNAL INHIBITORS

- Attitudes
- Self Management

3 OVERCOMING EXTERNAL INHIBITORS

4 OVERCOMING VICTIM RESISTANCE

Assessment Issues

- Search Terms ...use of DARKWEB
 - Indicates seeking out specific interest (e.g. PTHC0)
 - Apparently irrelevant terms e.g BUDAPSET (coded?)
- Content Viewed (NB Males)
- Other online activity (chat rooms to normalise; solicitation)
- Frequency of access
- Recency of access

Risk taking e.g others in room, location of computer

How do they represent themselves on line? (NB many do not misrepresent)

Current masturbation (e.g. in chat rooms)

Emotional withdrawal?

Progression of images and activity

Time spent on line

Collection or separation of images (eg from family)

Any acting out of fantasies in real life?

Sharing images

How near to production of images?

Time of day on line

User name

Disruption of other activity?

How did they get caught?

NUMBERS OF IMAGES

Poss high numbers downloaded by file sharing then ignored

Possible revisiting of specific images

Compare with numbers etc of other material

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY OFFENDER RISK TOOL

Seto and Eke 2015

-Not predictive for CP only offenders (low base rates)

-For other offenders:

-More boy content

-Criminal history

-Contact sex offences

-Younger

-More pedophilic

Interest in males.....

... will be $> 50\%$ of images

(SETO et al 75%)

Case Study

45 y.o man

Downloading images

Previous caution for DV

Wife evicts him

He is seeking staying contact in his 2 bedroomed flat with daughters aged 11 and 13.

Aloof and resentful, but too bright to be actively hostile. Assessment is an intrusion.

Q: What do you think the victims felt about your behaviours?

A: There were no victims. They were just on the screen.
.. You had better be careful what you are writing down!

Q: Bearing in mind your daughters would be in your flat, in bed, bathing etc, what would there be to stop you abusing them?

A: Well.. It would be about resisting temptation obviously

Imagine we are all on a desert island and we have no laws

.. We are working on agreeing the age of consent ..
Where should it be set.....

Well.. At the age of biological maturity

What .. 12 .. 13 .. ?

.... Probably .. Yes