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Issues in working with internet sexual offending

• Definitions - motives
• Prevalence - escalating with the internet
• Pathways and typologies
• Risk assessment and management - cross-over?
• Intervention - prevention, desistance, treatment?
• Legislative, systemic, cultural, educational issues
• Borderless - international issues - INTERPOL
CEOP (2012) - Prevent Protect Pursue

- 18,887 reports of child sexual exploitation
- > 8,000 UK-based transactions of Child Sexual Exploitation Material (CSEM)
- 70,000 still and moving images
- Two-fold increase on previous year
- 20% self generated
- 19% of online child sexual exploitation involves webcams
What is **online child sexual abuse**?
to engage in inappropriate (sexual) chat with children

to harass children online with threats or sexually explicit material

to locate and prepare ("groom") potential victims for contact abuse

to exploit youth produced sexual materials

to promote sexual tourism and/or child trafficking

to view and distribute child sexual exploitation material for personal and/or commercial reasons

to establish and engage in contact to other individuals with a sexual interest in children
UK PM’s Crackdown Speech

- Prime Minister’s declared “crack down” on online pornography (22 July 2013):
  - Introduce “pornography filters” to reduce children’s access to sexually explicit material
  - Criminalise access to “extreme pornography”
  - Limit the proliferation of CSEM on the internet
Jailed for life with a minimum term of 38 years for the murder of 12-year-old Tia Sharp

Searches for pornographic images of ‘incest’ & pre-teen girls, pornographic images of girls who wore glasses (which Tia did) and young girls sleeping (as he had taken of Tia)
Research Review
Characteristics of CSEM Users ▪ Typologies ▪ Risk
Sexual Interest in Children in Community Males

Briere & Runtz (1989; n = 193)
21%: some attraction to children
7%: likely to act on attraction

Hall et al. (1995; n = 80)
26.5%: either self-report, or penile response of arousal to paedophilic stimuli > adult stimuli


Ray et al. (2014; n = 176)
21%: self-report CSEM use amongst “problematic internet use”

Dawson et al. (2014; n = 305): 0.6% rated sexual activities with children as sexually arousing

Wurtele et al. (2014; n = 173):
9% reported having sex with children or viewing CSEM if they would not be caught or punished
Sexual Interest in Children in Community Males

Dombert et al (2015): Online survey of 8,718 German males

- 5.5%: any indication of paedophilic sexual interest (any report of fantasy, having paid a child for sexual services, travelling into another country with the intent to have sexual contact with a child)

- 4.1%: sexual fantasies of prepubescent children (girls > boys > both)

- Men indicating sexual interest in boys (or both) revealed the highest paedophilic behavior and fantasy preference scores in the sample

- Self-reports: 1.7% CSEM use, 2.4%: contact sex offending against prepubescent children, 0.7% both ⇒ fantasy was positively correlated with behaviour
Online child sexual exploitation challenges

• Trends (Europol, 2016)
  – Youth produced sexual material; groomed/extorted online
  – Use of TOR / dark web
  – Peer-to-peer
  – Live online abuse

• Borderless - international legislation, protocols
  – Interpol - CSEM indexing
  – International sex offender protocols, databases
TCSA - Challenges and Responses

• Offender typologies:
  – Motives, Modus operandi, Risks
  – Definitions – legal, psychological

• Interface between offender types:
  – Fantasy vs contact driven
  – Blurring of offender types
  – Live streaming, ‘Sweetie’
Dutch children's charity Terre des Hommes used a computer-generated 10 year old child *Sweetie* who was “available” for online for sexual behaviour
⇒ identified 1,000 people willing to pay for online sexual exploitation

CROSS OVER?
CONTACT OR NON-CONTACT OFFENDING?
Research Review
Characteristics of CSEM Users ▪ Typologies ▪ Risk
Internet offenders (meta-analyses)
Offending histories and reoffending rates

- **Criminal history of CSEM users:**
  - Hanson & Babchishin (2009; n = 3,536): 13.3% previous contact sex offending “mostly against a child” (n. p.); 18.5% based on self-report
  - Seto, Hanson, & Babchishin (2011; n = 4,697): 12.2% previous contact sex offending “mostly against a child” (p. 9); 17.3% based on self-report

- **Reoffending rates of CSEM users**
  - Seto et al. (2011; n = 2630): 5% sexual reoffending: 3.4% CSEM, 2% contact sex offence
  - Faust et al. (2014; n = 638; 428 CSEM index): follow-up 1-9 years; recidivism: 3% contact sex offence, 1.6% CSEM (US data)
Updated meta-analysis Babchishin et al. (2014)

- Includes 30 studies, published between 2003-2013
- Most samples from United States ($k = 9$), followed by Canada ($k = 7$), and UK ($k = 7$)

Comparisons between:

- Child Sexual Exploitation Material Offenders (CSEMOs)
- Child Sexual Offenders (contact offences) (CSOs)
- Mixed Offenders (CSEMOs and CSOs)
Risks & Needs – Summary

Indicates opportunistic behaviour: Routine Activity Theory

Babchishin et al., 2014
Risks & Needs – Summary

Antisociality and psychological barriers to offending are most crucial for cross-over

⇒ **MOs highest on both deviancy and antisociality**

Babchishin et al., 2014
Risk Assessment

Existing risk assessment tools not developed and validated for CSEM Users

- e.g., RM2000 not predictive of reoffending
  (Middleton et al, 2009; Osborn et al., 2010; Wakeling et al., 2011; Webb et al., 2007)
- Biased items: e.g., stranger victims, non-contact offending

Focus: Prioritisation of Police Work

- Polygraph Testing (Herts Police): Pilot on 30 CSEM Users ⇐ 2/3 identified as high risk (10 admitted high risk behaviours; incl. 3 with contact offences; 10 failures)

- Kent Internet Risk Assessment Tool (KIRAT; Long, Alison, & McManus, 2012): empirical differences between non-contact and “dual offenders” (e.g., dual offenders > previous convictions, access to children, cross-over behaviour) (.86 predictive accuracy)
CSEM offenders \((N = 286)\) from police files, with CSEM index offence
- 43% with criminal history, incl. 6% historic CSEM offence; 19% “some type of prior sexual offence”
- 42% more than one CSEM charge at index
- 13% combined with charges for “other sexual cases”
- 20% combined with charges for non-sexual offence

Recidivism:
- 39% total reoffending
- 4% contact sex offence against a child
- 12% CSEM offence
- 8% violent offence

Development sample of 266 offenders, with fixed 5 year follow-up for recidivism data
Risk predictor analysis revealed 7 items:

- Age above 35 years (49%)
- Any prior criminal history (41%)
- Any contact sex offence (prior & index) (18%)
- Any failure on conditional release (15%)
- Paedophilic or hebephilic interest (40%)
- More boy than girl content in illegal image material (15%)
- More boy than girl content in nudity (fully/ partially dressed, no sexual activity) and other child content (e.g., website images, catalogues, children in public spaces) (16%)

CPORT Scores: $M = 1.94$ ($SD = 1.57$)

Seto & Eke (2015)
## CPOR TR – Risk Prediction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Any recidivism</th>
<th>Any sexual recidivism</th>
<th>Contact sexual recidivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUC</strong></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CI</strong></td>
<td>[.59, .73]</td>
<td>[.63, .84]</td>
<td>[.55, .94]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSEM index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>not significant</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSEM + contact sex offence index</strong></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>[.63, .96]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSEM + other index</strong></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>[.54, .83]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confident risk prediction for users with contact offence history
Potential markers for cross-over highlighted ⇒ potential subgroups of (exclusive) CSEM users?
Jailed for life with a minimum term of 38 years for the murder of 12-year-old Tia Sharp

Searches for pornographic images of ‘incest’ & pre-teen girls, pornographic images of girls who wore glasses (which Tia did) and young girls sleeping (as he had taken of Tia)
Hazel had 30 criminal convictions and served three prison sentences for drug dealing, assault and the possession of a machete.
Pathways to Online Sex Offending
Development of a case formulation model for users of child sexual exploitation material
Model Development Process

1. Literature Review
2. Thematic Deduction from Case Interviews
3. Professional Consultation
4. Model-driven Case Analysis
5. Information Synthesis

Development of a theoretical framework and interim model (N = 20)

Random selection of development sample (N = 12)
Thematic Analysis: Variable generation

Final Model Development
The diagram illustrates the relationship between propensities, situational factors, and the process of offending behaviour. The key components are:

- **Propensities**: Developmental context, with sub-components such as sexual arousal.
- **Situational Factors**: Internet environment.
- **Motivation** and **Facilitation** stages, which are interconnected.

**Motivation** includes:
- Permission-giving thoughts
- Personal situation

**Facilitation** leads to:
- Offending behaviour
- Evaluation of consequences

- Further offending behaviour
- Desistance

The arrows indicate the flow and influence between these components, highlighting the dynamic process from propensities to offending behaviour and its consequences.
Individual Propensities include
- Offence-related propensities
- Offence-protective factors

shaped through an individual’s personal history (Developmental Context).

- a lack of positive connections with others
- role of sex and relationships

negative internal states
trauma
guilt/shame
dysfunctional coping

sexual interest in children
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Impact of sexual arousal on decision making

- more likely to report and interest in unusual, incl. deviant, and risky sexual behaviours (Ariely & Lowenstein, 2006; Lowenstein et al., 1997; Imhoff & Schmidt, 2014)
- greater willingness to engage in risky behaviours and make worse decisions (e.g., gambling; Laier et al., 2014; Skakoon-Sparling, 2011; Skakoon-Sparling et al., 2014)
- more likely to self-report sexual coercion and over-perception of a female’s sexual interest/intent (Bouffard & Miller, 2014)
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a loss of control
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worsened personal circumstances

offending behaviour

desistance
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New developments in addressing offence-related sexual interests
Explicit & Implicit Sexual Interest Profile (EISIP): Profile

- Assessment tool measuring **explicit** and **implicit** sexual interest
  - Explicit: self-report questionnaire; self-report rating of pictures
  - Implicit: viewing time; Implicit Association Test (IAT)
  - Sexual interest: hetero-/homosexual; paedophilic, hebephilic, adult

Banse & Schmidt (2013)
## Explicit Sexual Interest Questionnaire (ESIQ)

### Items concerning young boys and girls, women, men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have enjoyed orally stimulating a …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have tongue kissed a …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have enjoyed getting my private parts touched by a …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have sexually caressed a …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had sexual intercourse with a …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fantasy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find it erotic if I see a …’s beautiful chest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have daydreamed of having sex with a …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it erotic to see a …’s body through the clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it erotic to see a …’s beautiful bottom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get excited when I imagine that a … stimulates me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring:
- Forced-choice (Don’t agree/Agree)
- Scale values = mean frequencies (% of agreed items)

(Banse, Schmidt, & Clarbour, 2010)
Sexual maturity groups (Tanner classes 1-5) x gender

Sexually unexciting  1—2—3—4—5  Sexually very exciting
Implicit Association Tasks

Attribute categories: Sexually exciting vs. Unexciting

Target categories: Men-Women, Boys-Men, Girls-Women
Assessment in Practice

Case Example
Contact and Internet Sex Offending: Risk Analyses and Cross-over

**STATIC - For specific samples**
- CONTACT SEX OFFENDERS (CSO), eg RM2000
- CSEMO: CPORT *but only if CSO history*

**DYNAMIC - Potentially modifiable / manageable traits**
- CSO: Sexual Deviance, Psychopathic traits
- CSEMO: Sexual Deviance, Antisociality, Socio-emotional Dysfunction

**ACUTE / SITUATIONAL - Rapidly changing**
- CSO: Negative affect, Substance misuse, Dropping out
- CSEMO: Negative affect, Access (to Internet / Children)

**STRUCTURED PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT**
- CSO: eg SARN, RSVP
- CSEMO: Work in progress
Treatment Trial
Lucy Faithfull Foundation
More detailed information in here, including:

- research context
- references for interview guidelines and specific scales to inform assessment

Also:
Self-assessment guide for CSEM Users currently in trial
Offence-related Propensities

Situational Factors

Permission-giving Thoughts

Personal Situation

Protective Propensities

Evaluation of Consequences
Stop it now!
UK & Ireland
Together we can prevent child sexual abuse
Internet Offenders: Calls to StopItNow!

Number of Internet Offenders Calling the Helpline
Year on Year, Arrested vs Not Arrested

Findlater (2014)
Inform and Inform Plus Groups
Lucy Faithfull Foundation, UK (2014)

- **Inform Plus** - community-based, psycho-educational and risk-reduction group for men who acknowledge accessing CSEM (usually post-arrest) via the Stop it Now helpline

- **Inform** - for relatives and partners of men who have accessed CSEM, usually joining via the ‘Stop-it-Now’ helpline

- 6 key themes over 10, weekly, 2.5 hour sessions + non-compulsory 'between session' work

- Participant, partner/family and facilitator feedback study
Main themes from the participant interviews
(Dervley, 2016)

1. Empowering Self to be an Agent of Change

2. Facilitation of Open Communication

3. Life Beyond Inform Plus
Prevention

From to “Don’t get Started”
Prevention Project Dunkelfeld

- „Kein Täter werden“ ≈ (to) not become an offender/ don‘t offend
- „Dunkelfeld“ ≈ dark field (of undetected offences; dark figure)
- Confidential treatment, free of charge
- German legislature: no mandatory report law
  - StGB §138: concretely planned offences (place, time, victim) need to be reported; however:
  - StGB §139: psychotherapists do not render themselves liable for prosecution if they do not report a planned offence
Combating Sexual Exploitation of Children Online

International Working Group (IWG) on Best Practice in the Management of Online Sex Offending

HANNAH MERDIAN          MAGGIE BRENNAN          DEREK PERKINS
IWG CONSULTATIONS

SEPTEMBER 2014 – IATSO CONFERENCE, PORTO

22 APRIL 2015 – NCA CEOP COMMAND, LONDON

17 SEPTEMBER 2015 – NOTA ANNUAL CONFERENCE, DUBLIN

MAY-JULY 2016 – INTERNATIONAL DELPHI SURVEY

SEPTEMBER 2016 – IATSO CONFERENCE, COPENHAGEN
Broad Aims of the Consultations

- Identify **key challenges** in the assessment, management and prevention of online child sexual offending behaviour

- Identify and disseminate current **good practice examples** at different points in the offending cycle / at different stages in the criminal justice process:
  - investigation & prosecution
  - offender management
  - approaches to desistance and prevention

- These consultations informed a **2016 Delphi Survey**...
  (conducted by Emma Tyrrell, onlineProtect, Maastricht University & the IWG)
Delphi Survey (May-July 2016)

Demographics

Role
21% were Law Enforcement
19% were Academics/ Researchers
17% were Treatment/ Intervention
17% worked in Mental Health Services
14% were Policy Makers/ Government Bodies
12% worked in Charities / NGOs

Respondents from:
Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Estonia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, The Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom, and United States.
Delphi Survey (May-July 2016)

- Multi-professional group of 2,000 experts accessed through networks of academia, Europol, IWG, NCA, and onlineProtect

- **Round 1**: responses and comments to 18 questions or statements

- **Round 2**: responses and comments to 20 questions shaped by responses to round 1

- **Round 3**: semi-structured online interviews with professionals from 11 countries - thematic qualitative analysis results elaborated on key quantitative findings

- 46 analyses from rounds 1, 2 & 3
Delphi Survey (May-July 2016)

Over-arching conclusions

- Increased international collaboration to target ‘high level’ distributors
- Key role for preventative education (from childhood onwards) on the nature and implications of online CSEM
- More research needed on online child sex offender pathways, typologies, risk assessment, treatment and desistance effectiveness
- Potential benefits of a ‘public health model’
IWG Collaborators