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ABSTRACT

The increase in Internet based sexual crimes against children is due in part to the proliferation of the Internet. This includes accessing, distributing and producing child exploitation material (CEM). Research has examined whether Internet sexual offenders share a similar profile to contact sexual offenders or ‘dual’ sexual offenders (offenders who engage in both Internet and contact sexual crimes against children). Internet offenders are typically understood as posing a lower risk of reoffending, however, the risk of harm to their victims is commensurate with contact sexual offences. Limited data exist on detailed offender characteristics in an Australian population. The current research aimed to further the literature by investigating three research questions: (1) whether Internet offender characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, differ from contact and dual sexual offenders; (2) whether the presence of these characteristics are related to reoffending over time according to group membership; and (3) whether the presence of these characteristics are related to sentence type (i.e., community or custody) duration according to group membership. The files of 450 sexual offenders managed by Corrections Victoria, Australia, were retrospectively reviewed for offender and offence-specific characteristics. The sexual offenders were divided into three categories: Internet offences only (excluding any contact offending), contact offences only (excluding any internet, and dual offences). Results indicated that Internet offenders differ from contact and dual sexual offenders on a number of characteristics including demographic, psychological,
psychometric, offence specific attitudes and legal domains. The recidivism rate for sexual reoffending is low (5.7% - 7.5%) across sexual offender groups. Several characteristics including psychological, psychosexual and offence specific attitudes all predicted sentence duration among and between groups. The knowledge gained from this research provides an increased understanding of Internet offenders and how they may differ from contact and dual sexual offenders. This may allow for the identification of characteristics that act as warning flags for further offending, particularly escalation from contact sexual offences to Internet offending. Such findings will aid in the development of risk assessments practices and therapeutic interventions targeted towards the prevention and reduction of Internet offending.
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PART A

CHAPTER ONE: THESIS OVERVIEW

Introduction

Ubiquitous access to the Internet provides unparalleled opportunities for individuals to communicate quickly, anonymously, and on a global scale. It is within this technological environment that sexual offending has extended from the conventional (i.e., offending by physical contact) to a broad range of sophisticated online methods. The current research examined sexual offences committed by adults against children, and investigated the characteristics of sexual offenders who have offended both on- and offline (i.e., Internet offenders vs. contact offenders), with a primary focus on Internet offenders. Offenders who committed both Internet and contact offences were also considered and referred to as dual offenders. Offenders were separated into the above three groups via the assessment of their criminal histories or current offence in order to distinguish offence type. Throughout this thesis, subsequent references to ‘sexual offending’ should be taken to be specific to sexual offences committed by male adults against children of either gender and will be referred to as either ‘Internet,’ ‘contact’ or ‘dual’ offending. The overall aim of this research was to develop a better understanding of the characteristics of Australian sexual offenders in order to determine: (a) if characteristic differences predict group membership; and (b) if discrete intervention pathways are indicated for varied sexual offender groups.
Statement of the Problem

While contact sexual offending generally involves the physical contact of a child or at least the offender being in close physical proximity to the child, Internet offending exists in a number of forms. These include:

(i) using the Internet to view child exploitation material (CEM) online (for personal use only);

(ii) using the Internet to manufacture and distribute CEM (Briggs, Simon & Simonsen, 2011); and

(iii) solicitation offences with no intention of physical contact (i.e., using the Internet to engage minors in an online sexual relationship with/without the use of live videoing, however, have no intention of making physical contact with their victims or creating CEM (Seto, Wood, Babchishin, & Flynn, 2011).

While there is no unified legal definition of an ‘Internet offender’, the Crimes Act 1958 (Vic) s.67A, defines child pornography as, ‘a film, photograph, publication or computer game that describes or depicts a person who is, or appears to be, a minor engaging in sexual activity or depicted in an indecent sexual manner or context’. While the distinction is somewhat elucidated in the literature, the degree to which this has been reflected in clinical treatment terms remains limited. This is problematic for managing recidivism, the diversification of sexual offending methods (i.e., changes to group membership), and the overall rehabilitation of offenders. Understanding the characteristic differences between Internet, contact and dual offenders is therefore critical for working towards the
prevention of (Internet based) first time offences and recidivism. Presently, all populations are treated with a similar framework, namely a cognitive behavioural approach (Youssef, Casey, & Birgden, 2017). Only a small selection of treatment programs have been developed exclusively for Internet offenders, with limited studies evaluating their efficacy (Gillespie et al., 2016; Middleton, Mandeville-Norden & Hayes, 2009). With some studies suggesting that the interchange of CEM can actively ‘legitimise and normalise’ an adult’s (physical) sexual interest in children (O’Connell, 2000), targeted intervention for Internet offenders may be a key determinant in preventing the escalation of offending from offline to online and visa versa. Escalation from offline to online offending has garnered significant concern among law enforcement since the proliferation of the internet. Research has shown that many individuals who engage CEM are in fact paedophilic (Eke, Seto & Williams, 2011). Therefore concerns exists regarding the degree of risk such offenders pose to pre-pubescent and even pubescent children. Their sexual proclivity may see them cross over from the offline to the online world in a bid to further satiate their sexual desires.

Investigating a targeted intervention approach for Internet offenders requires the characteristic differences between sexual offending populations to be understood. This study examined between group characteristics to gain a consolidated understanding of where characteristics intersect and what other factors can help to better understand the various pathways to offending/reoffending, as well as the pathways to rehabilitation.
There are severe consequences for failing to clinically address the distinctive nature of Internet offending for both perpetrators and victims. For perpetrators, Internet offending can interfere with psychological and sexual well-being, employment and intimate partner relationships (Green, Carnes, Carnes & Weinman, 2012). These factors, when intact, may help serve as protective mechanisms against further offending (Ward & Stewart, 2003). For victims, the consequences are great. It has been demonstrated that victims of sexual abuse are far more likely than non-abused children to experience longstanding difficulties associated with psychological, physical, social, legal and occupational domains (Cashmore & Shackel, 2013). Victims such as the 1263 children who were unveiled from the online ‘Wonderland Club’ must rebuild their lives in order to restore effective functioning.

The Wonderland Club – an apt example of the reach of Internet offending – was a major online pedophile ring. It had an online library consisting of at least 750,000 pictures along with 1800 hours of computerised videos depicting children being sexually abused. Some members routinely abducted, raped and tortured children as part of their ‘contribution’ to the club. The Wonderland Club had over two hundred members spread across an estimated forty-seven countries before it was shut down in 1998 (Graham, 2000). The Wonderland Club was sophisticated in its operations and entailed three key requirements to lower its potential for exposure: limit membership; use innovative technology; and maintain strict anonymity. New members were inducted under the strictest of provisions. First, the group required a senior member to sponsor, every new member. Next, to be
considered, candidates were required to possess in excess of 10,000 unique images of child pornography to contribute to the club’s library. As a final precaution, a formal membership committee reviewed the credentials of all candidates seeking membership. These requirements limited membership to the staunchest group of pedophiles (Graham, 2000) demonstrating the unique nature that Internet offending affords.

The Internet itself is very difficult to police (Edelmann, 2010) due to: (a) the sophisticated nature of online networks and systems; (b) the unique appeal of the virtual world such as (perceived) anonymity (Seto, 2013); (c) the emotional support/connectedness of online networks among sexual offenders (Mercado, Merdian & Egg, 2011); (d) the ability to mask perpetrator identity; and (e) the psychological ability to absolve oneself of personally inflicting physical harm on a child. To this end, detection, apprehension and prosecution were not within the scope of this research.

Intent of Present Research

While the remit of online sexual offending is a relatively new area of investigation, numerous international studies have begun to build a profile of this population in the last decade (Babchishin, Hanson & Van Zuilen, 2015; Babchishin, Hanson & Hermann, 2011; Bates & Metcalf, 2007; Rimer; 2017). In Australia, however, the research base is exceptionally limited (Henshaw, Ogloff & Clough, 2017). The present research, therefore, intended to contribute to the international literature from an Australian lens. To the best of the author’s
knowledge, the present research was the first to examine demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment related characteristics across all three sexual offending groups in a Victorian (Australian) sample. It was also the first of its kind nationally and globally to investigate characteristic predictors of sentencing duration across sexual offending groups. The research comprised of three distinct studies. Study one sought to compare sexual offender characteristics across Internet, contact and dual offenders by firstly, examining differences on a univariate dimension, and secondly, predicting which offender characteristics were likely to result in group membership. Study two sought to examine reoffending over time, namely, which characteristics were likely to result in greater levels of recidivism according to group membership. Study three sought to examine how characteristics resulting in greater sentence duration can help inform sentencing practices and offender rehabilitation.

Specific research questions are outlined below.

**Research Questions**

**Study one: Sexual offender characteristics: A comparative study of Internet, contact and dual offenders.**

1. Do specific characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, differ among Internet, contact and dual sexual offenders?
2. Can specific characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, predict sexual offender group membership?

**Study two: Sexual offender recidivism characteristics: An examination of reoffending over time.**

3. Do sexual offenders have contact with the criminal justice system according to their offence type (i.e., Internet vs. contact vs. dual)?

4. Can the presence of specific characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, predict reoffending over time according to group membership?

**Study three: Predicting sentence duration based on offender characteristics.**

5. Can the presence of specific characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, predict sentence duration according to group membership?

**Organisation of the thesis**

This thesis is organised into four key sections, parts A, B, C and D. A brief outline of the four sections is provided below.

**Part A: A critical review of the literature.** Part A examines the current body of literature regarding a number of topics relevant to this research. These include: (a) an historical overview of sexual offender assessment and treatment; (b) characteristics of Internet, contact and dual sexual offenders identified in
research locally and internationally; (c) factors which result in specific group membership of sexual offenders; (d) the landscape of sexual offender treatment modalities including cognitive behavior therapy, dialectical behaviour therapy and schema therapy; (e) factors which facilitate the measurement of longitudinal treatment outcomes of Internet sexual offenders; (f) characteristic predictors of sentence duration; and (g) how sentencing patterns effect offender rehabilitation.

Throughout the literature review, two papers are frequently referred to. This is due to their relevance and the limited reviews/meta analyses carried out on this population to date. The literature review by Henshaw et al. (2017) is the most recently published paper which considers online child pornography offenders and how they characteristically compare to contact and dual offenders. The research by Babchishin et al. (2015) is the most recent meta analytical study comparing the characteristics of online, offline and dual offenders. Their study was based upon 30 unique samples with ns ranging from 98 to 2702 and provides the strongest baseline to build upon. While there are numerous other studies with high relevance (e.g., Wolak, Finkelhor & Mitchell, 2005), not all are referred to individually throughout the literature review as they are noted in the papers above.

**Part B: Methodology.** Part B expands upon how the ‘parent’ study differed from current study. The parent study was completed by Dr Marie Henshaw and comprised of a larger data linkage project carried out by Swinburne University of Technology, the Department of Justice and Regulation, Victoria Police and the Department of Health. The parent project characterised all individuals sentenced with any Internet offence between 2004 and 2014, although the available data
range was much broader. The parent study investigated basic demographics, legal and mental health histories, and Internet specific characteristics. The current study took a subsample of 450 offenders from the original 2000 offenders utilised in the parent study. Differing from the parent study, the current study empirically compared the characteristics of those sentenced and treated for (1) Internet offences; (2) contact offences; and (3) both Internet and contact offences (i.e., dual offenders), during a broader time period (2000-2014) and in greater detail characteristically.

The methodology section then outlines the procedures adopted in the design of the current research and why certain statistical procedures, including univariate and multivariate analyses, were chosen. This section then outlines how these statistical procedures were applied in order to interpret the data. A rationale for the research, as well as research questions, hypotheses and aims are all outlined in this chapter. Ethical considerations are also summarised here.

**Part C: Results.** Part C reports the findings from studies one and three. Study one examines the characteristics of Internet, contact and dual sexual offenders via univariate and multivariate analyses. It was intended that study two would examine sexual offender recidivistic characteristics over time, however, due to significant data problems it was not possible to successfully execute this analysis, therefore, these results are not reported. While study three examines predictors of sentence duration based on offender characteristics.
**Part D: Discussion.** Part D provides a detailed discussion regarding the findings of the current research. This is achieved by examining the results from each study separately, and then by providing an integrated discussion to conclude with. Strengths and limitations of the study are considered, and implications and future directions for research are discussed.

**CHAPTER TWO: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

Widely accepted myths such as ‘stranger danger’ and ‘high rates of sexual recidivism’ are among the rhetoric that drive public hysteria and community perceptions of sexual offenders (Budd & Mancini, 2017; Payne, Tewksbury, & Mustaine, 2010). State efforts to respond to such hysteria and quash sexual offending are harsh and punitive, primarily directed at limiting offender opportunities within society. Post detention regimes, sexual offender registers and other invasive responses (i.e., the mandatory collection of DNA samples from offenders) represent the preferred ‘tough on crime’ stance adopted by the state (Premier of Victoria, 2017). While these measures may have a place for the management of the most serious and dangerous sexual offenders, they are a severe infringement upon the civil liberties of all sexual offenders. This dissertation argues there is greater utility in understanding the characteristic profile of sexual offending groups which can inform targeted intervention strategies. Through appropriate risk assessment, treatment, rehabilitation and reintegration into society, sexual offenders have the opportunity to restore effective functioning.
Psychological frameworks have illuminated characteristic differences between offender groups. What is known so far, is that Internet offenders indicate greater levels of social isolation, are less likely to have been in a relationship, harbour lower levels of criminality, lower levels of offence supportive attitudes and anti-sociality (Babchishin et al., 2015; Babchishin et al., 2011; Bates & Metcalf, 2007; Rimer, 2017), while contact/dual offenders appear to attain a lower level of education/employment, have direct access to victims, are more physically aggressive and have greater levels of impulsivity (Babchishin, et al., 2015; Henshaw et al., 2017). There is strong evidence to suggest that the extent of deviancy between groups is heterogeneous. Research by Seto, Cantor and Blanchard (2006) which involved the examination of sexual arousal with a penile plethysmograph (PPG), indicated that CEM offending is a strong indicator of sexual deviancy (i.e., pedophilia). The meta-analysis by Babchishin et al. (2015) supported these findings. Other research, however, found Internet offenders to be less deviant overall, although this research did not measure physiological arousal and was therefore limited in this sense (Tomak, Weschler, Ghahramanlou-Holloway, Virdin, & Nademin, 2009). Therefore, while the literature is beginning to construct a sound basis of the characteristics of Internet offenders, further research is indicated to develop greater clarity of offender profiles overall. While psychologically focused research is no doubt instrumental in this process, other relevant factors which foster a cross disciplinary response also warrant consideration. Research has recently emerged linking the anthropological perspective and its relationship to (sexual) Internet offending. Rimer (2017)
argues that by examining the nature of online environments, Internet offenders’ perceptions of them and consequences for offending, it may be possible to address these perceptions in the context of intervention and deterrence.

Deterrence, one of the five sentencing principles outlined in section 5(1) of the Sentencing Act 1991 sets out the only purposes of sentencing an adult in Victoria, Australia. Developing greater insight into which variables might influence or predict certain sentencing outcomes can also serve to inform intervention strategies, alleviating judicial pressures, a burgeoning prison system and help mitigate concerns that incarceration can in fact increase an offender’s risk rather than decrease it (Mews, Di Vella, & Purver, 2017).

To this end, the review will critically analyse the literature on Internet, contact and dual offenders, with a specific focus on:

(i) the historical context of sexual offender assessment and treatment;

(ii) understanding offender characteristics across Internet, contact and dual group offenders;

(iii) determining if between group differences exist and therefore indicate discriminant group treatment;

(iv) the extent of current treatment programs and their outcomes for each population; and

(v) how specific characteristics may impact/help predict sentence duration across each population, thereby illuminating treatment pathways.
Historical overview: theories and models of offending, risk assessment and treatment

Significant advances have occurred in offender risk assessment and treatment over the past several decades. The first wave of assessment/treatment pre-dating the 1970s relied solely upon professional judgement. It was soon recognised, however, that this approach was too subjective and lacked scientific rigor (Huss, 2009). The 1970s saw the emergence of the second- and third- waves of assessment/treatment, introducing evidence-based assessment and dynamic evidence-based assessment, respectively. These approaches were believed to be more scientifically robust. More recently, a fourth wave emerged, integrating systematic intervention and monitoring with the assessment of a broader range of offender risk factors and other personal factors important to treatment (Andrews, Bonta & Wormith, 2006). Of those supported, the most esteemed model is Andrews and Bonta’s Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) Model. The model provides a basis for the prediction of risk and classification of offenders for treatment, based on research findings that:

(i) criminal behaviour can be predicted;

(ii) risk interacts with the level of treatment intensity and therefore impacts treatment outcome (e.g., recidivism); and

(iii) these factors interact with offender-based factors in influencing outcome (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; 2006).

The ‘risk principle’ states that offender recidivism can be reduced if the level of treatment provided to the offender is proportional to the offender’s risk to
re-offend (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Therefore, the higher the offender’s risk, the more intensive treatment ought to be. While conceptually sound, the model presumes the accurate assessment of offender risk in the first instance; a challenge in its own right which requires professional judgement to determine what type/intensity of treatment is commensurate with the offender’s level of risk. This approach requires flexibility from the treating clinician to modify treatment plans accordingly based on the pre-determined level of ‘intensity.’

The ‘need principle’ calls for the focus of treatment to be on criminogenic needs (i.e., factors that are directly linked to criminal behaviour, and when targeted in treatment, can lead to a decrease in recidivism) (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). The very nature of criminogenic needs, however, suggest that they are fluid unlike static risk factors that can only change in one direction (increase in risk) (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). Non-criminogenic needs are offender needs, that, when changed, are unlikely to result in any changes to recidivism. This principle is therefore heavily focused on what is determined to be criminogenic and in doing so, detracts from other meaningful gains that can be made in life. Ward’s Good Lives Model (discussed below) is one example of the value of meaningful ‘goods,’ and likewise, the power of the therapeutic alliance; both seen to have a significant impact on facilitating offenders’ gains by reducing recidivism (Ward & Stewart, 2003a). Non-criminogenic factors also have merit. For example, an individual’s self-esteem may be considered non-criminogenic, however, if an offender is experiencing this factor severely, it may impact on their ability to
engage treatment effectively, limiting offence specific gains they may have otherwise made.

Lastly, the ‘responsivity principle’ stipulates that offender treatment programs are the most effective when they are able to maximise therapeutic engagement with (or responsiveness of) offenders. (Andrews, Bontas, & Hoge, 1990). Barriers to effective responsivity might include low intelligence, poor literacy, mental illness, substance abuse, or language and cultural differences (Smallbone & McHugh, 2010). In the RNR model, this is achieved through the application of cognitive behavioural techniques and strengthening of the therapeutic alliance. Cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) has gained significant traction in the sexual offending space (Youssef, Casey, & Birgden, 2017).

A variant of CBT known as Dialectical Behaviour Therapy (DBT), has also begun to emerge in the sexual offending space; in particular, the DBT module focused on emotional dysregulation. DBT was created in the 1970’s by Linehan and was developed to address the needs of clients with borderline personality disorder (BPD). Such clients typically experience strong emotional responses to stimuli in their environment and impulsively react to them in maladaptive ways (Linehan, 1993). As sexual offenders can display impulsivity and emotional dysregulation in their offence process, DBT is a worthy candidate for further exploration in this population (discussed below). Notwithstanding the above limitations, the RNR model has provided the landscape of contact sexual offending with a strong, empirically driven basis for assessment and treatment.
Although much research exists on the treatment of contact sexual offenders, such as the application of cognitive behavioural techniques, Internet sexual offenders are less well understood. Seto (2013) argues that they differ from contact sexual offenders on a number of points, however, how exactly they differ is something researchers are still determining. While research on the differences in characteristics between groups is starting to emerge (Babchishin et al., 2015; Henshaw et al., 2017), theoretical approaches have predominantly explained sexual offending from a contact offence perspective, as no one theory has been developed for Internet offenders. While this is in part due to the limited amount of research on Internet offenders, it is also argued that some of the factors important in contact offending theoretically underpin the Internet population (Seto, 2013). Therefore, three of the most prevalent models relating to contact offenders are briefly explored here to establish a theoretical basis for this research: the Pathways Model by Ward and Siegert (2002), the Integrated Theory of Sexual Offending (ITSO) by Ward and Beech (2006) and the Good Lives Model by Ward and Stewart (2003).

The Pathways Model was developed for contact offenders and suggests that there are multiple, independent aetiological pathways, each associated with a set of interacting primary psychological mechanisms that can result in sexually abusive behaviour. Learning events, situational environments, biological factors and cultural factors exert proximal and distal influences on development, creating the following five pathways which lead to sexual abuse of children: (1) intimacy deficits; (2) distorted sexual scripts; (3) emotional dysregulation; (4) anti-social
The Pathways Model offers an explanation as to why some individuals abuse, while others do not. However, the model is somewhat limited by assuming a largely homogenous approach to the explanation of sexual offending. That is, it attempts to categorise offenders into the five pathways. This approach is problematic, as research has shown that sexual offenders are in fact largely heterogeneous in nature. For example, a cluster analysis study conducted by Gannon, Terriere and Leader (2012) found that only some of the sexual offenders in their study showed a semblance to the pathways originally hypothesised by Ward and Siegert (2002). These were the intimacy deficits, antisocial cognitions, and multiple dysfunction pathways. Further, two additional clusters were developed in Gannon et al.’s (2012) research that did not fit comfortably with any of the predicted pathways proposed by Ward and Siegert (2002). These two clusters were labelled ‘impulsivity’ and ‘boy predators.’ The Pathways Model is therefore limited to explaining why some men experiencing (any of) the five pathways become sexual offenders while others do not and why these men go on to reoffend or maintain their offending behaviours. Lastly, the model stipulates that every sexual offense involves emotional, intimacy, cognitive and arousal components. This is a prescriptive approach which does not allow for these four mechanisms to operate separately. Of notable interest, however, was the application of the Pathways Model to an Internet offending population (Middleton et al., 2006). In their study, Middleton et al. (2006) found that the intimacy deficits pathway applied to 35% of their sample. Middleton et al. (2006)
suggested that the primary determinant of this pathway is an insecure attachment style, which then has implications for social functioning abilities (i.e., generally lower level social skills and self esteem). Offenders who are characterised by this pathway are likely to sexually offend to compensate for a lack of intimacy (Ward & Siegert, 2002).

Elliot and Beech (2009) also sought to apply this model to Internet offenders. They identified a key proximal influence (a circumstance that makes the commission of an offence more likely) among Internet offenders. Specifically, their study found that “the key proximal factor related to the maintenance of online child pornography access is compulsive, or pathological, use of the Internet itself” (2009, p. 10). Middleton et al. (2006) had earlier found that a statistically significant portion of their sample scored highly on psychological measures of motor impulsivity (offenders who scored on motor impulsivity were at an 8% increased chance of being an Internet offender when compared to contact offenders) and suggested that the emotional dysregulation group tended to act without thinking and had a lack of regard for future consequences. However, they were only able to classify 33 of the 72 Internet sexual offenders (46%) into a pathway (emotional regulation (n=14), intimacy deficits (n=15), deviant sexual scripts (n=2), antisocial cognition (n=1), and multiple dysfunction (n=1)). The remaining 54% of the sample did not yield scores that indicated any pathway membership.

A comparative study by Babchishin et al. (2011) challenges Ward and Seigert’s (2002) pathway of anti-social cognitions for Internet offenders. Their
research found that in comparison to contact offenders, Internet offenders scored higher in victim empathy and lower in antisocial tendencies such as impulsivity, rejection of personal responsibility, substance abuse, or antisocial behaviour. Seto et al. (2011) argue that, “although they are more likely to be sexually deviant, Internet offenders are also higher in psychological self-control than contact offenders, which may explain why they are significantly less likely to sexually reoffend than contact offenders and unlikely to have official records of prior contact offenses (p. 320).” Another theory regarding sexual offending is the ITSO.

The ITSO – an extension of the Pathways Model - suggests that sexual offending occurs as a consequence of a number of interacting and causal variables including biological, ecological and neuropsychological. More specifically, these variables include brain development, an ecological niche: proximal and distal factors, neuropsychological functioning and clinical symptomatology. The ITSO argues that earlier models of sexual offending only considered surface-level symptomatology and, as a consequence, failed to identify causal origins of sexual behaviour (Ward & Beech, 2006). This was aptly noted by Ward and Beech and is certainly one of the strengths of the ITSO. Many earlier models (i.e., Ward & Seigert’s (2002) Pathways Model; Marshall & Barbaree’s (1990) Integrated Theory, Finkelhor’s (1984) Precondition theory) have been limited to explaining sexual offending on an ecological level, rather than providing a model which seeks to understand the underlying causes of presenting problems. The ITSO bridges this gap by explaining sexual offending as a consequence of the
interaction between neurological and ecological factors. The ITSO is strengthened by its unique ability to account for the onset, development and maintenance of sexually offensive behaviours. Other models (i.e., the Pathways Model) have only been able to explain why individuals develop into sexual offenders.

The ITSO, however, exists within an abstract framework, despite the authors proffering this feature as a strength. While this feature does provide the model with a degree of flexibility (i.e., it enables the model to be applied to a range of sexual offences), it conversely lacks the specificity needed to be operationalised in a meaningful way. Its neurological component, for example, explains how clinical symptoms arise. This section is heavily based upon Pennington’s (2002) neuroscientific account of human behaviour which submits four levels of analysis including (i) aetiological analysis; (ii) brain mechanism analysis; (iii) neuropsychological analysis; and (iv) symptom or surface level analysis. Ward and Beech (2006) claim that level three: neuropsychological analysis directly informs researchers on the mechanisms generating offenders’ psychological symptoms. They also support Pennington’s assertions (2002) by claiming it is possible to divide the central nervous system into three systems each associated with distinct functions: (i) motivation/emotional; (ii) perception and memory; and (iii) action, selection and control. While this conceptualisation of the neuropsychology of sexual offending is tenable, this aspect of Ward and Beech’s (2006) theory does little to illuminate how the various structures of the brain actually become impaired and why some individuals become ‘ill’ while others do not. Further, from a diagnostic perspective, the authors’ model falls short in
Elliot and Beech (2009) applied the ITSO to Internet offenders and suggested that problematic internet use is the product of distal (i.e., early sexualisation) and proximal factors (i.e., perceptions of anonymity) being coupled with neuropsychological function (i.e., problematic cognitions, loneliness). Similar to their earlier 2009 study evaluating the Pathways Model, they found that the most problematic factor in the commission of Internet offending is the use of the Internet itself. They stated that the acquisition of skills such as improving search terms to access abusive material and improving methods of avoiding detection appear to represent a change to the ecological niche of the individual. They acknowledged, however, that the ITSO has only moderate utility in explaining Internet based offending overall. As such, the Good Lives Model is considered next.

The Good Lives Model-Comprehensive – GLM-C – submits that an individual will commit sexual offences because s/he lacks the capacity to realise valued outcomes in personally fulfilling and socially acceptable ways (Ward & Siegert, 2002). The GLM-C is an example of a positive psychological approach to the treatment of sexual offenders. It assumes that as human beings, sexual offenders are goal-directed organisms who are predisposed to seek a number of primary goods (eleven in total). Primary goods are states of affairs, states of mind, personal characteristics, activities, or experiences that are sought for an individual’s own sake and are likely to increase psychological well-being if
achieved (Kekes, 1989; Ward & Stewart, 2003a). The GLM-C is unique to sexual offender treatment by virtue of its humanising approach. That is, not only is it concerned with reducing risk, but it is also aimed at adding meaning to offenders’ lives. While this is certainly a strength of the model, it is questionable if this is indeed a ‘new’ approach, or merely a theory which formalises and integrates what humans have known and practiced for centuries. Humans are, innately, pleasure seeking creatures, a prospect which can be traced back to the writings of ancient philosophers Plato, Socrates and more prominently Aristotle in his eminent ten volume text series titled ‘Nichomachean Ethics’ (Aristotle, 2004).

The model raises further questions. As noted by McNeil (2009), do all offenders actually value and pursue primary goods to the extent the model suggests? While it is tenable to argue that all humans do seek pleasure on a continuum, it remains plausible that this core feature is over-valued and that offenders might rehabilitate just as successfully in the absence of prescriptive primary goods. An alternate model might emphasise strengthening an offender’s capacity to self-soothe/regulate during the onset of distress, a factor which often precipitates sexual dysregulation/offending. This approach might be more powerful than emphasising primary goods, as the ability to self soothe; a product of strengthening an offender’s internal world fosters a sense of agency, which in turn, can cultivate empowerment and better decision making. Ambiguity exists as to how clinicians might interpret what constitutes a good balance between adding meaning and reducing risk. There are equal dangers in a clinician applying the model and placing too much weight on adding meaning to an offender’s life,
without placing enough emphasis on minimising risk; as conversely there is in placing too much emphasis on risk and not enough on adding meaning. The former results in an offender that is happy but still a danger to society; the latter results in a safer society, however, an unhappy offender, which could ultimately perpetuate the cycle of offending. The model does little to explain the role of offending in populations where offenders are already achieving primary goods (i.e., sexual offenders who come from affluent environments and who have achieved many of their primary goods such as becoming successful professionally, have their own family and network of friends, as well as hobbies). Questions also exist pertaining to how culturally robust the model is. The meaning of primary goods in a western nation may be interpreted and weighted differently to communities of the east. Finally, there do not appear to be empirical studies published to date which demonstrate the validity/efficacy of the GLM in reducing recidivism.

Several studies have sought to evaluate programs which have incorporated the GLM. Simons, McCullar and Tyler (2006; 2008) compared a GLM based program to a Relapse Prevention (RP) module. These findings were presented at the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers (ATSA) conference in 2006 and 2008, however, were never formally published. As such they are referred to in Willis and Ward (2013). Willis and Ward (2013) reported that Simons et al. (2006; 2008) compared 96 offenders who undertook GLM based treatment against 100 offenders who undertook RP based treatment. Results revealed that offenders indicated similar levels of improvement on social skills and victim
empathy, however, those in the GLM group demonstrated significantly better problem-solving ability and coping skills. There was no evaluation of recidivism, however. Other studies yielded similar findings, however, again did not provide any evidence for the reduction of recidivism (Harkins & Beech, 2012; Barnett, Manderville-Nordon & Rakestrow, 2014). Marshall, Marshall, Serran and O’Brien (2011) sought to address this gap and evaluated 535 sexual offenders from Rockwood Psychological Services (RPS) program. While this evaluation study found some reduction in sexual and non-sexual reoffending rates at both 5.4 and 8.4 years follow up, the program was delivered across three phases, and only the third phase incorporated some elements of the GLM. Therefore, based on this study, it cannot be determined that the GLM accounted for this reduction in risk. Further validation studies are therefore warranted to determine the efficacy of the GLM in reducing recidivism.

These theories demonstrate that while many of the characteristics important in contact sexual offending apply to the Internet population there are also notable differences that warrant further exploration in the context of theoretical basis and treatment (i.e., demographic, psychiatric, offence specific factors). This chapter now turns its attention to the examination of sexual offender characteristics documented within the current literature base.

**Internet, contact and dual sexual offender characteristics**

“Looking at CEM is not as bad as touching a child” (Kettleborough & Merdian, 2017). This statement encapsulates one of the many characteristic
differences between Internet and contact offenders. There is a hierarchy of
criminality, not only between members of the community, but between offenders
themselves. It is widely accepted that sexual offences are considered the most
abhorrent (McMah & Palin, 2016). However, what may be less known is that
among sexual offences, contact offending appears to be perceived as the most
heinous, while Internet offences appear to be the most justifiable, as demonstrated
by U.S. prosecutor Wayne Dishman (Talamo, 2017). In an article by The Times,
Dishman was quoted as stating, “They are doing an act by downloading or
looking at it, but I do not think it’s as harmful as the molestation or the rape or the
other sex crimes. Someone who looks at a picture is not as bad as a person who
actually takes that into action” (Talamo, 2017). Such publicly proclaimed
thoughts or ‘distortions’ by professional figures can perpetuate myths about the
true detrimental outcomes of Internet sexual offences and may influence
problematic offender beliefs or attitudes (i.e., cognitive distortions).

**Attitudes towards offending.** Kettleborough and Merdian (2017)
investigated differences in cognitive distortions between sexual offending groups,
and found that Internet and contact offenders differed on a number of distortions.
These group differences were also examined (more broadly) by Babchishin et al.
(2015) who found that contact offenders experienced greater levels of distortions
than Internet offenders. However, Kettleborough and Merdian’s (2017) study
sought to examine the nature of distortions according to group membership in
greater depth. They approached this via the application of Ward and Keenan’s
(1999) implicit theories model to Internet offenders and subjects matched to
Contact and dual offending. The implicit theories model suggests that cognitive distortions result from five specific schemas which include: (i) children as sexual beings; (ii) entitlement; (iii) dangerous world; (iv) uncontrollability; and (v) nature of harm. Kettleborough and Merdian (2017) found that the highest levels of consistency between groups was for children as sexual beings and the nature of harm. The dangerous world and uncontrollability schemas did not apply to the Internet offending group. These findings are consistent with other literature (Rimer, 2017; Winder & Gough, 2010) which suggest that Internet offenders do not generally perceive their actions as harmful due to the fact that they are not engaging in physical contact with victims. The nature of harm schema describes a belief system which results in judgements that children are not harmed by abuse itself, but rather by their own unique response to it or because of other factors such as physical force. They indicate that Internet offenders hold belief systems that children are sexual beings in similar ways to adults and have the capacity to make informed decisions about engaging in sexual activity with adults. These results suggest that offenders hold views which seek to minimise, justify or deny their offending. Evaluating the severity of these false beliefs in a treatment readiness assessment may be critical to the potential success of any treatment later engaged.

Internet offenders tend to be distinct from contact offenders who typically believe that the world is a dangerous place and therefore it is necessary to achieve dominance. Internet offenders were not found to hold these views which is consistent with other findings that illuminate constructs of anti-sociality and high
levels of more general criminality; variables which appear to be unique to contact and dual offenders, but less prevalent among Internet offenders (Henshaw et al. 2017). The uncontrollability schema was also unique to contact offenders who believe that there are factors beyond their control that underlie their tendency to sexually abuse children and therefore cannot be held accountable. This construct appears to indicate markers of sexual deviancy and suggests that while contact offenders may not necessarily have a formal diagnosis of deviancy, those who identify with the uncontrollability schema may be indicating belief patterns consistent with formally diagnosed deviant individuals.

**Sexual deviancy (paraphilias) and offence specific factors.** Evidence indicates that the when compared to contact offenders, Internet offenders are more sexually deviant (Babchishin et al., 2015; Seto et al., 2011). Seto et al. (2006) argues that Internet offending appears to be a strong predictor of sexual deviance (i.e., pedophilia). However, when Babchishin et al. (2015) compared Internet offenders to dual offenders, they found that Internet offenders possessed lower levels of deviancy overall. These findings raise questions regarding the relationship between deviancy and opportunity to offend. It can be argued that Internet offenders who are high in deviancy but offending online only, would be expected to have greater access to the Internet, but less access to physical victims. Indeed, this assertion is supported by Babchishin et al. (2015) who found that Internet offenders had less access to physical victims and greater access to the Internet. Conversely then, it would be expected that contact offenders have greater direct access to physical victims and less access to the Internet. However, given
contact offenders were the least likely of all three groups to be deviant in the meta-analysis by Babchishin et al. (2015), it would appear that opportunity has a greater bearing on whether they go on to offend, than perhaps sexual psychopathology itself. In Babchishin et al. (2015) it was found that contact offenders had less access to the Internet and greater access to physical victims. Further, in Seto et al. (2011), an absence of contact offending among the Internet offending group was attributed to increased victim empathy which was deemed a protective barrier. The consideration of dual offenders, however, is more complex. The combination of sexually deviant fantasies and direct access to children would appear to be a dangerous combination which significantly elevates an offender’s overall risk. Certainly, this trend is demonstrated by evidence regarding the (heightened) risk of dual offenders who are both deviant and have physical access to children (Babchishin et al., 2015). However, what remains unclear from the evidence above is which precise factors serve as protective for Internet offenders – this is important as it may predict whether Internet offenders go on to become dual offenders, or alternatively, provides insight that dual offenders commence with contact offending rather than Internet offending. If the research by Babchishin et al. (2015) and Seto et al. (2011) suggests that Internet offenders are less likely to engage in contact offending because they have (i) less access to physical victims; and (ii) possess greater victim empathy, then what must be considered next is whether either of these variables confounds the other. For example, are Internet offenders less likely to engage in contact offending because they do not have the same opportunities as contact offenders, or because
they do have similar opportunities to access physical victims, yet possess higher victim empathy and choose not to act on deviant thoughts? From the research outlined above this distinction is not clear. In a similar vein, this question can be considered from the lens of the dual offender. If dual offenders engage in Internet offending first and then escalate to contact offending, then evidence would suggest that barriers such as increased victim empathy appear to have little effect in translating to the real world and mitigating risk of recidivism. Perhaps it is more apt to suggest that such Internet offenders are only less likely to physically offend in the absence of opportunities of access to physical victims, although this assertion has not been sufficiently investigated in the research. Conversely, if dual offenders have engaged in contact offending first and then escalated to Internet offending, then protective factors such as victim empathy are less relevant in understanding this group. Interestingly, findings by Babchishin et al., (2015) revealed that dual offenders possessed greater deficits in victim empathy when engaged in contact offending. Therefore, according to Babchishin et al. (2015), Internet offenders possess the highest degree of victim empathy, contact offenders the next highest and dual offenders possess the lowest. It would be reasonable then to expect a finding of difference between Internet and dual offenders on this construct, however, no significant differences on victim empathy were found between these groups. At the present time, the value of this construct is not well understood. Given the potential for victim empathy to serve as a protective factor, it warrants further research.

In other research, similar levels of mood disorders have been found
between sexual offender groups (Babchishin et al., 2015). Studies have not yet been able to differentiate negative mood states between groups suggesting homogeneity of this variable. This finding warrants further exploration given the other characteristic differences that exist between groups. On the basis that Internet offenders are more likely to be insular individuals who find emotional safety in the virtual world (Rimer, 2017), an association might be seen between anxiety, distress, isolation, boredom, loneliness and/or a fear of rejection (Armstrong & Mellor, 2013; Rimer, 2017), although, it is acknowledged that not all social isolates experience these states. Certainly, if this were the case, however, there would be significant implications for treatment. For example, DBT modules pertaining to distress tolerance and emotional regulation might be emphasised with this group. Further research is indicated regarding this variable.

**Demographic and Psychological characteristics.** Research examining demographic and psychological characteristics found that contact offenders were the most likely to exhibit high rates of substance abuse, antisocial personality disorder and severe mental illness (i.e., schizophrenia) (Babchishin et al., 2015; Jackson & Richards, 2007) when compared to Internet offenders. Contact offenders were also more likely to be in a racial minority, unemployed, attain a lower level of education, experience higher levels of emotional identification with children and greater levels of childhood abuse/adversity (i.e., emotional/physical/sexual abuse, bullying, parental mental illness, parental substance abuse, parental death, financial disadvantage), than Internet offenders (Babchishin et al., 2015; Babchishin et al., 2011). Internet offenders, on the other
hand, were more likely to attain higher levels of education and employment than contact offenders, and were less likely to experience a relationship at the time of offending, more likely to be lonely, and more likely to be socially isolated than contact offenders (Aslan & Edelmann, 2014; Babchishin et. al., 2015; Henshaw et al., 2017). Unsurprisingly, dual offenders were partially aligned to both Internet and contact offenders. For example, they possessed higher levels of violent criminality, unemployment and substance abuse, than Internet offenders. They had greater to access to children, had more sexual problems and reported greater levels of childhood abuse/adversity than Internet offenders. When compared to contact offenders, dual offenders had less direct access to victims, greater sexual interest in children, fewer levels of anti-sociality and greater victim empathy deficits (Babchishin et al., 2015). These findings have implications for treatment targets and treatment modality. If contact offenders are more likely to be characterised by a background of trauma and/or abuse, then trauma focused treatment may be indicated as an adjunct to offence specific work. Conversely, if Internet offenders are less likely to be in a racial minority (i.e., fewer language barriers), have attained higher education and employment, then treatment should be higher order, commensurate to the intellect of the population in order to maximise engagement and treatment gains. Dual offenders appear to be more complex and less distinct characteristically than Internet and contact offenders. More research in understanding this group is needed.

The differences between groups regarding relationship status, intimacy deficits, isolation and loneliness are of clinical importance. These characteristics
have been conceptualised as dynamic risk factors primarily for the Internet offending population. That is, there is an inference that Internet offenders engage in this type of offending due to the presence of these characteristics. Understanding why this group may be more likely to experience these factors, therefore, warrants attention. Several researchers have sought to examine this idea through the lens of attachment styles, notably anxious and avoidant attachment styles.

Hazen and Shaver (1987) originally examined various attachment styles (in non-offending populations) and posited that individuals with anxious attachments are characterised by a need to be close to others due to a worry of abandonment. While those with avoidant attachments may have their attachment system deactivated. “Seeking proximity with the attachment figure is believed to be futile, therefore avoidant people try to keep a distance from others and remain independent” (Li & Chan, 2012, p. 408). Bartholomew and Horowitz’s (1991) four-category model included the avoidant category which was complimentary to this idea. The avoidant category is divided into dismissing avoidance (i.e., rejecting the value of relationships), and fearful avoidance (i.e., a desire for and fear of close relationships), while Marshall (1993) built upon his predecessors’ work, integrating it into the realm of sexual offending. Marshall (1993) posited that often, sexual offenders fail to develop secure attachments in childhood and as a result, fail to develop interpersonal skills and self-confidence, variable which are necessary for the establishment of intimacy. He suggested that as a consequence, sexual offenders fail to engage in suitable courting behaviour. This results in
sexual offenders seeking and experiencing emotional intimacy primarily through sex. Armstrong and Mellor (2013) also examined intimacy deficits and attachment styles, specifically related to Internet offenders. They found that Internet offenders were significantly less likely to experience a secure attachment, when compared to contact offenders. No differences were found between Internet and dual offenders on this variable. These results suggest a greater likelihood of ‘insecure’ attachment within the Internet offending group. Ward, Hudson, Marshall and Siegert (1995) sought to categorise the concept of an ‘insecure’ attachment among (all) sexual offenders in a bid to understand the relevance of intimacy deficits. They proffered three insecure attachment styles: (i) preoccupied; (ii) fearful; and (iii) dismissing. When Armstrong and Mellor (2013) investigated these attachment styles in their study, they found that Internet offenders were most closely aligned to a fearful attachment style. Their study revealed that Internet offenders were more likely to hold a negative view of themselves and feel less worthy of love than contact offenders. Internet offenders also achieved a higher mean score on social avoidance and distress than contact and dual offenders. Lastly, it was found that Internet offenders did not report a fear of intimacy; a finding consistent with being aligned to a fearful attachment style. Ward et al. (1995) suggested that individuals who experience a fearful attachment style pursue non-rejecting partners who can meet their heightened need for intimacy. They are likely to be non-hostile, devoid of closeness (due to fear of rejection) and self-focused. In some respects, these findings might suggest that Internet offenders are more likely to pursue a relationship in order to satiate
their need for intimacy, however, it appears as though elevated levels of social
anxiety and distress act as confounding variables, preventing this population from
adaptively pursuing and meeting their needs in a safe, intimate, adult relationship.
Instead, Internet offenders turn to the Internet, an environment where social
anxiety and distress is controlled for, to satiate intimacy needs safely through
interactions with children who are less emotionally threatening.

Ward and Seigert’s (2012) attachment styles are aligned to meta analytic
research on non-forensic attachment styles by Li and Chan (2012). Their meta-
analysis indicates that individuals with anxious attachments are characterised by a
need to be close to others due to a worry of abandonment, while those with
avoidant attachments share a fear of closeness and the tendency to avoid
dependence on others (Hazen & Shaver, 1987; Li & Chan, 2012). Characteristics
of both attachment styles can be applied to the findings of Armstrong and Mellor
(2013) and subsequently inform a better understanding of the profile of Internet
offenders. Babchishin et al. (2015) examined similar concepts, although did not
specifically look at attachment styles. They examined group differences in
approaches to relationships and found that contact offenders were more likely
than Internet offenders to have a detached approach to relationships, but less
likely to have a sexual preoccupation. These findings were supported by
Armstrong and Mellor (2013) who indicated that Internet offenders did not have a
fear of intimacy, although were somewhat conflicting with Ward and Seigert’s
(2012) fearful attachment style which suggests that such individuals are devoid of
closeness. Dual offenders were found to have a higher likelihood of low
commitment sex (i.e., frequent partners) and greater sexual regulation problems when compared to Internet offenders. When compared to contact offenders, dual offenders reported greater intimacy deficits.

The above findings, overall, construct a profile of an Internet offender who is a well-educated and resourced individual with a (perceived) positive social standing, but who in reality is a ‘loner’ with limited social outlets. Internet offenders experience a greater incidence of fearful attachments, social anxiety and distress, preventing them from adaptively meeting their needs in healthy, intimate, adult relationships. They do, however, report the highest incidence of victim empathy across all three groups. Contact offenders, conversely, experience lower levels of social and economic status, resulting in a greater incidence of mental health problems and criminality. They are more likely to be in relationships, a factor which no doubt increases their opportunities to access victims and physically offend, have greater levels of cognitive distortions regarding children, the least amount of victim empathy, but are not likely to be deviant. Dual offenders appear to be the most deviant of all three groups, have greater access to victims than Internet offenders, but less access to victims when compared to contact offenders. They have less victim empathy than contact offenders, yet surprisingly no differences in victim empathy were seen between dual and Internet offenders. Dual offenders have greater education than contact offenders, yet are more likely to be unemployed than Internet offenders. They are anti-social like contact offenders but have greater levels of intimacy deficits than contact offenders.
In other studies, personality constructs have been examined between groups. Tomak et al. (2009) investigated between and within group differences according to the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Second Edition (MMPI-2). They found that the MMPI-2 was of limited utility in differentiating between groups, however, some differences were indicated. Internet offenders were significantly more likely to score lower on scales measuring Faking Good, Faking Bad, Psychopathic Deviate and Schizophrenia. These findings suggest Internet offenders are less likely to lie, however, they also suggest that Internet offenders are more likely to engage in sexually deviant fantasies, a problematic characteristic when combined with readily available access to the Internet (Babchishin et al., 2015). In other studies, differences were found between Internet and contact offenders but did not support these findings. Bates and Metcalf (2007) found that Internet offenders had a significantly higher level of impression management (IM – i.e., the degree to which subjects present themselves in an unduly optimistic light, specifically towards other people) score than contact offenders. This is suggestive of two possibilities: (1) Internet offenders (who on average have a less severe criminal history than contact offenders) could genuinely behave more pro-socially and this would explain their higher scores on the IM scale. However, this is unlikely as the Paulhus’ Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR) scale, from which the IM scale is derived, was not designed with offenders in mind but rather the general population (Paulhus, 1998). The other possibility is that (2) Internet offenders were ‘faking good’, giving ideal but not necessarily realistic responses to
questions because they were intrinsically aware that their offending behaviour would likely be judged and shamed, including the possible view that they are ‘pedophiles’ who are at risk of sexual offending directed to their own and other children. In the research by Bates and Metcalf (2007) 61.8% of Internet offenders were found to be ‘faking good,’ compared to 39.5% of contact offenders.

Babchishin et al. (2015) examined impression management and found that contact offenders scored higher on impression management when compared to dual offenders, however, no differences were detected between Internet and contact offenders. More research understanding how impression management differs between groups, and consequently, may affect treatment engagement/treatment outcomes is needed. Offenders heavily invested in managing clinicians’ perceptions of themselves are unlikely to make sustainable treatment gains, and may be more likely to reoffend.

Lastly, Marshall, O’Brien, Marshall, Booth and Davis (2012) found that compared to contact offenders, Internet offenders more commonly exhibited obsessive compulsive tendencies. This is a notable finding worthy of further exploration. If Internet offenders have a proclivity to exhibit obsessive compulsive tendencies, this may have a significant bearing upon their engagement with CEM. Further research on this construct is indicated.

Examining characteristics of offenders from a cross disciplinary lens can add further context to the psychological characteristics outlined above. While non-quantitative studies on sexual offenders are rare, Rimer (2017) recently conducted a qualitative examination on the anthropological markers of Internet
offenders. He sought to actively “listen, watch and regard offenders’ perceptions (Rimer, 2017, p. 34)” as they relate to the Internet in a bid to elucidate potential explanations of why and how they offend. His study found that several key elements underpinned their behaviour: (i) psychological characteristics of Internet offenders; (ii) offender dichotomisation of the online/offline realms; (iii) Foucauldian theory and the construction of boundaries; (iv) online offending spaces as lacking interaction and potential social surveillance; and (v) moral flexibility.

It was found that offenders share similar psychological characteristics as described earlier. That is, Internet offenders were likely to experience social and emotional issues including depression, loneliness, stress, difficulty with past abuse, low self-esteem, a lack of agency, relationship difficulties, lack of intimacy and in less than 10% of the sample, a sexual preference for children. Rimer’s (2017) findings provided a solid evidentiary basis for Armstrong and Mellor’s (2013) results. That is, offenders from Rimer’s (2017) study explicitly stated that engaging in CEM alleviated the characteristics outlined above, as well as eased boredom and satiated a curiosity/excitement that ordinary adult pornography could not.

Offenders were likely to dichotomously view themselves as “Jekyll and Hyde (Rimer, 2017, p. 38).” That is, the Internet afforded offenders a type of transformation or disembodiment, not available in the offline world, due to online factors such as anonymity, accessibility and affordability. Consequently, different boundaries existed in the online world, as compared to the offline world. One
Offender captured the essence of this by stating, “Your online character would do things that you would never dream of doing offline. You ask yourself what would this person do, as opposed to what would I do (Rimer, 2017, p. 38)?” Some offenders indicated significant distress at this dichotomisation of the self and stated, “I just want to kill one of them and go back to the other one completely (Rimer, 2017, p. 38).” This finding alludes to a number of interpretations; perhaps most notably one which returns us to the findings of Armstrong and Mellor (2013); an offender’s sense of safety is bolstered in the virtual world by mitigating their increased levels of social anxiety and distress. Offenders who are limited in their ability to cope with loneliness, depression and stress, and who lack agency in the physical world, are more likely to find safety in an alternate reality where emotional resources required to mitigate such factors are superfluous. In the virtual world, an individual can place distressing feelings aside and get lost in a constructed persona which represents the ‘liberated or ideal’ self. One which can harbour a number of opposing characteristics to the actual ones experienced in the physical world such as connection, excitement, and a perceived sense of power. This delineation results in a distinction of morals and boundaries between the two (perceived) worlds.

While a distinction of boundaries between the online and offline world is therefore evident, perhaps even more salient is the distinction of boundaries in the online world alone. Traditionally, anthropologists have viewed the Internet as a heterogeneous entity comprising of “multiple and differing spaces constructed by users in different contexts (Rimer, 2017, p. 38). Boellstorf (2013) suggested that
users create boundaries between different online spaces. Therefore, an offender might construct different rules or boundaries for the use of ‘Instagram’ versus an anonymous online blog site or CEM site. It is therefore suggested that online users create and perceive boundaries based on their own social influences/realities. In his study, Rimer (2017) identified that offenders created online boundaries based on their own moral code via a process of compartmentalisation. Many offenders went as far as owning two computers; one for ‘ordinary’ computer use such as Instagram, Google searches etc., while another for CEM use exclusively. Offending was usually confined to the evening and was viewed as ‘alone time,’ while offenders created specific spaces in the home to localise their behaviour. One offender reported, “You confined it to one room of the house, you know, just to my bedroom. And everything outside it is…has got nothing to do with it (Rimer, 2017, p. 40).” Rimer’s observation of compartmentalisation provides support for the idea that offenders engage this strategy to strengthen their personal safety. Through the physical isolation, offenders create a space for themselves which yields a sense of power and autonomy to pursue their constructed persona.

Rimer (2017) argues that by constructing the boundaries outlined above, offenders are able to manage the degree to which they are perceivably able to be subjected to social surveillance. However, this assertion does not factor in the reality that offenders can be watched by others in the virtual world itself. Escaping the eyes of social surveillance in the physical world does not, therefore, translate to a truly non-surveilled environment in the virtual world. The modern-
day premise of securitisation is rooted in the late 18th century idea of the ‘panopticon’ constructed by Bentham. The ‘panopticon’ was the idea that ‘one’ watches over the ‘many’ (Semple, 2003). Foucault critiqued this concept and proffered that modern "disciplinary" societies have a pervasive inclination to observe and normalise. Modern day theorists have expanded upon this premise and asserted that technology has allowed for the deployment of panoptic structures invisibly throughout society; notably that the Internet itself is a medium which engenders a panoptic style of observation (Brignall, 2002).

The premise of the ‘virtual panopticon’ has been operationalised by numerous bodies including security forces. Specifically, metadata – data that describes and gives information about other data - is collected and analysed to (in this scenario) pursue and detect illicit online activity. The collection of metadata is a form of social surveillance which documents the online trail an individual leaves behind. Therefore, while offenders who engage the online world may seek to engender a sense of safety from their physical world, it is ultimately a distortion or a fallacy. In Rimer’s interviews (2017, p. 39), offenders reported that there was no “governing body” online and that “no one takes responsibility for what’s on there.” This statement supports Rimer’s (2017) earlier finding that offenders tend to ‘split’ or dichotomise their reality whereby rules only matter offline, meanwhile the online environment is perceived as a space of freedom with limited social morals and codes. Offender perceptions, therefore, have a significant role to play in understanding/deconstructing Internet offending. Perceptions such as these can allude to mechanisms of denial or cognitive distortions which should be
investigated further and incorporated into a targeted intervention plan. As demonstrated, there is merit in fostering a cross disciplinary response to the wider problem of sexual offending in order to improve risk mitigation strategies and develop targeted intervention. This chapter now turns its attention to the applicability of one of the most commonly used sexual offending risk assessment tools across sexual offending groups; the Static 99.

Risk assessment and Static 99. Regarding CEM offenders, the Child Pornography Offender Risk Tool (CPORT) was created by Seto and Eke (2015), however, is still in its infancy. That is, no significant real-world validation of the measure has been carried out as yet and as such an application of the tool for real world purposes must be undertaken with caution. A small validation study was recently carried out on the CPORT, however, the sample comprised of $n = 80$ and only a very small number of offenders (unspecified for CEM offenders) went on to reoffend. Predictive validity for this study for CEM offenders was $AUC = .63$. Rice and Harris (2005) equate this $AUC$ to a medium effect size, while the traditional academic point system outlines the following interpretation guidance for $AUC$ scores: $AUC: 0.90-1.00 = excellent$ performance; $AUC: 0.80-0.90 = good$ performance; $AUC: 0.70-0.80 = fair$ performance; $AUC: 0.60-0.70 = poor$ performance; and $AUC: 0.50-0.60 = fail$ performance (Tape, 2009). The CPORT was not part of the scope of the current research, however, the Static 99 was utilised instead.

The Static 99 is designed for use with male, adult, contact or dual offenders primarily (Hanson & Thornton, 2000). Its items load onto general
offending and sexual deviancy. It can be applied to Internet offenders, however, only in instances where there is an identifiable victim. On the basis of evidence reported thus far, it would be expected that dual offenders (highest in deviancy and medium degree of access to physical victims) would score the highest, contact offenders (highest in access to victims, no deviancy) would score the next highest and Internet offenders (medium in deviancy, no access to physical victims) would score the lowest in risk.

Although the literature and on the predictive capacity of this tool according to group membership is scant, differences in risk scores have been reported. In Babchishin et.al. (2015), no differences were found between Internet and contact offenders on the Static 99 and the Risk Matrix 2000. Contact offenders, however, were found to have a higher risk score than Internet offenders on ‘other risk scales’ which were defined as various risk tools used by clinicians (i.e., ACUTE 2000, clinicians’ subjective assessments based on self-report data). Dual offenders were not reported on this variable. These results were confounded by the fact that the Static 99 was pooled with the Risk Matrix 2000. Separating the two tools then analysing group differences is required. Given the Static 99 and Static 99-R are two of the most prominently used risk assessment tools with the sexual offending population, further research examining their relevance/applicability to Internet offenders is indicated. The implications for assessing risk inaccurately are significant for perpetrators, victims and the community alike.
**Sexual offender reoffending.** Despite community perceptions that sexual offenders are highly likely to commit further sexual offences, research has consistently indicated that sexual offender re-offence rates are low (Lievore, 2004; Goodman-Delahunty & O’Brien, 2014). While the prevalence of child sexual abuse is difficult to quantify due to large numbers of under-reported crimes, reported base lines remain at around 4-8% (male) and 7-12% (female) for victims of penetrative abuse. The estimates are higher for non-penetrative abuse (Goodman-Delahunty & O’Brien, 2014). There are limited studies examining the prevalence of CEM reoffending. Eke, Seto and Williams (2011) published data indicating that in a sample of 541 adult male CEM offenders, 5.2% sexually reoffended (when CEM offences were excluded) and 11% sexually reoffended (when CEM offences were included). While it is believed that these figures are underestimates due to the underreporting of crime, reportable baselines remain low. This has made research examining the recidivism of reoffending challenging. The present study seeks to examine sexual reoffence rates in the current sample, however, acknowledges that traditionally low base rates may pose a barrier.

**Legal status.** Research has consistently indicated that contact offenders are more likely to report chronic sexual and non-sexual criminal histories when compared to Internet offenders (Babchishin et al., 2015; Babchishin et al., 2011; Doyle, Ogloff & Thomas, 2011; Seto & Eke, 2005). According to Babchishin et al. (2015), dual offenders were more likely to report violent criminal histories compared to Internet offenders, however, no further sentencing data on dual offenders is available at the current time.
Evidence suggests that Internet offenders are the most likely to receive a non-custodial sanction (i.e. community corrections order or suspended sentence) and that offences are most likely to be heard in the Magistrates Court (Drill & Hurley, 2015). By contrast, contact and dual offenders are the most likely to receive custodial terms (Sentencing Advisory Counsel, 2017) with over 94% of offenders receiving an immediate custodial sentence between 2011 and 2016. These findings have implications for the rehabilitation of offenders. For example, if magistrates are sentencing Internet offenders to CCO’s, it is critical that they are of a duration sufficient enough to allow for the completion of a treatment program. Generally a minimum duration of 24 months would be required to achieve this, factoring in the assessment of the offender, being waitlisted for the program, enrolment into the program and program completion. Further research regarding (i) the incidence of non-custodial sentences among Internet offenders; and (ii) the effects of such sanctions on rehabilitation prospects are required to better understand how sentencing practices impact treatment prospects/outcomes. This chapter now turns its attention to the examination of sexual offender group membership and the characteristics of offenders which may predict which type of sexual offender an individual may become. Likewise, treatment factors are considered across the three sexual offending groups.

Sexual offender group membership and treatment

Understanding offender characteristics is critical in forecasting prospective changes to group membership by offenders. Questions remain as to whether
existing treatment modalities address sexual offender needs based on sexual offender group (i.e., contact-specific treatment excluding Internet specific treatment and vice versa), or whether treatments address criminogenic factors in both contact and Internet offending groups as a homogenous concept? This is an important distinction. Depending on the significance of offender cross over between groups (i.e., from contact to Internet offending or vice versa), it may be that current treatment is failing to adequately address important risk factors unique to group membership. This in turn, may (inadvertently) fail to prevent membership to the alternate sexual offender group. It has been demonstrated that targeting non-criminogenic factors, or factors non-specific to the population being treated results in no change to reoffending (Latessa & Lowenkamp, 2005).

Some research has explored this concept of cross over and examined whether Internet offenders progress to commit a contact offence. In a meta-analysis by Seto, Hanson and Babchishin (2009), it was revealed that 12.2% of Internet sexual offenders had previously engaged in contact sexual offences, while this figure increased to 55.1% when including self-reports by offenders. In 2009, the ‘Butner Study’ revealed that the Internet offenders in their sample were significantly more likely to have sexually abused a child via a contact offence, than not (Bourke & Hernandez, 2009). The Butner Study outlined “a substantial percentage of men in treatment at Butner who claimed to be at “low risk” of harm to children because they exclusively collected child abuse images and allegedly never molested a child, subsequently indicated that, in fact, they had committed acts of undetected child sexual abuse (Bourke & Hernandez, 2009, p.185).” These
findings are complex. On the one hand, they suggest that groups are largely homogenous and perhaps indiscriminate intervention strategies may be sufficient. However, this assumption is oversimplified because it is clear that heterogeneous characteristics exist between groups. Without addressing these heterogeneous characteristics between offenders, the risk of unique differences remaining untreated is an ongoing concern. Consequently, the risk of recidivism may not be sufficiently mitigated. The implications are significant, therefore understanding if clinicians are approaching treatment in a criminogenic specific way will be critical to preventing future offending and membership to alternate sexual offender groups.

The research regarding group membership illuminates opportunities for further investigation into the treatment needs of Internet offenders. While cognitive behavioural strategies have proved the most popular in the sexual offending population (Youssef et al., 2017), understanding which criminogenic factors to target are a necessary underpinning in the determination of any treatment modality (Latessa & Lowenkamp, 2005).

Matson (2002) outlines that sexual offences are committed for a range of reasons including anger, power and dominance, inappropriate sexual attraction, or inadequate social skills that preclude formation and maintenance of intimate and social relationships; although he was referring exclusively to contact offenders. Causal factors of any type of sexual offending are layered and complex. Offending is viewed as a learned behaviour that is subject to control, rather than a biological condition that can be cured (Curnow, Streker & Williams, 1998).
Therefore, ascertaining the behavioural and cognitive needs of offenders can inform the development of treatment. The following table based on Ogloff and Davis (2004) outlines the treatment needs of offenders by examining criminogenic and non-criminogenic factors. While not originally designed for sexual offenders, it is provided as a comparative basis this population.

Table 2.1
*Treatment needs of offenders*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminogenic</th>
<th>Non-criminogenic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-criminal attitudes</td>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal associates</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>Feelings of alienation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial personality</td>
<td>Psychological discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving skills</td>
<td>Group cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility/anger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 suggests that targeting variables such as pro-criminal attitudes, anti-social personality traits and substance abuse is likely to result in a reduction of risk. While a similar summary has not yet been compiled for sexual offenders, several studies have compared criminogenic and non-criminogenic risk factors between contact and Internet offenders. Middleton, Beech, and Mandeville-Norden (2005) and Middleton et al. (2006) sought to examine whether criminogenic risk factors were congruent between Internet offenders and contact offenders. The results revealed a number of similarities, namely intimacy deficits
and problems with emotional regulation. It was suggested that the behaviour of those in the intimacy deficits group reflected a need to engage in a sexual relationship with another person to alleviate loneliness and to compensate for a lack of intimacy. Individuals in the emotional dysregulation group were found to be more likely to offend in the presence of strong negative mood states, which, in conjunction with the use of sex as a coping or soothing strategy, led them to seek sexualised images of children to meet their needs (Middleton et al., 2009). These results provide a sound evidentiary basis to investigate DBT as an intervention strategy suitable for all sexual offending groups. Similarly, Morahan-Martin and Schumacher (2000) found that Internet offenders experienced higher than usual levels of depression and may have been using the viewing of CEM as a distraction from negative mood states. These results indicate that while characteristic differences between populations do exist, further research is needed in this domain to integrate these findings with targeted intervention.

What treatment has worked?

CBT has been the most widely used and evaluated intervention for contact offenders. However, only a limited number of Internet offender-specific programs exist for evaluation. In 2006, an 'Internet - Sexual Offender Treatment Program' (the i-SOTP) was given accreditation for use in the community by the National Probation Service (England and Wales). The program was largely based upon the tenets of CBT. The key elements of the program as outlined in Middleton (2008) are to:
- Increase motivation, decrease denial and identify and reduce discrepancy between perceived pro-social values and behaviour (addressing distorted attitudes).

- Challenge offence supportive attitudes and behaviours (addressing distorted attitudes).

- Build an empathic response to identifying that children depicted in the indecent images are real victims of child abuse (addressing distorted attitudes and socio affective functioning).

- Reduce use of sexual offending as a coping strategy and emotional avoidance, replacing it with effective problem solving strategies (addressing socio-affective functioning and self-management).

- Develop adequate relationship, intimacy and coping skills; improve self-esteem and internal locus of control (social adequacy factors and self-management).

- Develop realistic relapse prevention strategies and new pro-social lifestyle goals (addressing self-management and socio-affective functioning).

Middleton et al. (2009) assessed the clinical impact of the program following completion of psychometric assessments pre- and post-treatment by a sample of 264 convicted Internet offenders. The results revealed an improvement in deficits concerning socio-affective functioning (emptiness, lack of empathy, loneliness) and a decrease in pro-offending attitudes. Specifically, the treatment
increased offenders’ level of self-esteem over time, and results indicated that they were better able to accept responsibility for their behaviour following the completion of treatment. Offenders demonstrated a significant improvement in their victim empathy abilities, and a reduction in cognitive distortions which were supportive of child sexual abuse, as well emotional over-identification with children. Lastly, results showed that 53% of the sample achieved a ‘treated profile’ (i.e., offenders must be psychometrically indistinguishable from a non-offending sample across a number of measures that consider both socio-affective functioning and pro-offending attitudes (Mandeville-Norden & Beech, 2004)). This study is one of the few to assess the efficacy of treatment in Internet sexual offenders and creates an important baseline for future work.

The study was confounded by several limitations. As this is one of the only Internet specific sexual offending treatment programs it would have been opportune to evaluate the program thoroughly to determine its overall efficacy. A comprehensive program evaluation should measure change across the program by examining the reliability of the measure (a statistical approach whereby the reliability of the difference score increases as (i) the reliability of the measure increases; (ii) the correlation between pre-test scores and difference scores increase; and (iii) the correlation between pre-test scores and post-test scores approaches zero), as well as an impact assessment determining the precise impact the program has had on the intended population. Various questions remain at the conclusion of the study by Mandeville et al. (2009) including to what extent did the program achieve its goals; what aspects of the program contributed to its
success; how can the effects of their program be improved; and how valid is the theory underlying their program? Instead, the study looked exclusively at pre- and post- measures to evaluate success without any explicit theoretical underpinning. As stated by Whitley and Kite (2013, p. 565), a theoretical underpinning plays a fundamental role, “[t]he theory of a program specifies what kinds of treatments should be provided to clients. The theory also specifies the expected outcomes of the treatment in terms of variables relevant to the theory and those relevant to the program’s goals. A theory specifies the moderating variables that can limit the effectiveness of the treatment (capability of performance) and the mediating variables that come between the treatment and the outcome.” Lastly, there are limitations to the term they coined ‘treated profile.’ Mandeville et al. (2009) state that an offender was deemed treated if he satisfied all three parts of the necessary criteria which included (i) score within the required range on all three pro-offending measures; (ii) score within the required range on three of the five scales that measure socio-affective functioning; and (iii) score within the required range on relapse prevention measure. While these elements are empirically supported by the literature, they are not all encompassing. That is, by requiring offenders to meet these three criteria alone, the authors essentially excluded other key determinants of a treated profile which may have been just as indicative of an offender’s rehabilitation. Factors such as a strong therapeutic alliance, changes in perception regarding use of the Internet itself and a deeper sense of agency (Rimer, 2017; Youssef, 2016) all have merit in determining the extent of an offender’s rehabilitation. Lastly, as identified by the authors, this study would
benefit from a follow up in several years to determine if offenders who were considered to have achieved a ‘treated profile’ do in fact desist from offending or go on to reoffend.

In another study by Winder and Gough (2010), Internet sexual offenders were interviewed to gain insight into their own personal accounts (of their offences). The overwhelming themes that emerged can be understood in the context of cognitive distortions, or more simply, thoughts that permit an individual to offend. Offenders distanced themselves from the idea of creating child victims; rejected the offender label for themselves due to an absence of contact offending; and presented their activities as relatively inoffensive when compared to other, mainly contact crimes. One offender was quoted as stating, “They’re enjoying it, they’re having fun, nobody’s getting harmed, they’re only pictures” (Winder & Gough, 2010, p. 130). Interestingly, offenders constructed other (contact) sexual offenders (but not themselves) in much the same way as the general public representation (obscene, insatiable predators, etc.). Other offenders attempted to absolve their culpability by asserting that their urges to view these images were ‘uncontrollable’ and therefore they were not at fault. However, offenders did indicate a level of recognition and acceptance of personal culpability and criminality post treatment. Winder and Gough (2010, p. 135) outlined, “Several participants said that it was only when they undertook treatment courses that they began to orientate to culpability regarding their offences.” Almost all participants who had been through a Sexual Offender Treatment Program (SOTP) acknowledged they were now aware of the creation
of victims through their acts. This study garners support that targeting distorted cognitions is of value in the treatment of Internet offenders, although it is not clear if this ultimately leads to a reduction in reoffending.

Moving forward, schema therapy – an approach underpinning the concept of cognitive distortions - may be a complimentary treatment modality worthy of exploration. Schema therapy has the capacity to delve into past problematic beliefs (manifesting from schemas) that have become entrenched, as well as to modify the impact those beliefs have on current behaviour.

**Schema therapy in an Internet sexual offending population**

The idea of anti-social cognitions stems from the concept of cognitive schemas. Schemas – originally termed by Piaget (Piaget & Cook, 1952) – are underlying cognitive structures, seen as the basis for guiding perceptions about the self, others, and the world, and are believed to occur automatically (Beck, 1996). Schemas are therefore a network of learned associations (Bem, 1981) that guide attention, inform perceptions, and save mental energy by providing shortcuts to interpreting incoming stimuli (Fiske & Taylor, 1984). While the terms are often confused, schematic associations are *not* synonymous with beliefs. Instead they provide the basis for beliefs.

Similar to attachment types, cognitive schemas are shaped in childhood; unsatisfactory early experiences can generate dysfunctional cognitive schemas about the self and the world (Carvalho & Nobre, 2014). Anti-social cognitions and distorted sexual scripts (i.e., the Pathways Model) relate closely to the
concept of maladaptive schemas. Maladaptive schemas are of particular interest as it has been revealed that targeting this domain can contribute to the treatment and rehabilitation of sexual offending (Carvalho & Nobre, 2014). Sexual offenders' maladaptive schemas may be related to developmental factors. Young coined the term Early Maladaptive Schemas (EMS) to describe the most basic concept of maladaptive schemas as “broad, pervasive themes regarding oneself and one's relationship with others, developed during childhood and elaborated throughout one's lifetime, and dysfunctional to a significant degree (Young, 1994, p. 9).” Because they begin early in life, schemas become familiar and thus comfortable. Young suggests that individuals with EMS distort their view of events in their lives in order to maintain the validity of their schemas. Schemas may remain dormant until they are activated by situations relevant to that particular schema (Young, Rafaeli & Bernstein, 2010). These underlying schemas may be activated by environmental cues and generate negative affect and dysfunctional coping reactions, leading to severe interpersonal difficulties and psychological maladjustment (Young, Klosko, & Weishaar, 2003). While the concept of EMS has been applied to clinical psychopathology, its application in sexual offending is limited.

Carvalho and Nobre (2014) recently compared EMSs of rapists, child sexual offenders and non-sexual offenders and found that EMSs were significantly more prevalent in individuals convicted for child sexual abuse compared to rapists and non-offenders, except in the impaired limits domain. Richardson (2005) found high levels of schemas from the disconnection/rejection
domain and from the over vigilance/inhibition domain in a sample of adolescent
sexual abusers. In another study, EMSs from the disconnection/rejection domain
and from the other-directedness domain were found to be more prevalent in child
sexual offenders compared to non-sexual violent child offenders (Chakhssi Ruiter,
& Bernstein, 2013). The persistent theme of disconnection/rejection indicates that
sexual offenders may have felt emotionally detached and neglected by their
primary care giver/s and possibly grew up in an abusive environment. As a result,
these individuals learn to internalise feelings of abandonment, instability,
isolation, undesirability and defectiveness. Basic human needs formed within a
healthy, secure attachment such as security, warmth, love, safety and stability
become a fantasy or ideal that is expected to never be met by other adults. It is not
surprising, therefore, that these individuals seek solace and a sense of fulfilment
from children who, organically, are vulnerable, safe and unconditionally loving.
Developing a clearer understanding of the interaction between EMSs and Internet
offending may aid the development of targeted intervention strategies. Continuing
the examination of treatment modalities, this paper now turns its attention to
DBT.

**Dialectical Behaviour Therapy (DBT) in an Internet sexual offending
population**

The examination of DBT in the context of sexual offending reveals a
paucity of research. This form of CBT is beginning to gain traction in other
psychopathological presentations such as substance misuse and personality
disorders (Dimeff & Linehan, 2008). DBT is an intensive form of therapy which
targets emotional dysregulation/impulsivity, distress tolerance, interpersonal effectiveness and mindfulness. The program is comprised of three core elements including individual therapy, group therapy and phone coaching in between sessions. Stinson and Gonsalves (2015, p. 1) recently investigated the application of DBT in a sexual offending population and presented their findings at the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers (ATSA) conference. In their presentation, they argued that “self-regulatory problems are quite common among sexual offenders including difficulties with emotion regulation, violent and sexual aggression, interpersonal skills deficits, suicidality, and problems with substance use. Some sex offenders may be unable to meaningfully engage in sex offender specific treatment until they address more acute symptomatology.” While they did not present results relating to treatment efficacy, they examined the applicability of DBT in this population. Their predecessors Shingler (2004) and Sakdalan and Gupta (2012) noted key clinical similarities between sexual offenders and those experiencing BPD. These researchers identified that DBT principles could be appropriate in working therapeutically with sexual offenders. Sakdalan and Gupta (2012) argue for a reconceptualisation of DBT in a sexual offending population coining it the “Wise Mind – Risky Mind” approach. This term builds on Linehan’s (1993) original “emotional mind” concept which suggests that the “wise mind” is an integration of the “emotional mind” and the “reasonable mind.” Originally this concept was created by Linehan to help BPD clients better understand their issues with affective dysregulation. While not within the scope of
this research to explore this concept in detail, Linehan’s original model is outlined below.

Figure 2.1 Dialectic of the Wise Mind (Linehan, 1993)

Sakdalan and Gupta (2012) expanded upon the model to include the ‘risky mind.’

Figure 2.2 Dialectic of the Wise Mind – Risky Mind (Sakdalan & Gupta, 2012)
In Sakdalan and Gupta’s model, only the reasonable and emotional minds overlap with the wise mind; the risky mind remains isolated. For them, “the risky mind and the wise mind coexist in a direct dialectical relationship with each other” (2012, p. 115). This enables one to view the risky mind as operating with elements of the reasonable and emotional minds present, however, working in isolation from each other. The authors argue that this can be seen when an offender is engaging in the offending process in response to overwhelming affective states.

Practical application of this model during sexual offender treatment would involve teaching offenders to identify when their risky mind is operating (i.e. such as during feelings of intense anger and loneliness, with perhaps the underlying schema of rejection and abandonment). By identifying when the risky mind is operating (rather than the wise mind), the offender can begin to implement the skills taught in Linehan’s traditional DBT program based upon emotional dysregulation/impulsivity, distress tolerance, interpersonal effectiveness and mindfulness. Congruent themes between offender characteristics, risk factors, and problematic schemas make this intervention worthy of further exploration for Internet offenders.

**Measuring longitudinal treatment outcomes of Internet sexual offenders**

The emphasis on relevant treatment variables is ultimately to one end; treatment outcomes. In particular, it is critical to understand how addressing treatment variables can help achieve reductions in dynamic risk and other
criminogenic factors. It is noteworthy to address, however, that changes in
dynamic risk factors throughout the course of treatment may not necessarily
translate to a reduction in overall risk (Olver & Wong, 2013). While traditionally,
data collection on treatment outcomes has focused solely on recidivism rates,
more recent research argues that within treatment changes should be considered
(Harkins & Beech, 2007). When shorter-term outcomes such as within treatment
variables (i.e., therapeutic alliance, homework completion, reduction in cognitive
distortions and other dynamic factors), are considered beside longer-term
outcomes (i.e., recidivism) the impact of treatment can be more accurately
assessed (Friendship, Falshaw & Beech, 2003).

Cognitive-behavioral, behavioral, and biomedical approaches have shown
the largest reductions in recidivism over time (Middleton et al., 2006; Olver,
Nicholaichuk, Gu, & Wong, 2013) in a contact offender population. Olver et al.
(2013) examined 732 Canadian contact sexual offenders via a brief actuarial risk
scale (BARS) consisting of six static items that predicted sexual and violent
recidivism. The BARS was created to control for important risk-related
differences between treated and untreated offenders. The sexual offender
programs were based upon Andrews and Bonta’s (2006) RNR principles, and
addressed a number of sexual offending criminogenic needs (e.g., deviant arousal
and fantasy, attitudes and cognitive distortions). They found that 11.7 years post
release the treated cohort of offenders had a significantly lower mean static
actuarial (BARS) score than the untreated group. Interestingly, treated offenders
exhibited significantly lower rates of violent, but not sexual, recidivism. Why this
was the case was not explored and warrants further enquiry, although is likely to be attributed to lower base rates for sexual reoffending in the first instance. Lastly, treatment completion was associated with significantly longer times to new sexual convictions and, among high risk offenders, any new violent convictions.

Several meta-analyses have been conducted on sex offender characteristics and treatment outcomes, although none have focused exclusively on Australian sex offender programs. A meta-analysis conducted by Hanson and Morton-Bourgon (2005), however, included Australian treatment programs within their broader international sample, although the focus of this meta-analysis was on persistent sexual recidivism rather than treatment outcomes specifically. As such, not all of the sample had undergone treatment. The review included 82 separate studies, involving approximately 30,000 sexual offenders from nine countries. The average observed sexual recidivism rate was 13.7% over an average at-risk period of just over six years (76 months). This review included studies of treated sexual offenders, but more than 60% of the studies involved untreated offenders, therefore determining the impact of treatment on recidivism was difficult. Nonetheless, the meta-analysis found that overall, those sexual offenders who did undergo treatment were less likely to reoffend than those who had not. While this review indicates that recidivism rates are relatively low, recidivism figures do not necessarily represent true recidivism. Underestimation of true sexual recidivism is due primarily to under- or delayed reporting of sexual offences, especially when children are implicated. Other factors such as delays in processing offenders and
the heightened likelihood of detecting offenders on community based or supervision orders may all confound true scores (Smallbone & McHugh, 2010).

More locally, researchers from Griffith University assessed the efficacy of a sex offender treatment program at Queensland Corrective Services, Australia in 2010. Their study comprised 409 adult males who had served a term of imprisonment in Queensland for a sexual offence, and who had been discharged between April 2005 and June 2008. Seventy-three (17.8%) identified as Indigenous. While ‘sexual offence’ was not specifically defined, it is assumed that the term encompassed both Internet and contact sexual offences. Results revealed that higher assessed risk and being discharged without any supervision were the biggest characteristic predictors of sexual recidivism in their sample. Matching high risk offenders to high intensity treatment programs was emphasised as essential, as was the commissioning of continued correctional support post release (Smallbone & McHugh, 2010).

As only a limited number of Internet treatment programs have been developed and evaluated, this paper returns to the i-SOTP (Mandeville et. al, 2006). In this evaluated treatment program, a positive treatment outcome was achieved when requirements for a ‘treated profile (as discussed earlier)’ were met. In Mandeville et. al.’s (2006) cohort of 196 offenders, 102 were deemed to have met criteria for a ‘treated profile’ following delivery of the i-SOTP, while 94 offenders did not. This suggests that the i-SOTP did successfully treat some Internet offenders on the basis of their own definition of ‘treated,’ however, a
more comprehensive measure could examine recidivism rates over time and correlate these with subjects who met criteria for ‘treated profiles.’

To this end, treatment programs universally share the same objectives regarding outcomes; to equip offenders with the skills to desist from reoffending or to prevent a first-time offence. This, in turn, is aimed at reducing harm to victims, the broader community, and offenders themselves, as well as deterring offenders from engagement with the criminal justice system for any (non-sexual) offence (ATSA, 2014; Smallbone & McHugh, 2010). However, treatment is only available to offenders who have a sufficient sentence duration and who meet the screening requirements for treatment eligibility. Additionally, in Australia, sexual offenders are only eligible for treatment once they have already offended and been mandated to complete a program. This is problematic as sexual offenders have low (official) recidivism rates, especially when compared to non-sexual offenders (Frieberg, Donnolly & Gelb, 2015). It would, therefore, seem the most reasonable place to allocate the bulk of resources is to first time or ‘would-be’ offenders (i.e., before they offend). It is also arguable that the exorbitant budget expenditure by the state for more punitive measures relating to longer sentences, custodial sanctions and post detention regimes are not commissioned with the true tenets of justice at heart. Rather, what is evident is a political reactivity to public pandemonium, moral panic and the culture of fear related to sexual offenders (Cohen, 2002; Frieberg, Furedi, 2006; Donnolly & Gelb, 2015; Mythen, 2014). The state continues to impose draconian measures with little evidence of efficacy in the deterrence or rehabilitation of sexual offenders. The state’s response is,
however, effective in satiating the public hysteria that surrounds sexual offenders, which in turn, has proven to be a strong political drawcard (Cohen, 2002; Frieberg, Donnolly & Gelb, 2015; Furedi, 2006). To this end, this chapter will now turn its attention to the impact that sentencing trends have on offender outcomes.

**Offender rehabilitation as an outcome of sentencing**

Sentencing outcomes (i.e., length of sentence) speak directly to the trajectory of an offender with regards to treatment, rehabilitation and community reintegration. Longer custodial sentences, for example, can result in greater levels of offender institutionalisation, making it more difficult to rehabilitate and reintegrate once released, and thereby, increasing offender risk factors post release.

Particularly problematic is the lack of research relating to sentencing outcomes for sexual offenders. While there is a substantive body of evidence examining sentencing predictors for non-sexual offences (Rydberg, Cassidy & Socia, 2017), there is limited research in this space for sexual offences (Madden, 2017). Rosenmerkel et al. (2009) found that gender differences were the most critical predictor of sentencing duration, second to only legal factors. In their study, male sexual offenders received much harsher sentences than female sexual offenders. Spohn (2009) found that sexual offenders who knew their victim were sentenced less harshly, than stranger offenders, while, Amirault and Beauregard (2014) found that sexual offenders who had child victims received harsher
penalties than those who had adult victims. In their study relating to sexual offenders, Rydberg, Cassidy and Socia (2017) discovered that sexual offenders who had a victim under the age of 13 years were more likely to experience a longer sentence (when compared to non-sexual offenders, also with a victim under 13 years). This cut off in age appears to coincide with the biological transitions of a child (i.e., puberty). Certainly, the small percentage of individuals diagnosed as pedophiles are attracted to and sexually aroused by pre-pubescent children almost exclusively. The cut off in victim age for a diagnosis of pedophilia is 13 years, among other diagnostic criteria (DSM-V, 2015). Sexual offenders who are pedophilic are known to present the greatest amount of risk to the community. However, the evidence suggests that in reality, only a very small percentage of sexual offenders are actually truly pedophilic; they are placed at between three to five percent of the overall general population, with a more likely base rate estimate of paedophilia set at one per cent (Seto, 2009).

Other research suggests that judges often lack all the information necessary to make a fully informed sentencing decision, and to compensate, will rely on ‘patterned responses’ based on offenders’ potential for rehabilitation as well as their level of risk (Albonetti, 1991). Judges are inherently part of the political machine Foucault conceptualized and coined ‘governmentality.’ Simply stated, governmentality is the way the State shapes its citizens to meet certain policy based needs (Mythen, 2014). Judges are not immune from the political pressures which serve to pacify public hysteria, rather, they are entrenched within them (Albonetti, 1991; Kramer & Ulmer, 2009). Research examining this
assertion has yielded evidence that (non-sexual) offenders’ gender and race/ethnicity are focal points for judges second only to legal factors when determining sentences (Rydberg et al., 2017). These are known as “decision making schema” (Johnson, Ulmer & Kramer, 2008). Changing these judicial processes/potential biases will be a long-term process; it is a product of cultural and political entrenchment.

Therefore, while the present research regarding predictors of sentencing for sexual offenders is not clear, it is critical that further research seeks to understand the basis for determinants of sentencing between sexual offending populations. Ensuring the sentencing process is not marred by any kind of systemic bias or discrimination against certain types of sexual offenders is pivotal in the effective rehabilitation of sexual offenders. More punitive responses to sexual offenders primarily serve to ostracise and isolate offenders, making reintegration into the community problematic and thereby inhibiting the process of rehabilitation. This, in turn, increases the risk of sexual re-offending; it is counter-productive. The burden to society of high rates of incarceration are not only of limited value to the offender, but they also impact upon an already burgeoning prison system. To this end, developing insight into the factors which impact upon sentencing outcomes can illuminate how to advance more honestly and effectively moving forward. Better outcomes for offenders will ultimately lead to better outcomes for the community. However, few studies have examined this concept through the lens of the offender. By investigating offender characteristics, it may be possible to approximate a sentence duration for any
given sexual offender group. This avenue of enquiry could help reshape the status quo longitudinally. If, for example, it can be demonstrated that certain offender characteristics are predictive of longer sentences, then a dual outcome is possible; (i) greater insight may be developed regarding sentencing processes in a bid to work towards fairer processes; and (ii) offender characteristics can be uniquely targeted within treatment as a means of addressing high risk factors and making harsher/longer sentencing more meaningful. Approaching offender rehabilitation from a clinical and empirical lens is a sound strategy that will yield effective outcomes for the community longitudinally. Basing policy changes on nationalist politics and emotional reactivity will do little to overturn the conversation pertaining to the effective management of sexual offenders.

Summary

The research on Internet offenders in comparison to contact offenders is still growing, however, this is a relative trend given Internet offending is still a field in its infancy. Research indicates that Internet offenders paint a stronger socioeconomic picture; that is, they are more educated, more likely to be in white collar roles, have lower criminal contacts with the system and are of (perceived) positive social standing. However, the research has also highlighted that in reality, they are less likely to be in an intimate relationship, are socially isolated, depressed, stressed and turn to the Internet to indulge in a “constructed persona” which allows for an alternate and autonomous reality from the physical world (Babchishin et al., 2015, Henshaw et al., 2017; Rimer, 2017).
By contrast, contact offenders are more likely to be less educated, unemployed, have a greater criminal history, indicate more anti-social traits, have greater access to victims, greater levels of impulsivity and have generally experienced greater levels of childhood abuse/adversity (Babchishin, et al., 2015; Henshaw et al., 2017). Significant group differences are therefore indicated and must be better understood.

Cross disciplinary approaches can provide greater insights to characteristics of Internet offending. Rimer’s (2017) anthropological study elucidated offender specific perspectives relating to (i) psychological characteristics of Internet offenders such as socially isolated, depressed, stressed, intimacy deficits, a lack of agency and low self-esteem; (ii) offender dichotomisation of the online/offline realms (i.e., feeling like “Jekyll and Hyde”); (iii) the construction of different boundaries for both on-and offline environments, but also within the online environment itself; (iv) online offending spaces being perceived by offenders as lacking social or law enforcement surveillance.

Little is known about sentencing factors and how these impact upon sentencing outcomes. Higher rates of incarceration of sexual offenders without the adoption of meaningful treatment programs are counterproductive to the criminal justice system and can increase a sexual offender’s risk of recidivism. Therefore, examining which characteristics of offenders lead to greater sentences may serve a dual purpose; (i) to inform judges of sentencing biases and work towards a fairer sentencing process; and (ii) provide greater insight as to which (high risk) offender characteristics should be targeted within treatment to make longer
sentence durations more meaningful with respect to offender rehabilitation.

Treatment is largely nonspecific to Internet offending, despite, evidence suggesting group differences. For example, Internet offenders experience domain specific distortions such as ‘just looking at pictures.’ The only Internet specific treatment program - the i-SOTP - (Mandeville et al., 2006) attempted to address these distortions and found that once a cognitive link was made between ‘the picture’ and ‘the child’ as a human, offenders were able to recognise that their behaviours were in fact harmful. The findings of the i-SOTP provides initial promise that the development of an offence specific intervention can reduce criminogenic factors. Consideration of a holistic and integrated treatment approach is therefore indicated. An integrative intervention program which seeks to combine elements of CBT, DBT and schema therapy may be yield strong results longitudinally and should be further explored. Such interventions should target the stage of change that the offender is currently presenting at and be commensurate to the offender’s level of risk.

The Present Research

It is evident from the current literature, that determining discrete offender profiles based on group membership is not straightforward. Rather, it is implied that differentiating between groups on the basis of sexual offence type is a complex process. One which must consider evidence from psychological, anthropological, sociological and criminological realms, if a comprehensive understanding of differences and similarities is to be gained.
The overall aim of the current research, therefore, is to develop a better understanding of the characteristics of Australian sexual offenders to determine:

(a) if characteristic differences predict group membership; and (b) if discrete intervention pathways are indicated for varied sexual offender groups. The research questions and hypotheses are outlined in Table 2.2 below.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

Table 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do specific characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, differ between Internet, contact and dual sexual offenders?</td>
<td>Internet sexual offenders are predicted to have a higher level of education, lower level of alcohol and other drug (AOD) use, and be in stable relationships, when compared to contact and dual sexual offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Can specific characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, predict sexual offender group membership?</td>
<td>Offender characteristics which predict Internet group membership will be different to contact and dual group membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do sexual offenders have a greater number of contacts with the criminal justice system according to their</td>
<td>Internet sexual offenders will have fewer previous contacts with the criminal justice system,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The term ‘index offence’ refers to a sexual offence/s committed at one particular time point in the offender’s criminal history whereby all the psychological and psychiatric data were collected and analysed for the present research.  

1 The term ‘index offence’ refers to a sexual offence/s committed at one particular time point in the offender’s criminal history whereby all the psychological and psychiatric data were collected and analysed for the present research.
Chapter Overview

Research questions were addressed by comparing and contrasting three sexual offender groups including Internet, contact and dual offenders, across offender characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors. This chapter details the rationale, aims, research questions and hypotheses of the current research.

Rationale for the Research

The increase of Internet based sexual crimes against children is due in part to the proliferation of the Internet. This includes access, distribution and production of child exploitation material (CEM). Research has examined whether Internet offenders share a similar profile to contact or dual offenders. Limited data exist on detailed offender characteristics, particularly in an Australian population. The current research aims to close this research gap by addressing relevant research questions. A summary of how this research design was translated into research questions, and appropriate statistical analyses, is presented in Table 3.1 below.
Table 3.1

*Summary of the research questions and corresponding studies, samples and analyses (prior to Multiple Imputations).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is being explored?</th>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who are they?</td>
<td>Do specific characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, differ between Internet, contact and dual sexual offenders?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics, Chi-Square Goodness of Fit, Binary Logistic Regression, Multinomial Logistic Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are they?</td>
<td>Can specific characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, predict sexual offender group membership?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Multinomial Logistic Regression, ROC analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did they enter the criminal justice system for?</td>
<td>Do sexual offenders have a greater number of contacts with the criminal justice system according to their</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics, Chi-Square Goodness of Fit, Binary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Characteristics of Australian Sexual Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Type (i.e., Internet vs. contact vs. dual)?</th>
<th>Logistic Regression, Multinomial Logistic Regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Why did they enter/re-enter the criminal justice system?**

| Can the presence of specific characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, predict reoffending over time according to group membership? | 2 | 202 | Cox’s Proportional Hazards Model |

| Sentence duration/outcomes | Can the presence of specific characteristics including demographic, psychological, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, predict sentence duration according to group membership? | 3 | 356 | Weighted Least Squares Regression |

---

This research was conducted as part of a larger data linkage project carried out by Swinburne University of Technology, the Department of Justice and
Regulation, Victoria Police and the Department of Health. The parent project characterised all individuals sentenced with any Internet offence between 2004 and 2014, although the overall data range provided by Corrections Victoria was for a longer timeframe. The parent project investigated basic demographics, legal and mental health histories, and Internet specific characteristics.

The current study empirically compared the characteristics of those sentenced and treated for (1) Internet offences; (2) contact offences; and (3) both Internet and contact offences (i.e., dual offenders), during a broader time period (2000-2014).

**The Current Study**

Contrasting the parent study, the current study had a more concise and detailed focus on offender characteristics. The current study evaluated a broader range of demographics, psychosocial data, such as childhood abuse and adversity, legal and mental health histories, general and offence specific attitudes, emotional states prior to offending, risk assessment characteristics (based on the Static 99), psychometric scores pre-and post (mandated) treatment, attitudes during treatment, recidivistic information following the completion of treatment and sentence related characteristics.

**Research Sample**

The initial research sample included 450 adult offenders who were randomly selected from the parent study sample of 2000 offenders. For the
present study, offenders were randomly selected across the study’s date range of 2000 and 2014. Offenders were convicted of one or more sexual offences involving a child victim. Offenders were sentenced to either a custodial or community based sentence. Retrospective offender data were manually collected from paper and/or electronic offender files provided by Corrections, Department of Justice and Regulation. As no contact was made with offenders, informed consent was not required. Offenders diagnosed with an intellectual disability or an acquired brain injury (11) were excluded from the sample. Similarly, individuals who had exclusively offended against adult victims (12) were removed from the sample to allow for a thorough analysis of sexual offending against child victims only. Due to the limited number of female offenders (4), they were also removed from the sample. The remaining sample size available for analysis comprised of 423 participants, of whom, 105 had received treatment from Corrections and therefore psychometric scores pre and post treatment were collated for this sub sample of offenders.

**Data Sources**

- Corrections Victoria Information Management System (CVIMS)
- e-Justice (electronic data management system shared by members of the Department of Justice)
- Prisoner Information Management System (PIMS)
- Paper files
Materials

No tests or other materials were administered to participants for the purpose of this research. All participant information was retrospective in nature and any psychometric tests administered were previously carried out by various administrative staff in Corrections Victoria.

A psychometric test battery compiled by Corrections Victoria was administered by Corrections Victoria staff to participants who engaged mandated treatment (where offenders gave their consent to do so). The battery was administered to participants before and after treatment. The tests included in the battery were the Self-Esteem scale, Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI), Relationship Questionnaire, Social Avoidance scale, Fear of Negative Evaluation scale, Fear of Intimacy scale, Assertion Inventory, Paulhaus deception scale (PDS), Child Identification, Multiphasic Sex Inventory, Abel and Becker, Hostility Towards Women, Burt Rape Myth, Wilson’s Sexual Fantasy and Emotional Control Questionnaire -II. Where available, such psychometric data were collated for participants in the present study, however, due to large volumes of missing data (i.e., >50%) the decision was made to not proceed with any analysis relating to this data. The following risk assessment data were collated from offender files and utilised for the purpose of this research.

Actuarial Risk Assessment: Static 99. The Static 99 is a ten-item actuarial measure designed to assist in the prediction of sexual and violent recidivism for adult male sexual offenders. The test was developed by Hanson and Thornton (2000) based on follow-up studies from Canada and the United Kingdom with a
total sample size of 1,301 sexual offenders. The Static-99 produces estimates of future risk based on a number of risk factors present in any one individual which are deemed as unchangeable (i.e., static). The risk factors included in the test are the presence of age less than 25 years old, having never lived with a lover for two continuous years, index non-sexual violence, having a history of non-sexual violence, prior sexual violence, the number of previous sentencing dates, have a history of non-contact sex offences, having male victims, having unrelated victims, and having stranger victims.

Scores range from zero to 12, therefore while it is possible to score more than six points, the top risk score is six. Risk ratings are: 0, 1 Low Risk; 2,3 Moderate-Low; 4,5 Moderate-High; 6+ High-Risk. In analysing the original samples it was found that there was no significant increase in recidivism rates for scores between six and twelve. This may be due to saturation occurring after a score of six is achieved or due to the diminishing sample size.

The recidivism estimates provided by the Static 99 are based on groups of individuals and, as such, these estimates do not directly correspond to the recidivism risk of an individual offender. The offender’s risk may be higher or lower than the probabilities estimated in the Static-99 depending on other risk or protective factors not measured by this instrument (Harris, Phenix, Hanson & Thornton, 2003).

**Structured Professional Judgment: The Risk for Sexual Violence Protocol (RSVP).** The RSVP consists of a set of structured professional
guidelines which are designed to assist the process of risk assessment and management. Evaluators are required to consider, among other relevant factors, a set of risk variables determined to be important according to the body of scientific literature. The RSVP is intended for use with adult male sexual offenders.

The RSVP provides an individualised assessment addressing the nature, imminence, severity and frequency of sexual violence. Each factor is considered in past, present and likely future relevance to risk. From this, plausible scenarios for future sexual violence and relevant management strategies specific to the individual can be developed. The RSVP has been validated in overseas studies and found to have acceptable reliability and moderate predictive accuracy. Risk factors in the RSVP include: ‘Sexual Violence History’ including chronicity, diversity, escalation, physical and psychological coercion; ‘Psychological Adjustment’ including attitudes that support or condone sexual violence, extreme minimisation or denial of sexual violence and problems with self-awareness, stress/coping and problems resulting from child abuse; ‘Mental Disorder’ including sexual deviance, psychopathic personality disorder, major mental illness, problems with substance use and violent or suicidal ideation.; ‘Social Adjustment’ including problems with intimate and non-intimate relationships, problems with employment and non-sexual criminality; ‘Manageability’ including problems with planning, treatment and supervision (Hart, Kropp, Laws, Klaver, Logan & Watt, 2003).
Procedure

All 450 manual file reviews were conducted by the author on site at Corrections Victoria head office. Historical files were retrieved from Grace Records, an offsite contractor that stores files on behalf of Corrections Victoria. The remaining files were available on site or electronically. Files dated 2013-2014 were available electronically, however, in these instances data were also cross checked with the offender’s paper file. All other files pre-dating 2013 were only available in paper form.

Many files consisted of multiple psychiatric/psychological reports, often with conflicting professional opinions; offenders often refused to complete psychometric data adequately or at all; and coding for qualitative variables such as ‘mood states precipitating offending’ or ‘attitudes during treatment’ required reading through detailed treatment reports (many offenders had multiple reports on file from different clinicians) and coding categories based on clinical judgement. Deducing themes from this data was difficult and subjective. Where available, information collected from the RSVP was drawn upon to bridge some of these discrepancies (i.e., past child abuse). The RSVP was not analysed holistically as a risk assessment tool.

Data collected from offender files were largely quantitative in nature, with the remaining qualitative data being converted into quantitative form. The qualitative data available - which became the predictor variables in the forthcoming analyses - included (i) socio-demographic information such as sex, ethnicity, birth date, education, relationship history, employment history and
number of children, (ii) background data such as childhood adversity, childhood abuse or adverse life events (as an adult) (iii) psychiatric and psychological history (evaluations carried out by either Corrections Victoria, the Victorian Institute of Forensic Mental Health or external/private practitioners) including details regarding an offender’s prior psychiatric diagnoses, suicidal history, admissions to hospital and substance abuse history, (iii) psychosexual data such as paraphilias (based on diagnosis only, i.e., no phallometric measures), hypersexuality, sexual preference for children, atypical sexual interests, preferred age of victim, preferred gender of victim; (iv) offence specific factors such as type of offence, number of victim/s, age of victim/s, number of child pornography images or videos; (v) attitudes towards offending such as offence minimisation/justification/denial; (vi) offence specific factors such as financial hardship, family issues implicated in offending, hostility towards authority, involvements with criminal associates, mood states present, alcohol and other drug use in offending, inability or unwillingness to consider consequences for victim; (vii) Static 99 scores; (viii) emotional factors at the time of offending; (ix) legal status data including Victoria Police criminal court outcomes reports (i.e., criminal history) and Victoria Police list of follow up offences (post index offence).

**Predictor Variables**

An outline of the most relevant predictor variables incorporated in the final analysis is presented below, with particular data collection challenges
outlined. For a more detailed review of all offender characteristics coded for, please refer to Appendix Three for the coding form.

**Socio-demographic information.** Given the static nature of these variables, they were fairly straightforward to collect. Variables such as sex, ethnicity, birth date, education level, relationship history, employment history and number of children were factually based and as such did not pose any particular problems.

**Psychosocial data.** Background data such as childhood adversity, childhood abuse or adverse life events (as an adult) were more difficult to code and were defined as follows.

**Childhood adversity.** This variable included the following events: severe family dysfunction; parental separation; parental mental illness; parental substance use or incarceration; domestic violence; parental absence; bullied; family relocation; lack of peer network; consumed alcohol young; parents lacked warmth/emotion; chronic/ongoing incontinence; witness to murder or death (suicide); parental death; abusive environment; placed in foster care; parental abandonment; mental illness of child; felt like a ‘loner’; refugee; lonely; felt unsafe at school; academically challenged; left home young; never met parent; always angry; illegitimate child; exposed to sex early; family member died; family member with mental illness (other than parent); learning disability; emotionally immature; ill parent requiring care; didn’t get along with siblings; strict parent; harsh upbringing (e.g., war); sexually abused sibling; suspended from school; generally unhappy childhood.
**Childhood abuse.** This variable included any sexual, emotional, or physical abuse the child experienced, as well as severe neglect.

**Adverse life events.** This variable included the following events which occurred post childhood: parental death; war survivor; parental mental illness (not in childhood); significant loss of loved one; physical ailment; adopted; socio-economic disadvantage; sexual, physical or emotional abuse; engaged in prostitution; disabled parents; homeless; psychiatric patient; ill/disabled child; bullied; incontinent; death of child; lost access to children; child with mental illness; had an accident; mental breakdown; perpetrated (bullying, assault); early sexual experience; migrated; mental illness; assaulted; rejected by significant person; parent was prisoner of war; separated from parents by country; incorrectly incarcerated and subsequently acquitted/released; difficult marriage; broken relationship with children; racially abused; carer of family member; declared bankruptcy; confused about sexuality; suicidal at young age; had to work as child; parent commit serious crime; frequent displacement/relocation; lack of friends; divorced.

**Psychiatric/psychological history.** These evaluations included details regarding an offender’s background, mental state examination, prior psychiatric diagnoses, suicidal history, admissions to hospital and substance abuse history, offending history, sexual history, clinician opinions/formulations and recommendations. Such reports were often challenging to code due to the often-conflicting nature of diagnoses and opinions of multiple clinicians. Where vastly different opinions were documented, the author read through all available file
documents in depth and made a subjective decision based on clinical experience/judgment.

**Psychosexual data.** Information such as paraphilia diagnoses, hypersexuality, sexual preference for children, atypical sexual interests, preferred age of victim and preferred gender of victim were often absent from offender files. These categories ultimately resulted in large percentages of missing data and no doubt reflect the broader definitional challenges currently being experienced and debated in the academic and clinical community.

**Offence specific factors.** With exception to number of child pornography images or videos, information such as type of offence, number of victim/s, age of victim/s, were mostly available and clearly outlined. The number of child pornography images or videos were documented at times in police reports, however, there was a large volume of missing data on this variable.

**Attitudes towards offending/Offence specific attitudes.** These categories comprised of a cluster of questions that were administered to offenders upon reception either in custody or during initial supervision with a Community Corrections Officer (CCO). Many of these items were therefore subjectively assessed by either the prison office or CCO. Items measured included: offence justification; minimise the nature of offending; minimise or deny impact of offending on the victim; condone or support offending or criminal lifestyle; minimise impact of offending on self; drug or alcohol abuse apparent, does the person deny it’s a problem; person reject sentence or believe it’s too severe; does the person show hostility to the assessor/fail to co-operate; involvements with
criminal associates; alcohol and other drugs (AOD) in offending; mental disorder in offending; direct access to previous victims\(^2\); mood states present; financial pressure related to offending; pro criminal/anti-social attitudes; family pressure as factor in offending; and inability or unwillingness to think about consequences of offending on victim.

**Inter-rater reliability**

Due to the subjective nature of the data collection process, a research assistant was employed to blind code 10\% of the data set. The results of the blind coding were compared to a matched sample collated by the author and analysed via Cohen’s Kappa statistic. A subset of 15\% of the total number of predictor variables was randomly selected and examined. The results are presented in Table 3.2 below.

Table 3.2

*Inter-Rater Reliability of Predictor Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Agreement %</th>
<th>Expected Agreement %</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Prob&gt; Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of offender</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphilias</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>72.52</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood states present</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>42.41</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Direct access to victims sought to measure whether an offender had ready access to children (i.e., either their own children, access to children via family members or in their community). This item was assessed by either prison officers at the time of offender reception into prison, or by community corrections officers.
Landis and Koch (1977) suggest the following interpretations:

Table 3.3

Interpretation of Inter-Rater Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohen’s Kappa % Range</th>
<th>Adequacy of Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 0.0</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00-0.20</td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.21-0.40</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41-0.60</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61-0.80</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81-1.99</td>
<td>Almost perfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores in Table 3.3 provide evidence for strong inter-rater reliability where variables were unambiguous (i.e., age, type of offender). Data which were qualitative in nature and needed to be coded based on clinical judgement predictably resulted in lower Kappa estimates. Despite this, it was decided that the data would still be utilised due to limited alternate options. Collection of data in Corrections Victoria follows stringent procedural guidelines and attempting to
collect similar data in a more robust manner would not have been operationally feasible.

**Design**

Participants were randomly selected from the larger project sample. Entry and exit from the study was arbitrary depending upon the participant’s offending and willingness to complete psychometric screening. The study was retrospective in nature as the sample of participants were measured over a historic time frame between 2000 and 2014, all at different time points. The central focus of the study was to examine characteristics of sexual offenders (Internet, contact and dual) who were charged with an index offence. The secondary purpose of the study was to examine predictor characteristics of those who reoffended at a later date, and to examine predictive characteristics of sentence duration.

**Data Coding, Screening and Cleaning**

Prior to analysis, all data were examined for missing values and fit between their distributions, and to determine whether assumptions of univariate and multivariate analysis were met. The final dataset (MASTER) comprised 117 variables. In its raw state, there were many ‘unknowns’ and ‘not available’ classifications in addition to empty cells. Various classifications were synonymous and therefore recoded. As a result, numerous data issues were identified which significantly impacted the second and third studies. Details of all three studies are outlined below.
Study one. Study one comprised of a satisfactory sample size after exclusions (i.e., intellectual disability (ID)/acquired brain injury (ABI)/female offender/adult victim only) were adjusted for (n=423); Hosmer, Lemeshow and Sturdivant (2013) suggest at least 10 observations per independent variable in the model. Following data screening and cleaning the predictor variables were reduced to approximately 40 to ensure the model would be statistically robust. The final sample size for study one allowed for univariate and multivariate analyses to be carried out on the original dataset. The missing data did not adversely impact the results of study one, except where very large numbers of missing data existed within any given predictor variable (i.e., hypersexuality, atypical sexual interests, number of CEM images or videos). Where this was the case, such variables were removed from analysis. The missing data did not cause any regression assumptions to be problematic/violated.

Data screening revealed that the assumptions were met for the chi square goodness of fit tests including; (i) one categorical variable; (ii) independence of observations; (iii) mutual exclusivity; and (iv) at least five expected frequencies in each group of the categorical variable (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2004). For the logistic and multinomial logistic regressions, assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity are not required (i.e., as they would be for a general linear model/linear regression). There are a range of other assumptions that were met for logistic regression including; (i) binary logistic regression requires the dependent variable to be binary and ordinal logistic regression requires the dependent variable to be ordinal; (ii) logistic regression assumes that P(Y=1) is the
probability of the event occurring, therefore it is necessary that the dependent variable is coded accordingly; (iii) the model should be fitted correctly; (iv) the error terms need to be independent (i.e., each observation to be independent); and (v) the independent variables are linearly related to the log odds. For the multinomial regression, three key assumptions were explored after the model was fit including: (i) the outcome follows a categorical distribution; (ii) independence of observational units; and (iii) linear relationship between covariates and expectation of the outcome (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2013). These assumptions were deemed satisfactory.

**Study two.** The large volume of missing data adversely impacted study two. Despite numerous attempts to fit a Cox proportional hazards model, it was not possible to fit a model successfully. The cell count was simply too low with some of the variables’ final $n$ count being as low as three subjects once split between offender groups (Internet, contact, dual) and once mapped to various time points. Removing these problem variables reduced the final sample size to 202 subjects. Additionally, upon examination of descriptive data, sexual reoffence rates were placed between 5-7.5% for each offender group. This made statistical analysis of sexual reoffending (across time) on the original data set not possible. For example, with the original sample size of $n=423$, only 10 out of 132 Internet offenders had sexually reoffended. Once the dataset was reduced to $n=202$ to compensate for all the missing data problems, this number reduced to single digits (in some cases as few as seven). A decision between eliminating study two completely or seeking an alternate option, therefore, had to be made. Eliminating
study two completely was a last resort. An alternate option was to employ multiple imputation (MI), however, this was a contentious decision given the process of MI can impact upon the integrity of original data and result in an artificial data set. Also, fitting a scientifically robust MI dataset requires advanced technical expertise due to its complexity. At a basic level, if MI is employed, it needs to be matched fairly closely to the original data set. Allison (2012) states, “your imputation model has to be ‘congenial’ with your analysis model. The two models do not have to be identical, but they can’t have major inconsistencies. And there are lots of ways that they can be inconsistent. For example, if your analysis model has interactions, then your imputation model better have them as well.” Therefore, as the primary researcher I needed to consider that if MI was utilised and ultimately not congenial, it would compromise the integrity of the data too greatly and produce biased results, or at worst, highly misleading results. However, if it was suitable it would potentially allow for an initial examination of reoffending based on the current sample, setting the groundwork for further studies to replicate results with a larger dataset. It was therefore decided that as an exploratory measure, the data would be imputed and congeniality would be determined by comparing predictor variable consistency between the two data sets (original vs. MI) before any final decisions were made. Contingent upon the fit of the MI data with the original data, a decision would subsequently be made as to whether to fit a regression model or abandon study two. An outline of the MI rationale followed is outlined below.
Multiple Imputation Rationale. MI represents a major advancement in the treatment of missing data. MI is advantageous over traditional methods, as it preserves the full dataset, as opposed to listwise deletion which unfairly penalises the sample size by removing all missing values. MI produces estimates that are consistent with existing data, can be applied to any distribution of data, and can be used with missing at random (MAR) data (Allison, 2002).

An absence of stringent auditing processes within Corrections Victoria resulted in large volumes of missing data which could not retrospectively be obtained. In some cases, offenders refused to answer certain questions, while other cases of missing data were the result of administrative errors by staff. To handle the missing data, one option was to remove these cells completely but retain the variable (with the remainder of cells that were not missing), however, this may have resulted in large standard errors due to reduced sample sizes. Another major limitation of excluding all the missing values was the likelihood of biased estimates. For example, the sample of observations that had no missing data might then have altered the representability of the full sample (Gelman & Hill, 2006). It was therefore decided in consultation with a professor of statistics, that the data would undergo a MI process in an attempt to preserve its integrity. Where data were insufficient for an imputation process the variable was completely removed. The MI process is described below.

Multiple Imputation Process. To rectify missing values in the present study, the MI nine step process was implemented as per the guidelines of Manly and Wells (2012). The nine steps are outlined below.
Report rates of missing data. 56 variables were used in the MI algorithm. Several variables were not imputed due to the proportion of missing data being greater than 50% as recommended in Manly and Wells (2012). These include number of treatment sessions (55.61%), sexual preference for children (65%), Abel and Becker score (75%), follow-up offence type (72%) and follow up number of offences (70%). The average missing data rate across all included variables was 20.53% with SD of 13.53%. The maximum missing data proportion was children's gender (49.64%).

Reporting reasons data are missing. There were a number of reasons why data were missing including: (i) offenders randomly refused or were unable to answer certain questions; (ii) professional and/or administrative staff collecting or entering data may have made errors that resulted in the omission of certain data cells; and (iii) data collection/entry by the author of this thesis was incorrectly entered.

Report evidence of ignorable patterns or assumptions. MAR data were assumed in the present MI. It is unlikely that the data were Missing Completely at Random (MCAR), but if they were, the MI algorithm is robust to departures from the stringent assumptions posed by MCAR. Missing Not at Random (MNAR) is not possible to be differentiated from MAR because the researcher would need to have an idea about the specific nature of the missing data. Sensitivity analysis would be able to differentiate, however this was not possible given the complexity of the process and the stringent time constraints imposed to this present study. Subsequently MAR had to be assumed in the present use of MI.
Report variables used in the imputation phase. Included variables in the MI algorithm were the following: (i) dependent variable: offence type; (ii) continuous variables: age first offence, age, minimum age, maximum age, number of victims, number of charges and number prior charges; (iii) ordinal variables: type of sentence, educational level, employment, profession, relationship, suicide, sexuality, preference for gender, children's gender; and (iv) binary variables: gender, ethnicity, childhood adversity, abuse, adverse life events, ever been in a significant relationship, ever married, lived with partner, substance abuse, alcohol abuse, paraphilias, sexual preference for children, attitude questions, offence attitude questions, Static 99 level (low/high), DSM-IV-TR binary coded (presence/absence).

Communicate the algorithm procedure. MI using Stata’s ‘mi impute’ command, was used to impute missing data, using predictive mean matching from the ten nearest neighbours and chained equations. Predictive mean matching (PMM) is a partially parametric method that matches the missing value to the observed value with the closest predicted mean (or linear prediction). PMM combines the standard linear regression and the nearest-neighbor imputation approaches. It uses the normal linear regression to obtain linear predictions. It then uses the linear prediction as a distance measure to form the set of nearest neighbors (possible donors) consisting of the complete values. Finally, it randomly draws an imputed value from this set. By drawing from the observed data, PMM preserves the distribution of the observed values in the missing part of the data, which makes it more robust than the fully parametric linear regression.

*Report the number of iterations.* Up to 50 resamples were drawn. This corresponds to the maximum amount of missing data amongst the included variables as suggested by Royston and Lambert (2011).

*Pooling of MI analysis results.* Estimation was carried out using Stata’s ‘mi estimate’ command, following ’Rubin's mi estimate estimates model parameters from multiply imputed data. Coefficients and standard errors were adjusted for the variability between imputations. This process ran the specified estimation command on each of the ‘M imputed’ datasets to obtain the ‘M completed-data’ estimates of coefficients and their variance covariance estimators (VCEs). The MI estimates of coefficients and standard errors were then computed by applying a combination rules (Rubin, 1987, 1977) to the ‘M completed-data’ estimates.

*Describe any notable imputation results.* The differences between the actual (raw) data and the imputed data overall was variable. For some variables, the data sets matched closely, however, for other variables data matching was low. Refer Table 3.4 below.

Table 3.4

*Multiply Imputed Data Examples –Imputed vs Non-Imputed Data Matching %*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Missing Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Original Raw)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imputed Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Raw + Imputed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 1
Childhood Adversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>35.32</th>
<th>33.97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64.48</td>
<td>66.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 2
Ever Been in a Significant Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>15.75</th>
<th>12.57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84.25</td>
<td>87.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 3
Victim Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31.11</th>
<th>18.14</th>
<th>16.58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>66.35</td>
<td>67.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>15.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a combination of factors including: (i) the variance between the MI results and the original data (outlined above); (ii) the variability in inter-rater reliability on certain predictor variables; and (iii) the fact that any MI analysis would be exploratory, rather than indicative/conclusive of findings, it was decided that utilising the MI data for this analysis was not warranted. Concerns over the interpretability/integrity of any analyses based on such artificial data were too great. Given the small sexual re offence rates in the original data set, the decision
was ultimately made not to proceed with a survival analysis for study two. Consequently, descriptive statistics (from the original dataset) were examined via chi square goodness of fit tests regarding re-offence rates and integrated within study one under ‘legal status’.

**Study three.** For study three, a general linear model (GLM) (multiple regression) was initially proposed to examine which characteristics predicted sentence duration (continuous outcome variable). Assumptions of the GLM/ordinary least squares (OLS) regression require the data to: (i) be normally distributed; (ii) be linear; (iii) not indicate multicollinearity; (iv) be homoscedastic; and (v) not indicate autocorrelations between predictor variables (Henrik, 2010). Initial screening revealed that the data was highly skewed (i.e., non-normal) and heteroscedastic. Details are outlined below.

**Normality.** To verify that the data met normality, a histogram was examined for sentence months overall (custodial and community sentences). It revealed a rightly skewed data set indicating non-normal data. Consequently, a log transformation was performed on the dependent variable. Two histograms are outlined below revealing pre-and post log transformations.
Figure 3.1 Histogram Sentence Months (Not Log Transformed)

Figure 3.2 Histogram Sentence Months (Log Transformed)
The second histogram revealed that while the log transformation did significantly adjust the data, it ultimately remained non-normal. This was confirmed by a Shapiro Wilk test which verified that the data was in fact non-normal after log transformation, $W = 3.14, p<.05$.

As a result, a number of other log transformations were investigated via box plots including ‘square root sentence months,’ ‘log sentence months + 1 and’ ‘inverted sentence months.’ None of the additional log transformations rectified the normality problem and it was ultimately decided that the original log transformed data remained the most suitable option. The Box Plots outlining normality via the various log transformations are outlined below.

![Box Plot Sentence Months](image)

*Figure 3.3. Box Plot Sentence Months Original Data*
Figure 3.4. Box Plot Sentence Months Overall – Log Transformed

Figure 3.5 Box Plot Sentence Months – Square Root Transformed
Figure 3.6 Box Plot Sentence Months – Log Transformed + 1

Figure 3.7 Box Plot Sentence Months – Inverted Transformation
Following inspection of the above box plots, normality troubleshooting further included investigating the ‘offender type’ variable as well as numerous predictor variables for normality. As a sample, two predictors - adverse life events and offence justification - are outlined below following Figure 3.8.

*Figure 3.8. Box Plot Offender Type (Internet, Contact, Dual)*

The box plot above indicated that data across offender type groups were largely normal and not deemed to be problematic. Outliers were also deemed to have not impacted the data significantly.
The box plot above indicated that data across (all) offender type groups, adverse life events and offence justification were mostly/approximately normal and not deemed to be significantly problematic. Outliers were also deemed to have not impacted the data significantly.

Lastly, interaction effects were also investigated for many predictor variables and no interactions were detected. For sampling purposes – adverse life events and offence justification – are once again outlined. These variables revealed that no interaction effects were detected, (OR 1.07 [CI -0.58, 0.43], p > 0.05).

All of the diagnostic tests indicated that overall the data was normal for all variables, with exception to the outcome variable – sentence months, which
remained non-normal.

Given the data remained non-normal following a log transformation, it was decided that two options were viable to proceed with. First, it was decided that a weighted least squares (WLS) regression was more appropriate than a GLM. A WLS attaches non-negative constants (weights) to data points and is used primarily when the data violates the assumption of heteroscedasticity and when other OLS assumptions are not met (Stata Base Reference Manual, 2017). The weights assigned to the data points are automatically determined by STATA.

Second, the alternative to a WLS – particularly given the non-normal dataset – was to perform a nonparametric regression. Nonparametric regressions provide an opportunity to obtain estimates that are robust to functional form misspecification (Stata Base Reference Manual, 2017). A kernel based estimator is most appropriate when the outcome variable is continuous. Nonparametric kernel-based estimators rely on an optimal bandwidth parameter that trades off bias and variance. However, non-parametric regressions come with significant complexities including: (i) calculating the estimates are complex and time consuming. The usual estimators depend on a smoothing parameter; this is typically difficult to select as there is no unique/obvious “optimal choice” for it; (ii) they require much larger data sample sets than parametric regressions because the theoretical motivation for estimators is mostly asymptotic (i.e., STATA suggests starting with (at least) n=500); and (iii) problems with dimensionality; as the data dimensions grow, the estimators require larger and larger sample sizes. Given the starting sample size was n=202, the dataset was deemed insufficient in
size and it was decided that the most suitable option was to proceed with a WLS model.

*Limitations of WLS.* Perhaps the most concerning limitation of the WLS is that the modelling is based on the assumption that the weights are known exactly. This is virtually impossible to attain, therefore estimates must be used instead. If the estimates deviate too greatly from their ideal value, the results can be significantly affected. Weights can be calculated manually, or estimated via software applications. For the current study, the weights were estimated by STATA.

*Other data adjustments.* Other changes to the dataset included (i) amalgamation of adjacent categories due to small cell numbers (e.g., casually employed offenders were amalgamated with part time employed offenders); (ii) recoding of ambiguous codings e.g., N/A, unknown, unexplained small numbers; and (iii) removal of predictors with small numbers of data, and large amounts of missing data.

**Ethical Considerations**

As the current research project comprised a sub sample of the parent project, the ethical process outlined in this section references the parent project. Approval was obtained from the following bodies/organisations:

- Victoria Police Research Coordinating Committee
- Corrections Victoria Research Committee
- National Coronial Information System Research Committee
Informed consent. Participants were not directly involved in the research, therefore the results of the study were not made available to individual participants. The parent study adopted a data linkage framework which sought information from a number of collaborating organisations as outlined above. This presented complications in seeking informed consent from each individual, therefore, it was decided they would not be made aware their data were being utilised for research purposes. A waiver of consent was obtained. The researchers of the larger parent study proposed to waive the requirement of informed consent specifically due to the magnitude of the sample size (at least 2000 participants in the larger data linkage study), the possibility that contacting participants may have caused them undue distress and embarrassment, and lastly, due to some participants being more likely to consent than others, resulting in a sample bias. This ethical request was formally granted.

However, participants were able to access the results of the study through the following methods:

- Written research reports, findings summaries and/or research presentations
- Peer reviewed manuscripts in numerous academic journals
- Two doctoral theses made available through Swinburne University of Technology
- Conference presentations, training workshops, reports to other forensic psychology or criminal justice organisations and online web based summaries.

**Data storage.** Data were obtained in both electronic and hard copy form. Throughout the research process all data was kept on, and transported via, password protected USB storage devices. Limited individuals had access to these devices. These devices were stored either at the Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science or Corrections Victoria. For the current study, as all data were collected from Corrections Victoria, the password encrypted USB will be returned to Corrections Victoria upon completion of the research. In accordance with legal requirements, data will be retained for seven years.
CHAPTER FOUR: METHOD OUTLINE
(STUDIES ONE AND THREE)

Chapter Overview

The focus of the first study was to determine which characteristics best predicted sexual offender group membership across Internet, contact and dual sexual offenders. The hypotheses were addressed using descriptive statistics, univariate tests (chi square goodness of fit) and tests of prediction (logistic regressions and multinomial logistic regressions). The data was mostly qualitative in nature, with some quantitative (psychometric) data also collected. The focus of the second study was to examine sexual re-offence rates based upon offender characteristics. As this study was ultimately excluded from the research, it is henceforth not referred to in the chapters to follow. The focus of the third study was to examine sentencing duration based upon offender characteristics across Internet, contact and dual offenders. The method adopted for study one is firstly outlined below.

Study One: Sexual Offender Characteristics: A Comparative Study of Internet, Contact and Dual Offenders

Following data screening and cleaning, study one was executed in two stages: (1) univariate analysis; and (2) multivariate analysis.

Step One: Univariate Analysis. For the initial phase of analysis, descriptive statistics, chi square goodness-of-fit tests, logistic and multinomial
regression tests were employed to assess differences between sexual offender groups (Internet, contact and dual offenders) on a number of participant characteristics. The characteristics comprised of binary, ordinal or nominal scales. Where continuous data were available, multinomial logistic regression logs were carried out instead. Following the examination and cleaning of predictor variables, the following variables in Table 4.1 remained in the study for analysis.
### Table 4.1

_Predictor Variables Utilised for Analysis_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Psychiatric</th>
<th>Psychometric</th>
<th>Offence Specific Factors</th>
<th>Attitudes Towards Offending</th>
<th>Offence Specific Attitudinal Factors</th>
<th>Static 99 Total Score</th>
<th>Treatment Factors</th>
<th>Legal Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at index offence</td>
<td>Childhood adversity</td>
<td>Paraphilia</td>
<td>Type of sentence</td>
<td>Offence justification</td>
<td>Criminal associates</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Emotional state prior to offending</td>
<td>Prior offence type/date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first ever offence</td>
<td>Abused during childhood</td>
<td>Type of offender</td>
<td>Length of sentence</td>
<td>Minimise offending</td>
<td>Alcohol or other drugs in offending</td>
<td>Ever lived with a lover</td>
<td>Number of treatment sessions completed</td>
<td>Index offence type/date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Adverse life events (as an adult)</td>
<td>Sentencing date</td>
<td>Deny offending</td>
<td>Mental disorder</td>
<td>Index non-sexual violence</td>
<td>Attitudes during treatment</td>
<td>Follow up offence type/date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Psychiatric</th>
<th>Psychometric</th>
<th>Offence Specific Factors</th>
<th>Attitudes Towards Offending</th>
<th>Offence Specific Attitudinal Factors</th>
<th>Static 99 Total Score</th>
<th>Treatment Factors</th>
<th>Legal Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>DSM-IV-TR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condone or support offending</td>
<td>Direct access to victim</td>
<td>Prior non-sexual violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>History of alcohol abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimise impact on self</td>
<td>Mood states present</td>
<td>Prior sex offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at index offence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drug or alcohol use history</td>
<td>Financial pressure</td>
<td>Prior sentencing date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>History of substance abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship at index offence</td>
<td>History of suicide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reject sentence</td>
<td>Pro criminality</td>
<td>Any convictions for non-contact sex offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td>Psychometric</td>
<td>Offence Specific Factors</td>
<td>Offence Specific Attitudinal Factors</td>
<td>Static 99 Total Score</td>
<td>Treatment Factors</td>
<td>Legal Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever lived with a partner</td>
<td>Person shows hostility</td>
<td>Family pressure</td>
<td>Any unrelated victims</td>
<td>Unable or unwilling to consider consequences</td>
<td>Any stranger victims</td>
<td>Any male victims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Step Two: Multinomial Logistic Regression.** The development of a predictive model of offender type drew upon the principles of purposeful selection to create a comprehensive model for analysis. Purposeful selection of variables is suitable when there is a sufficient literature base to inform selection of predictor variables. Variables included for purposeful selection were therefore chosen based on (i) empirical research; and (ii) clinical judgement to allow for the most parsimonious model. The final variables chosen were deemed as carrying empirical and clinical importance in the context of the current analysis. Table 4.2 outlines the variables chosen via purposeful selection and the corresponding empirical evidence supporting their inclusion in the model. Following the process of purposeful selection, a backward elimination method was applied to build the ‘optimal model.’ It was determined that backwards elimination was favourable over forward selection because it is possible for any given set of variables to have considerable predictive ability despite the fact a subset of them may not. In forward selection, this fact is unlikely to be identified. If variables do not predict well individually, they are unlikely to be noticed and will therefore not be entered into the model. However, backwards elimination begins with all the variables, so any joint predictive capability will be detected.

The process of backward elimination resulted in the least significant predictors being dropped one by one until the remaining predictors were statistically significant at $p<.05$. The resulting, reduced model, is referred to as the ‘optimal model.’
Table 4.2

*Predictor Variables chosen via Purposeful Selection and their Empirical Rationale for Inclusion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Empirical Rationale</th>
<th>Reference/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Online sexual offenders are more likely to attain higher education levels than contact sexual offenders.</td>
<td>Aslan &amp; Edelmann (2014); Babchishin et al. (2015); Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Online sexual offenders most likely to be engaged in a higher status of employment (i.e., white collar).</td>
<td>Aslan &amp; Edelmann (2014); Babchishin et al. (2015); Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship at time of offending</td>
<td>Online sexual offenders most likely to not have experienced relationship at time of offence and more likely to be lonely, socially isolated than contact offenders.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015); Elliott et al. (2009); Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever lived with a partner</td>
<td>Online sexual offenders most likely to have never lived with a partner compared to contact offenders.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015); Elliot et al. (2009); Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor Variable</td>
<td>Empirical Rationale</td>
<td>Reference/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been in a relationship</td>
<td>Online sexual offenders more likely to have never been in a relationship compared to contact offenders.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015); Elliot et al. (2009); Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood adversity</td>
<td>Contact sexual offenders more likely to experience childhood adversity when compared to online sexual offenders.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse life event (as adult)</td>
<td>Unclear-insufficient literature. This variable included on the basis of differences among other similar variables pertaining to abuse/adversity.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental illness diagnosis</td>
<td>Contact sexual offenders more likely to have a mental illness diagnosis when compared to online sexual offenders.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015); Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide history</td>
<td>Undetermined. This variable included on the basis of differences among other similar variables pertaining to mental illness.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor Variable</td>
<td>Empirical Rationale</td>
<td>Reference/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphilia</td>
<td>Online offenders more likely to be diagnosed with a paraphilia when compared to contact offenders.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual preference of child</td>
<td>Mixed findings. Contact sexual offenders more likely to emotionally identify with children than online offenders, although limited literature suggests online sexual offenders are more likely to have a sexual preference for children.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015); Elliot et al. (2009); Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>Undetermined.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual reoffending</td>
<td>Limited in terms of comparisons, however, online sexual offenders more likely to reoffend if they had prior sexual or non-sexual offences in their history.</td>
<td>Seto &amp; Eke (2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of charges (index)</td>
<td>While the number of offences is not adequately researched between sexual offender</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015), Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor Variable</td>
<td>Empirical Rationale</td>
<td>Reference/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups, online sexual offenders are likely to have less extensive criminal histories when compared to contact offenders.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015), Elliot et al. (2009), Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offence justification</td>
<td>Online sexual offenders less likely to experience cognitive distortions around offending when compared to contact sexual offenders.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015), Elliot et al. (2009), Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise offending</td>
<td>Online sexual offenders less likely to experience cognitive distortions around offending when compared to contact sexual offenders.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015), Elliot et al. (2009), Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol or other drugs in offending</td>
<td>Contact sexual offenders more likely to experience AOD issues than online offenders.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015), Henshaw et al. (2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct access to victim</td>
<td>Contact offenders more likely to have direct access to victims when compared to online offenders.</td>
<td>Babchishin et al. (2015).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mood states present | Higher levels of emotional loneliness found among online sexual offenders, although similar levels of mood disorders between sexual offender groups. | Babchishin et al. (2015), Henshaw et al. (2017).

Unable or unwilling to consider consequences | Online sexual offenders less likely to experience cognitive distortions around offending when compared to contact sexual offenders. | Babchishin et al. (2015), Elliot et al. (2009), Henshaw et al. (2017).

Study Three: Predictors of Sentence Duration: A Comparative Study of Internet, Contact and Dual Offenders

A GLM was conceptualised as the analysis of choice for study three, however, as noted earlier, two key assumptions were violated and a WLS regression was chosen instead. Study three was subsequently executed in two stages: (i) a WLS regression was performed on offenders who were given a custodial sentence; and (ii) a second WLS regression was performed on offenders who were given a community sentence. This method was chosen since the duration of community and custodial orders cannot be deemed equivalent.

**Study three predictor variables.** The predictors initially included in the model for study three were the same variables as those utilised in the multinomial
multiple regression model from study one and were grouped under the following ten categories: (i) socio-demographic information; (ii) psychological history (including background data such as childhood adversity, adverse life events, substance abuse etc.); (iii) psychosexual factors; (iv) offence specific factors; (v) attitudes towards offending; (vi) offence specific attitudinal factors; (vii) Static 99 scores; (viii) emotional factors at the time of offending; (ix) legal data; and (x) offender type (Internet, contact or dual). Following screening for missing data and data errors, the final variables which remained in the model were: ethnicity, education, employment, relationship, childhood adversity, abuse, adverse life events, ever been in an intimate relationship, DSM-IV-TR diagnosis, substance abuse, alcohol abuse, suicide, paraphilia, prior number of charges, offence justification; minimise the nature of offending; minimise or deny impact of offending on the victim; condone or support offending or criminal lifestyle; minimise impact of offending on self; drug or alcohol abuse apparent, does the person deny it is a problem; person rejects sentence or believe it’s too severe; does the person show hostility to the assessor/fail to co-operate; involvements with criminal associates; alcohol or other drugs in offending; mental disorder in offending; direct access to previous victims; mood states present; financial pressure related to offending; pro criminal/anti-social attitudes; family pressure as factor in offending; and inability or unwillingness to think about consequences of offending on victim.
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS STUDY ONE

SEXUAL OFFENDER CHARACTERISTICS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INTERNET, CONTACT AND DUAL OFFENDERS

Chapter Overview

To explore the proposed research questions of the present study, statistical analyses were performed using STATA for Windows version 14 licensed by STATA Corp LP. This section is organised into two key sections. The first section outlines the demographic characteristics of the sample and provides a quantitative analysis of which observed offender characteristics were significantly different than those expected by chance. This was achieved by performing Chi Square Goodness of Fit tests. For covariates which yielded significant results, either a Logistic Regression or Multinominal Regression was then performed to determine exactly where the statistical difference was located (i.e., between which particular groups).

The second section examines the Multinominal Multiple Regression model (based upon the original dataset) which was used to predict the probabilities of different possible outcomes of the three sexual offender groups, given a set of offender characteristics as described in section one. This was followed up with a Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analysis to determine best fit for the model.
Section One – Univariate Analysis of Offender Characteristics

The offender characteristics evaluated were grouped into the following eight broader categories: (i) demographic; (ii) psychological (including background data such as childhood adversity, adverse life events, substance abuse, etc.); (iii) psychometric; (iv) attitudes towards offending; (v) offence specific factors/attitudes; (vi) Static 99 scores; (vii) treatment factors; and (ix) legal status. Assumptions were screened to determine any violations. There were no violations.

Overview of ‘demographic’ analyses. Sexual offender demographic characteristics were examined to determine differences between groups. Variables examined include (i) ethnicity; (ii) education; (iii) employment at time of offence; (iv) relationship at time of offence; (v) ever lived with a partner; and (vi) sexuality. The $n$ values and their corresponding percentages are outlined in Table 5.1.
Table 5.1

*Offender Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Internet n=134</th>
<th></th>
<th>Contact n=121</th>
<th></th>
<th>Dual n=157</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ethnicity</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Aust.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALD</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Education</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(at time of offending)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10 or less</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58.51*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE course</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary (incomplete)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Employment (at time of offending)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>Casual or Part Time</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Full time student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>62.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship Status (at time of offending)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Status</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Partnered, De facto or Married</th>
<th>Separated or Divorced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.00*</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>55.05*</td>
<td>22.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.75</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td>18.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship Status (ever)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Status</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.62</td>
<td>19.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.11</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.97</td>
<td>11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ever Lived With a Partner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lived With Partner</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.71</td>
<td>39.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.80</td>
<td>25.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sexuality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>105</th>
<th>89.7</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>87.6</th>
<th>121</th>
<th>85.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes significance at p<.05. This value was significantly different from the other two groups in the same row (unless otherwise indicated).

**Demographic results.** Univariate analyses revealed that participants across the three sexual offender groups differed significantly on several characteristics. The statistical results indicated that for the variables education, relationship status, ever lived with a partner, and ever been in a significant relationship, the frequencies of sexual offender group are not equally distributed; frequencies are statistically different from what would be expected by chance. The results are detailed below. All other demographic characteristics including ethnicity, employment and sexuality were not statistically different from what would be expected by chance.

**Education.** Significant differences were found when comparing education levels across the offender groups $\chi^2(12, n = 343) = 24.64, p = .004$. Internet offenders were more likely to have completed tertiary education (11.97%) than either contact (2.13%) or dual offenders (7.58%). Contact Offenders were more likely to have completed Year 10 or below (58.51%) than either Internet (30.77%) or dual offenders (42.42%). The results were not deemed statistically significant at the multivariate level.
Relationship status (at time of offending). Significant differences were found when comparing relationship status across the offender groups $\chi^2 (4, n = 370) = 13.61, p = .009$. Internet offenders were more likely to be single (45.00%) than either contact (22.02%) or dual offenders (34.75%). Contact offenders were more likely to be in a current relationship (55.05%) than either Internet (37.50%) or dual offenders (46.81%).

The odds ratio was 2.90 for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders, with 95% CIs [1.62, 5.17], $p < .001$. The odds ratio was 1.88 for contact offenders when compared to dual offenders, [1.06, 3.33], $p = .029$.

Ever lived with a partner. Significant differences were found when comparing ever lived with a partner across the offender groups $\chi^2 (2, n = 344) = 13.61, p = .004$. Internet offenders were more likely to have never lived with a partner (39.29%) than either contact (20.00%) or dual offenders (25.20%).

The odds ratio was 2.59 for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders, with 95% CIs [1.40, 4.76], $p = .002$. The odds ratio was 1.92 for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders, [1.10, 3.33], $p = .020$.

Ever been in a significant relationship. Significant differences were found when comparing relationship status across the offender groups $\chi^2 (2, n = 388) = 7.82, p = .020$. Internet offenders were more likely to have never been in a significant relationship (19.38%) than either contact (7.99%) or dual offenders (11.03%).
The odds ratio was 2.80 for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders, with 95% CIs [1.25, 6.30], \( p = .012 \). The odds ratio was 1.94 for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders, [0.98, 3.82], \( p = .056 \).

**Overview of ‘psychological’ analyses.** Sexual offender psychological characteristics were examined to determine differences between groups. Variables examined include (i) abuse in adulthood (physical, sexual, emotional and/or psychological); (ii) childhood adversity (bullying, parental mental illness, parental substance abuse, parental death, financial disadvantage); (iii) adverse life events; (iv) alcohol abuse at time of offending; (v) substance abuse at time of offending; (vi) suicidality and (vii) the presence of a DSM-IV-TR diagnosis. The \( n \) values and their corresponding percentages are outlined in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2

*Offender Psychological Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Characteristic</th>
<th>Internet ( n=134 )</th>
<th>Contact ( n=121 )</th>
<th>Dual ( n=157 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abuse in Childhood*

- Yes: 31 (25.41) 42 (42.00) 58 (41.13)
- No: 91 (74.59*) 58 (58.00) 83 (58.87)

*Totals*: 122 (100) 100 (100) 141 (100)

*Childhood Adversity*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adverse Life Events</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol Abuse</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substance Abuse</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suicidality</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.41*</td>
<td>37.59</td>
<td>62.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.91</td>
<td>31.09</td>
<td>68.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.56</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>77.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adverse Life Events</strong></td>
<td>46.27</td>
<td>53.73</td>
<td>46.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.24</td>
<td>48.76</td>
<td>51.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.05</td>
<td>43.95</td>
<td>56.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol Abuse</strong></td>
<td>33.91</td>
<td>53.47*</td>
<td>33.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.47*</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>53.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>61.90</td>
<td>38.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substance Abuse</strong></td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>72.16</td>
<td>19.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suicidality</strong></td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>73.91</td>
<td>18.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Psychological results. Univariate analyses revealed that participants across the three sexual offender groups differed significantly on a number of characteristics including (i) abuse in childhood (physical, sexual, emotional and/or psychological); (ii) childhood adversity (bullying, parental mental illness, parental substance abuse, parental death, financial disadvantage); (iii) alcohol abuse at time of offending; (iv) substance abuse at time of offending; and (vi) DSM-IV-TR diagnosis. All other variables including adverse life events and suicidality were not statistically different from what would be expected by chance. The results are outlined below.

**Childhood abuse.** Significant differences were found when comparing childhood abuse across the offender groups $\chi^2 (2, n = 363) = 9.10, p = .011$. Internet offenders were less likely to have been abused in childhood (25.41%) than either contact (42.00%) or dual offenders (41.13%).
The odds ratio was 2.12 for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders, with 95% CIs [1.20, 3.75], \( p = .009 \). The odds ratio was 2.05 for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders, [1.21, 3.75], \( p = .008 \).

**Childhood adversity.** Significant differences were found when comparing childhood adversity across the offender groups \( \chi^2 (2, n = 408) = 7.98, \ p = .018 \). Internet offenders were much more likely to have experienced adversity in childhood (37.59%) when compared to Contact (31.09%) and Dual offenders (22.44%).

The odds ratio was 2.08 for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders, with 95% CIs [1.24, 3.48], \( p = .005 \).

**Alcohol abuse (ever).** Significant differences were found when comparing alcohol abuse across the offender groups \( \chi^2 (2, n = 342) = 9.29, \ p = .010 \). Contact offenders were more likely to have abused alcohol (53.47%) than either Internet (33.91%) or dual offenders (38.10%).

The odds ratio was 2.39 for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders with 95% CIs [1.29, 3.88], \( p = .004 \). The odds ratio was 1.87 for contact offenders when compared to dual offenders, [1.10, 3.16], \( p = .021 \).

**Substance abuse (ever).** Significant differences were found when comparing substance abuse across the offender groups \( \chi^2 (2, n = 338) = 6.22, \ p = .045 \). Internet offenders were less likely to have abused substances (19.13%) than either contact (27.84%) or dual offenders (33.33%).
The odds ratio was 2.11 for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders, with 95% CIs [1.17, 3.83], \( p = .014 \).

*History of DSM-IV-TR diagnosis.* Significant differences were found when comparing DSM-IV-TR diagnosis across the offender groups \( \chi^2 (2, n = 400) = 6.15, p = .046 \). Contact offenders were less likely to have received a DSM-IV-TR diagnosis (33.62%) than either Internet (48.87%) or dual offenders (44.37%).

The odds ratio was 1.89 for Internet offenders when compared to contact offenders, with 95% CIs [1.12, 3.15], \( p = .015 \).

*Overview of ‘psychosexual’ analyses.* One sexual offender psychosexual characteristic was examined to determine differences between groups - paraphilias. The \( n \) values and their corresponding percentages are outlined in Table 5.3 below.
Table 5.3

*Psychosexual characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychosexual Characteristic</th>
<th>Internet (n=134)</th>
<th>Contact (n=121)</th>
<th>Dual (n=157)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraphilia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 (8.73%)</td>
<td>11 (9.40%)</td>
<td>26 (17.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>115 (91.27%)</td>
<td>106 (90.60%)</td>
<td>124 (82.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>126 (100%)</td>
<td>117 (100%)</td>
<td>150 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes significance at p<.05. This value was significantly different from the other two groups in the same row (unless otherwise indicated).*

**Psychosexual results.** Univariate analyses revealed that participants across the three sexual offender groups differed significantly on paraphilias. The results are outlined below.

**Paraphilias.** Significant differences were found when comparing paraphilia diagnosis across the offender groups $\chi^2 (2, n = 393) = 5.95, p = .051$. Dual offenders were more likely to have received a paraphilia diagnosis (17.33%) than either Internet (8.73%) or contact offenders (9.40%).

The odds ratio was 2.19 for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders, with 95% CIs [1.03, 4.64], $p=.040$. This indicates that dual offenders were twice as likely to have a recorded paraphilia when compared to Internet offenders.
**Overview of ‘attitudes towards offending’ analyses.** Sexual offender attitudes towards offending characteristics were examined to determine differences between groups. Variables examined included offence justification, minimise offending, deny offending, minimise impact on self, condone or support offending, drug or alcohol history, reject sentence and person shows hostility. The \( n \) values and their corresponding percentages are outlined in Table 5.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Towards Offending</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n = 134 )</td>
<td>( n = 121 )</td>
<td>( n = 157 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offence Justification</strong></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>( n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60.91</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39.09</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimise Offending</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66.96</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deny Impact of Offending on Victim</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.89</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Characteristics of Australian Sexual Offenders**

**Total n**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>95</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>116</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Condone or Support Offending**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condone or Support Offending</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>91.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>88.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>90.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total n**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>108</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>121</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Alcohol and Other Drug History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and Other Drug History</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>81.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.67*</td>
<td>66.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>76.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total n**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>113</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>98</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>134</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Minimise Impact on Self**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimise Impact on Self</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>94.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>93.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>93.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total n**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>112</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>130</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Reject Sentence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reject Sentence</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>89.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>82.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total n**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>119</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>140</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Person Shows Hostility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person Shows Hostility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>89.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>82.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudes towards offending results. Univariate analyses revealed that participants across the three sexual offender groups differed significantly on one characteristic; drug or alcohol history. All other variables including offence justification, minimise offending, deny impact on victim, condone or support offending, minimise impact on self, reject sentence and person shows hostility were not statistically different from what would be expected by chance.

Drug or alcohol history. Significant differences were found when comparing drug or alcohol history across the offender groups $\chi^2 (2, n = 345) = 6.51, p < .040$. Contact offenders were more likely to have a drug or alcohol history (33.67%) than either Internet (18.58%) or dual offenders (23.88%).

The odds ratio was 2.22 for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders, with 95% CIs [1.18, 4.19], $p = .013$.

Overview of ‘offence specific attitudes’ analyses. Sexual offender offence specific attitudinal information was examined to determine differences between groups. Variables examined included direct access to victim, drug or alcohol a factor in offending, mood states present, criminal associates, mental disorder, financial pressure, pro criminality, family pressure and unable or unwilling to consider consequences. The $n$ values and their corresponding percentages are outlined in Table 5.5 below.
Table 5.5
Offence specific characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Towards Offending</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=134</td>
<td>n=121</td>
<td>n=157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direct Access to Victim**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>90.32</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>90.32</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65.49</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drug or Alcohol a Factor in Offending**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84.78</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84.78</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70.45</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mood States Present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49.53*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50.47</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50.47</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73.47</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criminal Associates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>97.25</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>97.25</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>97.44</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mental Disorder**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Pressure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro Criminality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Pressure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unable or Unwilling to Consider Consequences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41.77</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49.47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total n</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes significance at p<.05. This value was significantly different from the other two groups in the same row (unless otherwise indicated).
**Offence specific attitude results.** Univariate analyses revealed that participants across the three sexual offender groups differed significantly on several characteristics; direct access to victim and mood states present. All other variables including alcohol or drugs present in offending, criminal associates, mental disorder, financial pressure, pro criminality, family pressure and unable or unwilling to consider consequences were not statistically different from what would be expected by chance. The results are described below.

**Direct access to victim.** Significant differences were found when comparing direct access to victim across the offender groups $\chi^2 (2, n = 379) = 33.99, p < .001$. Dual Offenders were more likely to have direct access to a victim (40.85%) than either Internet (9.68%) or contact offenders (34.51%).

The odds ratio was 6.44 for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders, 95% CIs [3.25, 12.76], $p < .001$. The odds ratio was 4.91 for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders, [2.42, 10.01], $p < .001$.

**Mood states present.** Significant differences were found when comparing mood states across the offender groups $\chi^2 (2, n = 331) = 11.42, p = .003$. Internet offenders were more likely to have been experiencing a mood state during offending (49.53%) than either contact offenders (26.53%) or dual offenders (38.89%).

The odds ratio was 2.71 for Internet offenders when compared to contact offenders, with 95% CIs [1.51, 4.89], $p = .001$. The odds ratio was 1.76 for dual offenders when compared to contact offenders, [0.99, 3.12], $p = .053$. 


Overview of ‘Static 99 score’ analyses. Sexual offender Static 99 ‘total’ scores were examined to determine differences between groups, however, it is noteworthy that limited results were available for this risk assessment tool due to the tool itself being unsuitable for Internet offenders (where there was no physical contact with the victim). The final distribution of the Static 99 resulted in an $n=28$ for Internet offenders$^3$, $n=90$ for contact offenders and $n=140$ for dual offenders.

Static 99 results. A one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that the Static 99 total score was significant between groups, $F(2, 255) = 11.55, p = .000$. Post hoc analyses were performed via a Bonferroni correction which resulted in adjusted alpha levels of .017 (.05/3). Results indicated that the average Static 99 total score for Internet offenders ($M = 8.75, SD = 3.35$) was significantly higher than the average Static 99 total score for Contact offenders ($M=6.17, SD = 3.01$) and the average Static 99 total score for Dual/Mixed offenders ($M = 7.39, SD = 2.29$) was significantly higher than the average total score for Contact offenders ($M=6.17, SD = 3.01$). Table 5.6 details the Static 99 scores according to offender type.

---

$^3$ Internet offenders were available for analysis in the Static 99 as they included cases where there was an identifiable victim within the CEM.
Table 5.6

*Static 99 Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Static 99 scores</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n=134$</td>
<td>$n=121$</td>
<td>$n=157$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of ‘treatment factors’ analyses. Sexual offender treatment factors were examined to determine differences between groups. Variables examined included number of treatment sessions completed (descriptive only). The $n$ values and their corresponding percentages are outlined in Table 5.7 below.

Table 5.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of treatment sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>26.93</td>
<td>32.68</td>
<td>35.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>12.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $n$</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes significance at $p<.05$. This value was significantly different from the other two groups in the same row (unless otherwise indicated).
**Treatment factor results.** Univariate analyses revealed that participants across the three sexual offender groups were not statistically different from what would be expected by chance regarding their attitudes during treatment.

**Overview of ‘legal status’ analyses.** Sexual offender legal status was examined to determine differences between groups. Variables examined included follow up offence type. The $n$ values and their corresponding percentages are outlined in Table 5.8 below.

Table 5.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Status</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n=134$</td>
<td>$n=121$</td>
<td>$n=157$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow up</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All criminal reoffending</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sexual reoffending only</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any sexual reoffending</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Univariate analyses revealed that participants across the three sexual offender groups did not differ significantly from what would be expected by chance on follow up offence items.

### Internet offending

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contact offending

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dual offending

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual offending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total n

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes significance at p<.05. This value was significantly different from the other two groups in the same row (unless otherwise indicated).
Section Two: Multinomial Multiple Regression Model – Predicting Group Membership by Sexual Offender Type

A multinomial multiple regression model was fit to predict the probabilities of sexual offender group membership across three groups (Internet, contact, dual), given a set of offender characteristics as described in section one of this chapter. The characteristics deemed relevant for final input into the model were the result of both purposeful selection and an examination of the findings from section one and included: (i) abuse; (ii) paraphilias; (iii) offence justification; (iv) number of charges; (v) childhood adversity; (vi) alcohol abuse (vii) mood states present; (viii) condone or support offending behaviour; (ix) relationship status; (x) DSM-IV-TR diagnosis; (xi) minimise the nature of offending; (xii) condone or support offending; and (xiii) direct access to victim. A backward elimination process was then utilised to establish the ‘optimal’ final model. All of the above variables were entered into the model initially at the same time, with the least significant predictor being removed singularly one at a time until the model of best fit was determined. The model of best fit was established when the final possible set of predictors were all of significance in either level of the dependent variable. A comparison of the difference between McFadden’s $R^2$ and McFadden’s adjusted $R^2$ was also utilised to guide the optimal model. As expected, when the number of non-significant predictors were removed from the model, the difference between the two McFadden’s values decreased, indicating the model became stronger. The final model was considered the most parsimonious. The results are outlined below.
Table 5.9 shows the relative risk ratios, confidence intervals and $p$ values for all significant variables included in the final model.

Table 5.9

Multinomial Multiple Regression Odds Ratios (OR), Confidence Intervals (CI) and $P$ Values for the Relationship between Internet, Contact and Mixed/Dual Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Characteristics</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$95%$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contact vs. Internet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Characteristics</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol abuse</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.12 6.32</td>
<td>.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of charges</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.22 1.72</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct access to victims</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.07 11.30</td>
<td>.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status married</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.34 11.25</td>
<td>.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood states present</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.10 0.57</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dual vs. Internet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Characteristics</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of charges</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.54 2.25</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct access to victims</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>2.67 26.76</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the nature of Offending</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.14 0.94</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Dual vs. Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value 1</th>
<th>Value 2</th>
<th>Value 3</th>
<th>Value 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship – married</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol abuse</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of charges</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the nature of offending</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct access to victims</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>.039*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes significance at p<.05
Multinomial Multiple Regression Results - Overall Model

The final model produced a significant result, $\chi^2 (203) = 128.22, p < .001$, Craig-Uhler (Nagelkerke) $R^2$ variance of 51.70%. McFadden’s $R^2$ variance 28.10% and McFadden’s Adjusted $R^2$ variance 18.90%.

Contact vs. Internet

Results for Contact offenders (compared to Internet offenders as the reference group) are outlined below.

Alcohol Abuse. The odds ratio was 2.67 for alcohol abuse for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders, with 95% CIs [1.12, 6.32], $p < .027$.

Number of Charges. The odds ratio was 1.45 for number of charges at index offence for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders, [1.22, 1.72], $p < .001$.

Direct Access to Victims. The odds ratio was 3.48 for having direct access to victims for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders, [1.07, 11.30], $p = .038$.

Relationship status- partnered/de facto/married. The odds ratio was 3.90 for being partnered/de facto/married for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders, [1.34, 11.25], $p = .012$.

Mood States Present. The odds ratio was 0.28 for having a mood state at the time of offending for contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders, [0.10, 0.57], $p = .001$. 
Dual vs. Internet

Results for dual offenders (compared to Internet offenders as the reference group) are outlined below.

**Number of charges.** The odds ratio was 1.85 for number of charges at index offence was for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders, with 95% CIs [1.54, 2.25], *p* < .001.

**Direct access to victims.** The odds ratio was 8.45 for having direct access to victims for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders, [2.67, 26.76], *p* < .001.

**Minimise the nature of offending.** The odds ratio was 0.36 for minimising the nature of offending for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders, [0.14, 0.94], *p* = .032.

Dual vs. Contact

Results for dual offenders (compared to contact offenders as the reference group) are outlined below.

**Relationship - Partnered/De facto/Married.** The odds ratio was 0.25 for being in a partnered/de facto/married relationship at the time of offending for dual offenders when compared to contact offenders, with 95% CIs [0.10, 0.63], *p* = .003.

**Alcohol Abuse.** The odds ratio was 0.43 for alcohol abuse for dual offenders when compared to contact offenders, [0.19, 0.63], *p* = .037.
**Number of charges.** The odds ratio was 1.27 for having six or more charges at index offence for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders, [1.08, 1.49], \( p = .002 \).

**Minimise the nature of offending.** The odds ratio was 0.30 for minimising the nature of offending for dual offenders when compared to contact offenders, [0.12, 0.73], \( p < .001 \).

**Direct access to victims.** The odds ratio was 2.43 for having direct access to victims was for dual offenders when compared to contact offenders, [1.04, 5.63], \( p = .039 \).

**Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curve Analysis**

A ROC curve is a plot of *sensitivity (the ability of the model to predict an event correctly)* versus *1-specificity* for the possible cut-off classification probability values \( \pi_0 \). In the current model, the ROC curve was executed to examine how much predictive power the model has. In the graph below, the ROC curve is displayed for Internet vs. Contact offenders. The Area Under the Curve (AUC) is 0.85 indicating a large effect size (Rice & Harris, 2005).
Figure 5.1 ROC Internet vs. Contact

Area under ROC curve = 0.8473
In the graph below, the ROC curve is displayed for Dual vs. Contact offenders. The Area Under the Curve (AUC) is 0.91 indicating a large effect size (Rice & Harris, 2005).

*Figure 5.2 ROC Internet vs. Dual*
CHAPTER SIX: STUDY THREE RESULTS

PREDICTORS OF SENTENCE DURATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INTERNET, CONTACT AND DUAL OFFENDERS

Chapter overview

To explore the proposed research questions of the present study, statistical analyses were performed using STATA for Windows version 14 licensed by STATA Corp LP. This section outlines the results of a variance weighted least squares (WLS) regression model which was performed to examine which offender characteristics predicted sentence duration across offender types (Internet, contact and dual) and across sentencing types (community vs. custodial).

Descriptive Statistics Overall

Overview of ‘all sentencing types’ analyses. Sexual offender sentencing types were examined to determine differences between groups. The $n$ values and their corresponding percentages are outlined in Table 6.1 below.
Table 6.1

Type of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sentence</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75.44*</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.56*</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes significance at p<.05. This value was significantly different from the other two groups in the same row (unless otherwise indicated).

**Type of sentence.** Significant differences were found when comparing type of sentence across the offender groups $\chi^2 (2, n = 356) = 79.98, p = <.001$. Internet offenders were more likely to have a community corrections/based order (i.e., CCO/CBO) (75.44%) than either contact offenders (29.36%) or dual offenders (24.06%). Dual offenders (75.94%) and contact offenders (70.64%) were more likely to be sentenced to custody than Internet offenders (24.56%).

The odds ratio was 9.68 for Internet offenders compared to dual offenders for a community based sentence, with 95% CIs [1.69, 2.85], $p = <.001$. The odds ratio was 0.10 for Internet offenders compared to dual offenders for a custodial sentence, [-2.85, -1.69], $p = <.001$. The odds ratio was 7.39 for Internet offenders compared to contact offenders for a community based sentence, [1.41, 2.59],
The odds ratio was -0.14 for Internet offenders compared to contact offenders for a custodial sentence, [-2.59, -1.41], \( p<0.001 \).

**Descriptive Statistics - Community Sentence**

Descriptive statistics for community sentence (duration in months) for each offender group are outlined below in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2

*Descriptive statistics – Sentence (community only) (months) by offender type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internet (n=79)</th>
<th>Contact (n=29)</th>
<th>Dual (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results – Sentence Duration (Community Sentence) by Offender Type**

A WLS model was fit to determine whether offender type (Internet, contact, dual) predicted sentence duration for community sentences. No other predictor variables were included at this stage.
Offender type. Offender type was examined to determine if it predicted sentence duration. The model was statistically significant, $\chi^2 (2) = 4.81, p = .028$. The odds ratio was 1.14 for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders with 95% CIs [0.02, 0.25], $p=.026$.

Internet offenders and predictors of sentence duration (community). A model examining predictors of sentence duration for Internet offenders was examined and statistically significant, $\chi^2 (2) = 4.74, p =.030$.

Adverse life events. The odds ratio was 1.17 for Internet offenders who experienced adverse life events when compared to Internet offenders who did not experience adverse life events, with 95% CIs [0.02, 0.31], $p=.029$.

Contact offenders and predictors of sentence duration (community). A model examining predictors of sentence duration for contact offenders was examined and statistically significant, $\chi^2 (2) = 24.75, p =<.001$.

Relationship status. The odds ratio was 1.39 for contact offenders whose relationship status was divorced when compared to contact offenders whose relationship status was married or single, [0.08, 0.59], $p=.003$.

Dual offenders and predictors of sentence duration (community). A model examining predictors of sentence duration for dual offenders was examined and statistically significant, $\chi^2 (2) = 24.75, p =<.001$.

Education. The odds ratio was 1.22 for dual offenders who completed tertiary education when compared to dual offenders who had completed high school/TAFE, [-.04, -.05], $p=.011$. 
**Descriptive Statistics – Custodial Sentence**

Descriptive statistics for custodial sentence duration in months for each offender group are outlined below in Table 6.3.

Table 6.3

*Descriptive statistics – Sentence (custodial only) (months) by offender type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internet (n=24)</th>
<th>Contact (n=66)</th>
<th>Dual (n=87)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>33.21</td>
<td>59.42</td>
<td>81.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>41.79</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>58.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results –Sentence Duration (Custodial Sentence) by Offender Type**

First, a WLS model was fit to determine whether offender type (Internet, contact, dual) predicted sentence duration for custodial sentences. No other predictor variables were included at this stage.

**Offender type.** First, offender type was examined to determine if it predicted sentence duration. The model was statistically significant, $\chi^2 (2) = 25.31, p < .001$. The odds ratio was 2.37 for contact offenders when compared to
Internet offenders, with a 95% CI [0.35, 0.72], \( p = <.001 \). The odds ratio was 3.35 for dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders [0.79, 1.19], \( p = <.001 \).

**Internet offenders and predictors of sentence duration (custodial).** A model examining predictors of sentence duration for Internet offenders was examined and statistically significant, \( \chi^2 (2) = 31.61, p = <.001 \).

**Pro criminal attitudes.** The odds ratio was 5.99 for Internet offenders who indicated pro criminal attitudes when compared to Internet offenders who did not indicate pro criminal attitudes, with a 95% CI [0.98, 2.60], \( p = <.001 \).

**Offence denial.** The odds ratio was 2.98 for Internet offenders who denied their offending when compared to Internet offenders who did not deny their offending, [0.11, 1.05], \( p = .039 \).

**Contact offenders and predictors of sentence duration (custodial).** A model examining predictors of sentence duration for contact offenders was examined and statistically significant, \( \chi^2 (2) = 24.73, p = <.001 \).

**Offence justification.** The odds ratio was 1.78 for contact offenders who justified their offending when compared to contact offenders who did not justify their offending, [0.11, 1.05], \( p = .016 \).

**Pro criminal attitudes.** The odds ratio was 2.53 for contact offenders who indicated pro criminal attitudes when compared to contact offenders who did not indicate pro criminal attitudes, [0.39, 1.48], \( p = .001 \).

**Family issues a factor in offending.** The odds ratio was 1.63 for contact offenders who indicated they were experiencing family problems at the time of
offending, when compared to contact offenders who indicated they were not experiencing family problems at the time of offending, [0.03, 0.96], \( p = .039 \).

**Dual offenders and predictors of sentence duration.** A model examining predictors of sentence duration for dual offenders was examined and statistically significant, \( \chi^2 (4) = 96.23, p < .001 \).

**Paraphilia.** The odds ratio was 2.68 for dual offenders who were diagnosed with a paraphilia when compared to dual offenders who were not diagnosed with a paraphilia, with 95% CIs [0.57, 1.40], \( p < .001 \).

**Abuse.** The odds ratio was 1.50 for dual offenders who were abused in childhood when compared to dual offenders who were not abused in childhood, [0.10, 0.73], \( p = .011 \).

**Ever lived with a partner.** The odds ratio was 0.68 for dual offenders who were in a relationship at the time of offence when compared to dual offenders who were not in a relationship at the time of offence, [-0.74, -0.03], \( p = .032 \).

**History of Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) abuse.** The odds ratio was 1.51 for dual offenders who had a history of AOD abuse when compared to dual offenders who did not have a history of AOD abuse, [0.05, 0.78], \( p < .01 \).

**Mental disorder in offending.** The odds ratio was 1.53 for dual offenders who were assessed as having a mental disorder in offending, when compared to dual offenders who were not assessed as having a mental disorder in offending, [0.00, 0.84], \( p = .049 \).
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CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSION

Chapter Overview

Research, both nationally and globally, on the characteristics of Internet offenders is limited when compared to contact offenders. The current research therefore aimed to address this limitation by investigating three key research questions within an Australian population and comparing them to international findings (due to the limited studies completed in Australia): (1) Whether Internet offender characteristics, including demographic, psychiatric, psychometric, offence specific, legal and treatment factors, differ from contact and dual offenders; (2) Whether the presence of these characteristics can predict reoffending over time according to group membership; and (3) Whether the presence of these characteristics can predict sentence duration according to group membership. Research questions one and three are discussed below. As study two was not possible based upon the data constraints, there are no study outcomes to discuss.

This chapter will commence with reviewing the findings relating to the characteristics of internet, contact and dual sexual offenders. Specifically, the following themes are addressed: (i) demographic and psychological findings; (ii) relationship and sexuality findings; (iii) attitudes relating to sexual offending; (iv) findings relating to opportunistic offending; and (v) Static 99 scores. Characteristic predictors of group membership are examined next, in particular:
(i) how internet offenders are different to contact and dual offenders; and (ii) how contact offenders are different to dual offenders. Characteristic predictors of sentence duration are then considered including: (i) findings relating to most likely sentence type; (ii) characteristics of offenders sentenced to community orders; and (iii) characteristics of offenders sentenced to custodial orders. The chapter concludes by considering research implications, future research opportunities and limitations of the study.

**Characteristics of Internet, Contact and Dual Offenders**

Study one hypothesised that (i) Internet offenders would have a higher level of education, lower level of alcohol and other drug (AOD) use, and be in stable relationships, when compared to contact and dual offenders; and (ii) Internet offenders would have fewer previous contacts with the criminal justice system, when compared to contact and dual offenders. Results indicated support for these hypotheses as well as a number of additional offender characteristics. Overall, these findings were consistent with international research.

**Demographic and psychological findings.** Results revealed that offenders’ ethnicity did not differ according to group membership. These findings are consistent with Aslan and Edelmann (2014) who found no group differences; however, they contrast with Babchishin et al. (2015) and Babchishin (2011) who found that Internet offenders were less likely to be ethnically diverse when compared to contact offenders. The current findings suggest that ambiguity exists regarding the heterogeneous profile of sexual offending groups and while further
research may illuminate a clearer profile, it is more likely that offenders’ ethnicity bears little weight in differentiating between groups. This might be attributed to the proliferation of technology and the transnational nature of the Internet itself. While all offenders in the present sample were from an ‘Australian’ sample, those who were of a racial minority were no more or less likely to engage in this style of offending. Geographically, this type of crime is not restricted, it affords the perpetrator anonymity and accessibility. It therefore may be less culturally specific and more universal in nature.

Group differences were identified regarding offenders’ levels of education. As predicted, Internet offenders were eight and a half times more likely to have completed tertiary education than contact offenders, while Internet offenders were three times more likely to have completed year eleven than contact offenders. Overall, these findings are consistent with Aslan and Edelmann (2014) and Babchishin et al., (2015) who identified that contact offenders were more likely to have a lower level of education than Internet offenders. However, it must also be noted that significant heterogeneity existed within the Internet offender group itself. While 12% of the group had completed tertiary education, approximately 30% of the group had completed year 10 or below. Therefore, while Internet offenders were (statistically) significantly more educated than contact offenders, there was also a large percentage of Internet offenders who held lower levels of education. These findings suggest that perhaps Internet offenders are not homogenous in terms of education level and this diversity needs to be taken into account when assessing this group. Lower levels of education have been
associated with poor responses to child or adolescent mental illness (McLeod & Fettes, 2007), negative family environments (Mistry et al., 2010; Sektan et al., 2010) abuse or violence experienced as a child or adolescent (Mistry et al., 2010; Sektan et al., 2010), alcohol or substance abuse, poverty (Ferguson, Bovaird, & Mueller, 2007) and unemployment (OECD, 2006; 2000).

Results in the present study provided strong support for the presence of many of these variables in a contact offending population. Specifically, the current study revealed that contact offenders were almost two and a half times more likely to have experienced alcohol abuse when compared to Internet offenders, while, contact offenders were almost twice as likely to have abused alcohol when compared to dual offenders. Conversely, dual offenders were twice as likely to have abused a substance when compared to Internet offenders. Babchishin et al.’s (2015) research supports these findings and indicates that contact offenders are more likely to experience AOD issues when compared to Internet offenders. The lack of substance abuse by Internet offenders in the present study might suggest that alternate offending mechanisms are present in this group. Seto et al. (2006) suggest that Internet offending is a valid predictor of sexual deviance. Indeed, the present findings suggest that Internet offenders are less likely to be disinhibited during offending due to mind altering substances. This finding has implications for treatment and may suggest that targeting different psychological mechanisms to that of contact offenders is indicated.

The literature regarding childhood abuse or adverse childhood experiences (i.e., bullying at school, separation/divorce of parents, death of a parent or
siblings) indicates that contact offenders are more likely to experience childhood abuse (sexual or physical) and adversity (family disruption) when compared to Internet offenders (Babchishin et al., 2015). These findings were partially replicated in the current study. Contact offenders were twice as likely to have been abused (sexual, physical or emotional) as a child when compared to Internet offenders, while dual offenders were also twice as likely to have been abused as a child when compared to Internet offenders. However, no differences were found between contact offenders and Internet offenders regarding childhood adversity. Dual offenders, however, were twice as likely to have experienced childhood adversity when compared to Internet offenders. These findings are consistent overall with the assertion that contact and dual offenders have experienced more abusive or adverse childhoods than Internet offenders. Further research should investigate whether these variables (i.e., childhood abuse and adversity) are correlated with a proclivity to ‘act outwards’ or externalise problematic behaviours. This would, in turn, help in developing a greater understanding as to how individuals who stereotypically externalise problematic behaviours have their needs met through the commission of a contact sexual offence.

The current findings indicated that Internet offenders were almost twice as likely to have a mental illness diagnosis when compared to contact offenders. The research in Babchishin et al. (2015), however, indicated that while no differences were found between groups when measuring general mental illness (i.e., reports of depressive or anxiety experiences), contact offenders were more likely to have a severe mental illness diagnosis (i.e., schizophrenia) than Internet offenders.
When investigating paraphilia diagnoses, the current study revealed no differences between contact offenders and Internet offenders; however, dual offenders were twice as likely to have been diagnosed with a paraphilia when compared to Internet offenders. This finding was similar to the research by Babchishin et al. (2015) which indicated that dual offenders were more likely than Internet offenders to have paraphilic interests. As previously outlined, however, Babchishin et al. (2015), revealed that contact offenders were less likely than Internet offenders to have paraphilic interests. Reasons for these discrepancies may include differences in the measurement of arousal. For example, when Internet offenders were measured with the PPG they were determined to indicate the highest level of sexual deviance, however, when measured non-physiologically, results differed (Seto et al., 2006). Further, Seto, Maric and Barbaree (2001, p. 41) suggested that, “men who are sexually deviant may preferentially seek out pornography that depicts content that is highly arousing for them.” The notion of deviancy is critical to both risk assessment and treatment pathways. Deviant offenders require a targeted and longitudinal approach in treatment, when compared to opportunistic type sexual offenders, as acts borne out of deviancy are rarely opportunistic. Internet offenders in particular, do not have any physical contact with victims. Therefore, their offending is not typically opportunistic. Searching the Internet for CEM requires a pre-meditated thought. Sexual deviancy can be rigid and difficult to shift therefore, further research on this variable is important to help better understand the psychopathology of Internet offenders in particular.
While minimal differences have previously been found investigating differences in mood states between groups (Henshaw et al., 2017), the current study revealed that Internet offenders were significantly (49.53%) more likely to have experienced a mood state during offending when compared to contact offenders (26.53%) or dual offenders (38.89%). These figures do, however, indicate that significant heterogeneity was detected within the Internet offender group, and that fewer than half of all Internet offenders did effectively experience a mood state. In the present study, mood states were defined as feeling sad, down, melancholy, irritable, rejected. This variable was confounded somewhat by the fact that it was self-report. Nonetheless, the present findings suggest that mood states may be implicated in the commission of an online offence. Support for this finding is indicated in the research by Rimer (2017), Armstrong and Mellor (2013) and Babchishin et al. (2015) who all outlined that while not specifically measured as a ‘mood state,’ Internet offenders were more likely than contact offenders to report feeling bored and lonely and that they reported that these states precipitated offending. In particular, Armstrong and Mellor (2013) outlined that Internet offenders commonly fear rejection by those around them. Research examining whether a fear of rejection is correlated to negative mood states may be worthwhile in determining correlates of negative mood states (which ultimately lead to offending behaviours).

Regarding employment, no differences were found between groups in the present study. Empirically, two previous studies found that Internet offenders had more stability in employment and held more skilled positions than contact
offenders (Aslan & Edelmann, 2014; Babchishin et al., 2015). Specifically, in Babchishin et al. (2015), it was revealed that contact offenders were more likely to hold manual labour roles and be on a low income. However, these findings could be confounded by the fact that more skilled offenders were initially utilising the Internet, however, since the Internet has become so prolific in recent times, a broader demographic are now utilising it and thereby reflecting greater diversity among users.

While some inconsistencies are observed, these findings overall suggest a broader characteristic profile of an Internet offender having experienced a more adaptive upbringing as a child/adolescent; a safer environment with less risk dynamic factors, which, ultimately renders itself to greater educational attainment and consequently, greater stability and professionalism in employment.

**Relationship and sexuality findings.** Consistent with international research (Elliott et al., 2009; Seto, Wood, Babchishin, & Flynn, 2012; Webb, Craissati, & Keen, 2007), group differences emerged regarding relationship status across offender groups. In the present study, contact offenders were nearly three times more likely to be in a relationship at the time of offending when compared to Internet offenders, and contact offenders were almost twice as likely to be in a relationship at the time of offending when compared to dual offenders. These findings indicate that being in a current relationship does not necessarily serve as a protective factor from engaging physical victims, but rather suggests that additional factors are relevant. For example, as found in Armstrong and Mellor (2013), it is likely that intimacy deficits serve as a barrier to a romantic
relationship acting as a protective factor. This idea is supported by findings from Babchishin et al. (2015), who found that contact offenders were more likely to engage a detached approach to romantic relationships when compared to Internet offenders, although it remains unclear why such offenders turn to the exploitation of children rather than adult pornography for example. A detached approach is suggestive of intimacy needs not being met. However, despite this, the proclivity of contact offenders to pursue a physical sexual relationship when compared to Internet offenders, is suggestive of a marked difference between groups in emotional and cognitive profiles. Contact offenders appear to pursue physicality, while Internet offenders appear to be averse to it due their elevated levels of social anxiety and distress and their fear of rejection (Armstrong & Mellor, 2013). Further, contact offenders exhibit higher levels of anger, hostility and anti-sociality (Henshaw et al., 2017; Babchishin et al., 2015; Babchishin et al. 2011)–dynamic states, which, appear to be diffused by taking power from their physical world. Contact offenders, therefore, appear to be more disinhibited individuals who are stereotypically externalisers. Internet offenders, on the other hand, are less likely to be in a relationship and more likely to offend online where there is no physical contact with a victim. This suggests that Internet offenders may have fewer cognitive barriers (i.e., victim empathy) which prevents them from offending physically (Babchishin et al., 2015), are generally more pro-social or perhaps alternatively, are more fear based individuals, when compared to contact offenders, making them more inhibited from acting upon sexually deviant thoughts. Future research should seek to clarify these assertions.
In Babchishin et al. (2015), it was identified that contact offenders were more likely to have lived with a partner when compared to Internet offenders. The present study yielded support for these findings indicating that contact offenders were two and half times more likely to have ever lived with a partner when compared to Internet offenders. Differences between studies were found when comparing dual offenders, however. They were nearly two times more likely to have lived with a partner when compared to Internet offenders in the present study, while in Babchishin et al. (2015), dual offenders were more likely to have never lived with a partner when compared to Internet offenders.

Further discrepancies were observed regarding relationships. In Babchishin et al. (2015) it was identified that contact offenders were less likely to have ever been married, when compared to Internet offenders, yet the current study revealed that contact offenders were nearly three times more likely to have been in a significant relationship when compared to Internet offenders. In the current study, dual offenders were twice as likely to have been in a significant relationship when compared to Internet offenders, yet in Babchishin et al. (2015), they were more likely to have never been married. While discrepancies might be attributable to the difference in construct (i.e., marriage vs. significant relationship), these discrepancies remain unclear and further research is needed to understand how they might relate to pathways of offending.

Regarding an offender’s sexual preferences, no differences were found in the present study, however, another study revealed that dual offenders were more likely to be of a bi-sexual or homosexual orientation than Internet offenders.
Attitudes relating to offending. A number of attitudes of offenders were examined including pro criminal attitudes, denial, minimisation and justification of offending. No group differences were found on any of the attitude scales, indicating that attitudes are a homogenous construct across groups and not necessarily unique/based on offence type when assessing offenders characteristically.

Findings relating to opportunistic offending. In the present study, contact offenders were nearly five times more likely to have had direct access to a victim when compared to Internet offenders. Dual offenders were nearly six and a half times more likely to have had direct access to a victim when compared to Internet offenders. These findings were supported by the broader literature which indicated that contact offenders with deviant sexual fantasies were more likely to act on their thoughts when they had access to a child. Wortley and Smallbone’s (2006) analysis on situational principles indicated that contact sexual offenders were most likely to offend in the family home (69%), and that the family home also provided strong opportunities for extra familial offenders to establish friendships with the parents of children (45%) whom they later offended against. Similarly, Internet offenders with deviant fantasies were more likely to offend online when they had access to the Internet (Babchishin et al., 2015). While the
present research did not examine where offenders had access to victims, these findings suggest that opportunity plays a key role in the escalation of thoughts to behaviour. Therefore, limiting opportunity may seem an intuitive response, however, this must be balanced with the need to create a supportive environment allowing for the rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders into the broader community.

**Static 99 scores.** The Static 99 was examined to determine if known differences in risk profiles between groups was reflected. Accordingly, it was expected that dual offenders would return the highest score, followed by contact offenders and lastly Internet offenders. Results indicated that the mean Static 99 total score for Internet offenders ($M = 8.75$, $SD = 3.35$) was significantly higher than the average Static 99 total score for contact offenders ($M = 6.17$, $SD = 3.01$) and the average Static 99 total score for dual offenders ($M = 7.39$, $SD = 2.29$) was significantly higher than the average total score for Contact offenders ($M = 6.17$, $SD = 3.01$). While these results may appear counterintuitive, they are most likely reflective of the fact that the Static 99 is not psychometrically designed to be applied to Internet offenders unless there is an identifiable victim and even in this case, Internet offenders were not part of the initial considerations of the Static 99. This is due to the high loading of the following five items: ever lived with a lover; non-contact sexual offences; and the three victim items including ‘unrelated,’ ‘stranger,’ and ‘male victim.’ At a base level, therefore, Internet offenders are likely to reach a score of five (medium-high) before any personal data are even considered for scoring. This finding has significant implications and preliminarily
suggests that clinicians who rely on the Static 99 to assess risk for Internet offenders must use this tool as an adjunct to other risk assessment measures, rather than rely on it exclusively. Gross overestimates are indicated otherwise which present a raft of ethical and legal complexities associated with over estimating an offender’s level of risk. However, to adequately assess this construct, the present research on the Static 99 should be replicated with reoffending data to adequately determine how suitable/unsuitable it truly is with this population. 

To this end, the results revealed that Internet offenders appear to have a higher level of education, are more likely to be diagnosed with a mental illness, are more likely to experience a mood state at the time of offending, and are less likely to be in a relationship and experience a lower level of AOD use, when compared to contact offenders. Internet offenders are also less likely to be assessed as deviant when compared to dual offenders. Within group differences were also observed in the Internet offending group. There was significant diversity in a number of predictor variables including education, partnered at the time of offending and mood states. These results suggest that while it is possible to differentiate between groups, Internet offenders are themselves a heterogeneous group and this needs to be taken into account when delivering intervention programs. This chapter now turns its attention to which of the above characteristics predicted group membership.
Characteristic Predictors of Group Membership

A multinomial logistic regression model was conducted to examine which characteristics were related to the sexual offender groups (i.e., Internet, contact or dual\(^4\)). It was hypothesised that offenders characterised by fewer anti-social factors (i.e., higher regard for societal norms and pro social attitudes), a higher level of education, a lower level of AOD use, a lower incidence of childhood abuse/adversity and a higher incidence of stable relationships, would most likely be Internet offenders. It was also hypothesised that Internet offenders would have fewer contacts with the criminal justice system.

Overall, the model supported the above hypothesis. Specifically, alcohol abuse, number of charges (6+), direct access to victims, mood states present, DSM-IV-TR diagnosis, childhood adversity and relationship status all yielded statistically significant predictive value in determining group membership.

**Internet offenders are different to contact and dual offenders.**

Offenders who reported experiencing mood states at the time of offending and who had a DSM-IV-TR diagnosis were most likely to be Internet offenders, when compared to contact and dual offenders. Offenders who abused alcohol, had six or

\(^4\) Offenders’ index offence was the offence taken at a particular time point when the data for analysis was collected. Therefore, offenders were nominated into their ‘group of offending’ based on the index offence. Offenders may have had alternate types of sexual offences (i.e., if internet offence was the index offence, this offender may have had a contact offence as a follow up or historic offence).
more charges at index offence, and had direct access to a victim were most likely to be contact offenders when compared to Internet offenders. While offenders who experienced childhood adversity, had six or more charges at index offence and had direct access to a victim were most likely to be dual offenders when compared to Internet offenders.

Overall, the results indicate that the more pro-social/adaptive an offender is, the more likely they are to be in the Internet group. In the current study, offenders with fewer contacts with the criminal justice system, lower incidences of childhood adversity, and lower incidences of AOD abuse were likely to be Internet offenders. These results are consistent with broader literature (Babchishin et al., 2015; Henshaw et al., 2017; Rimer, 2017). Therefore, while Internet offenders are best understood as appearing ‘outwardly pro-social,’ they instead might be masking deviant behaviour which is unlikely to be opportunistic (Seto et al., 2006), although the present research was unable to confirm this. The results do, however, suggest that Internet offenders who turn to the Internet to cure negative affect, boredom, depression, stress and loneliness (Rimer, 2017) is not only indicative of limited internal resources and distress coping strategies, but also suggests that Internet offenders may lack the interpersonal and problem-solving skills to overcome the social isolation and loneliness that some of them may experience. Indeed, this assertion is not representative of the entire cohort; some Internet offenders are no doubt enjoying meaningful relationships or gainful employment. However, these findings suggest that those who are experiencing their external world in this manner, may indicate a more introverted
predisposition. While these factors may help explain why such individuals turn to the Internet, they do not illuminate why they choose to engage CEM instead of pro social online material. Sexual deviancy appears to remain as the most likely mechanism responsible for this relationship (Seto et al., 2006), despite it not being statistically significant in the current model. Further research should therefore examine the link between deviancy and problematic mood states in Internet offenders. It will be important moving forward to determine how these factors may affect Internet offenders’ ability to regulate their behaviour while online and to seek out or engage effectively during treatment.

Conversely, these results suggest that the more problematic an offender’s childhood is (i.e., bullying, parental separation); the more likely an offender is to have abused AOD; had numerous charges laid against them; had direct access to a victim; and been married and/or divorced, the more likely they are to physically offend against a victim (i.e., be a contact or dual offender). These results are consistent with broader literature (Babchishin et al., 2015; Henshaw, et al., 2017). Contact offenders appear more likely to seek out stimulation or risky behaviours involving physical contact or the external world, than Internet offenders. While the above predictors are clearly linked to contact offender type, they do not explain why such individuals turn to contact sexual offending specifically. It is possible that contact offenders may possess fewer appropriate emotional/psychological resources as a product of the disadvantage they experienced in childhood, or as a product of the disinhibition they experience if highly intoxicated (at the time of offending), for example. This in turn may
diminish their capacity to consider the needs of others. In the present study, no statistical differences were determined between groups regarding an offender’s ability to consider the consequences towards their victim. However, lower incidences of victim empathy were evidenced in Babchishin et al. (2015) among contact offenders. The discrepancy for this finding is not clear and further research is needed on this variable. Clarity regarding the degree to which victim empathy serves as a barrier from engaging contact offending could be of utility in both risk assessment and intervention regimes for Internet offenders and help illuminate the likelihood of cross over between sexual offence types.

**Contact offenders are different to dual offenders.** Offenders who were partnered/defacto/married/divorced were most likely to be contact offenders, when compared to dual offenders. Offenders who experienced childhood adversity were most likely to be dual offenders when compared to contact offenders. Offenders who abused alcohol and who had six or more charges at index offence were most likely to be dual offenders, when compared to contact offenders.

A predictor unique to contact offending when compared to dual offending was the likelihood to have been both married and divorced. Meta analytic research indicates that individuals who are consistently in romantic relationships but experience poor quality within their relationships are most likely to have developed anxious or avoidant attachments early in life (Li & Chan, 2012). While attachment styles were not examined in the present research, they are noteworthy. Developing an understanding as to how certain attachment styles are connected to
repeated and dysfunctional relationships and consequently, how they may be implicated in pathways to sexual offending could provide critical insights. For example, such research may illuminate what exactly contact offenders believe they can gain from engaging in sexual contact with children, that they cannot gain in their adult relationships. McKillop, Browm, Smallbone and Wortley (2017) suggested that attachment at the time of offending is likely to be more relevant than childhood attachment to the aetiology of sexual offending. Therefore, it is possible that contact offenders who are marrying and divorcing are experiencing intimate relationships in an anxious or avoidant manner as adults, and as a result, find a greater degree of safety among child or adolescent victims. The degree of futility is diminished in a vulnerable population where the power differential is greater. An avoidant attachment towards the intimate partner provides a sound rationale for the increased incidence of divorce in this population. These findings may therefore have important implications for unique intervention based on group membership. Further research examining attachment styles in internet, contact and dual offenders is indicated. Treatment targets which seek to mitigate unhealthy adult attachments may play an important role in reducing risk among sexual offenders.

These results revealed that certain offender characteristics can help predict which offending group an individual is most likely to be in. Mood states and a DSM-IV-TR diagnosis were indicative of being an Internet offender. The abuse of alcohol, having six or more charges at index offence, and having direct access to a victim were characteristics most likely to be associated with being a contact
offender (when compared to Internet offenders). While offenders who experienced childhood adversity, had six or more charges at index offence and had direct access to a victim were most likely to be dual offenders (when compared to Internet offenders).

Notably, contact offenders were the most likely to get married and divorced. There is utility in these findings for profiling offenders, which can subsequently provide clinicians with insights around criminogenic factors that may be contributing to the maintenance of offending. This chapter now turns its attention to examining the characteristic predictors of sentence duration.

**Characteristic Predictors of Sentence Duration**

As the characteristic profiles of offenders appear to align to their level of risk, it was determined that analysing characteristics according to sentence type (which is incidentally mapped to level of risk) would be of the greatest value. Offender characteristics were examined according to community and custodial sentence categories. This method was chosen since the duration of community and custodial orders cannot be deemed equivalent. Indeed, a six month custodial sentence would not be seen as equivalent to a six month community order. On this basis, study three hypothesised that the duration of sentence for Internet sexual offenders would be defined by offender characteristics which differed among contact and dual sexual offenders, for both community and custodial sentences. Overall, this hypothesis was confirmed. First, findings relating to most likely sentence type across offender groups are discussed.
Findings relating to most likely sentence type. It was hypothesised in the current study that Internet offenders would receive the lowest/least severe sanction according to type, when compared to contact and dual offenders, as they are deemed to pose the lowest risk. This hypothesis was supported. Internet offenders were almost six and a half times more likely to be sentenced to a community based order, than contact offenders. They were also 86% less likely to be sentenced to a custodial sentence, than contact offenders. While Internet offenders were eight and a half times more likely to be sentenced to a community based order, than dual offenders and 90% less likely to be sentenced to a custodial sentence, than dual offenders. These findings are commensurate to the evidence base, which indicates that Internet offenders pose a low risk of sexual reoffending, while contact and dual offenders pose the highest risk of sexual reoffending. The data demonstrate that sentencing trends are commensurate to empirical understandings of risk level according to offence type (Babchishin et al., 2015). Certainly, the duration of maximum sentences provides insight into this assertion. In Victoria, the possession of child pornography carries a maximum term of 10 years; while sexual penetration of a child under 10 years carries a maximum term of 25 years; and sexual penetration of a child between 10 and 16 years carries a maximum term of 15 years (Crimes Act, Vic, 1958).

While the findings speak to the risk of recidivism (i.e., low risk offenders tend to receive the least harshest sentences), these findings may also suggest that Internet offenders are perceived to inflict the lesser of harms to victims of sexual abuse. This rhetoric has been historical and evidenced not only by offenders
themselves, but by professionals in the field. Understanding the degree to which judges and magistrates perceive Internet offending as the least harmful, and consequently how much this perception or bias influences sentencing, would be of critical value looking forward. The narrative around Internet offenders inflicting the least amount of harm to such victims has been contentious for some time. On the topic of accessing child pornography material in DPP vs. Sullivan (2013), the judge stated, “Your offending has not involved the dissemination of material and it has not involved participation in chat rooms where often the most revolting conversations take place about what people intend to do to children in the future, or what they have done to children in the past.” This offender received a wholly suspended sentence (maximum penalty was 15 years imprisonment). While this judge was no doubt considering the gravity of the offence in her comments, weight was given to the nature of the offence. Within this weighting was an implicit message that merely ‘accessing child pornography’ was ‘not as bad’ as soliciting conversations with a minor. From the perspective of risk assessment, this may hold true, however, from the perspective of harm to the victim/s, it is doubtful that there is much of a difference in degrees of harm between a victim solicited online vs. a victim physically abused to create the child pornography images that Sullivan accessed. Similarly, in 2016, Judge Weinstein of the United States sentenced an Internet offender to five days imprisonment and “sharply criticised punishment guidelines for failing to distinguish between dangerous offenders and those who pose little threat” (Connor, 2016, p. 1). However, in response, he was ‘sharply criticised’ for reducing the severity of Internet
offending to ‘just looking at pictures.’ Judge Weinstein was criticised for minimising the extent of the harm caused to victims of this type of abuse who are often initially victims of contact offences in order to create the CEM product itself (Connor, 2016). There is mounting evidence that confirms the harm caused to victims of CEM (Anti-Slavery Australia, 2017; Rogers, 2008). For many victims, not only have they been physically abused in the production of the CEM, they must also live with the knowledge that images of their abuse are likely to remain in the online world indefinitely, for the viewing of Internet offenders across the globe. Shifting sentencing laws, as well as the narrative that Internet offending is akin to ‘just looking at pictures’ through a process of education is a critical starting point for professionals, offenders and victims alike. To this end, further research examining judge/magistrate attitudes is indicated.

**Characteristics of offenders sentenced to community orders.** Research suggests that offenders overall are sentenced as a consequence of two key determinants: (i) severity of the offence; and (ii) criminal history of the offender (Spohn, 2009). Severity refers to how serious the crime was with respect to the degree of harm or risk caused by the offender, and also considers their culpability in the commission of the offence/s. Regarding culpability, the Crimes Act (Vic) (1958) considers whether the offender intended to cause serious harm to the victim, or negligently caused serious injury. Limited research exists examining characteristic determinants of sexual offender sentences, however, some literature has considered this topic and found that gender differences, legal factors,
familiarity of victim and age of victim were all predictors of sentence duration (Amirault & Beauregard, 2014; Rosenmerkel et al., 2009; Rydberg et al., 2017; Spohn, 2009). The present research sought to address this research gap and found that both within and between group differences exist in predictors of sexual offender sentence duration. Results pertaining to offenders sentenced to community orders are discussed below. Following this section, results outlining offenders sentenced to custodial sentences are then discussed.

**Demographic and psychological findings.** Internet offenders who experienced adverse life events were 17% more likely to experience a longer community sentence duration, when compared to Internet offenders who did not experience adverse life events. Adverse life events included experiences such as the death of a loved one, divorce, severe parental mental illness, rejection by a loved one or peers etc. (refer Appendix Three for full list). Many adverse life events indicated themes of rejection, abandonment and isolation (physical or emotional). These findings are congruent with the research outlined earlier by Rimer (2017) and Armstrong and Mellor (2013) who found that many of the Internet offenders reported feelings of anxiety, distress, isolation, boredom, loneliness and a fear of rejection. Internet offenders receiving longer community sentences based upon the presence of adverse life events suggests that this subpopulation does in fact possess a range of related risk factors (i.e. higher previous criminality, greater likelihood of substance abuse etc.) which arise from having experienced an adverse life event, but that such offenders do not meet the threshold for a custodial sentence, therefore, a longer community sentence is
determined to allow for the effective monitoring of such offenders. Alternatively, in study one of this research it was demonstrated that negative mood states are experienced more frequently by Internet offenders. Therefore, it may be that the experience of adverse life events does indeed lead to a higher incidence of criminality as a consequence of distress tolerance deficiencies. It would be worthy exploring this variable further to determine (i) what other risk factors might be correlated to adverse life events; and (ii) if Internet offenders who experienced adverse life events did load higher on problematic mood states at the time of offending.

Regarding education, it was revealed that dual offenders who completed tertiary education were 22% less likely to experience a longer sentence duration, when compared to dual offenders who only completed high school/TAFE. These findings appear intuitive and reinforce well documented support as to the value of obtaining a sound education. Education has long been understood to serve as a major protective factor in the trajectory of an individual’s life and dramatically reduce the incidence of criminality (Polidano, 2016). These results support broader international findings and reinforce the value of education in the context of not only criminality, but the associated sentence duration.

**Relationship findings.** Contact offenders who indicated they were divorced were 39% more likely to experience a longer community sentence duration, when compared to contact offenders who were single or married. While causality cannot be inferred, research has shown that men find greater protective utility from marriage, when compared to women (Rendall, Weden, Favreault, &
Waldron, 2011; Wu, Penning, Pollard & Hart, 2003). Indeed, studies have shown that once divorced, men tend to experience negative health outcomes (when compared to women) (Robards, 2012), such as an increase in suicidality (Kolves, 2010) and an increased likelihood of commencing (or recommencing) alcohol and tobacco use (Hemminki & Li, 2003). Further, men may be more emotionally dependent on their intimate partners, leaving them with limited options for support following separation (McClintock, 2014). Therefore, while it is not known why men who have failed in their relationships are more likely to experience a longer sentence duration, it is possible that the emotional distress in the aftermath of a divorce results in maladaptive coping mechanisms which increase their other risk factors. The data pertaining to sentence duration most likely speaks to both the risk profile of offenders, as well as the elevated needs for mental health support post-divorce. Further research would be required to be able to infer causality. What remains unclear is whether men who are divorced pose an actual higher risk to the community, or whether stereotypes or biases might instead influence sentencing outcomes. Or, alternatively, whether judges simply acknowledge that such men experience a higher incidence of dynamic risk factors and therefore require greater support to rehabilitate under supervision while in the community. In considering this proposition, it must be noted that the construct of divorce is complex and several further considerations are warranted. First, it is not clear whether offenders who are divorced and subsequently serving longer sentences are more likely to have been poor relationship partners in the first instance, when compared to non-divorced or single offenders. If this is the case,
then perhaps it is the character and traits of the offender that are more relevant, rather than the construct of divorce itself. If so, then such individuals would inevitably be more likely to engage in criminality regardless of marital disposition, and subsequently serve longer sentences. Alternatively, it is possible that poorer quality marriages - ending in divorce – prompted the engagement of criminality as a signpost of lack of coping. Further research should seek to explore this distinction as the implications are important for intervention. Specifically, a more detailed analysis of this construct would require fitting a model which controls for mediating variables such as number of charges (prior, present and future), substance abuse history, the degree of love within the marriage, any extramarital affairs, economic strain and violence within the relationship. Such an analysis would provide a more comprehensive account as to the actual risk profile of these offenders, as well as the state of the marriage, when compared to those who served lower sentences and were not divorced at the time of offending.

**Characteristics of offenders sentenced to custodial orders.**

**Demographic & psychological findings.** Dual offenders who were abused in childhood were 79% more likely to experience a longer sentence duration, when compared to dual offenders who were not abused in childhood. This finding is congruent with the significant body of research that indicates rates of childhood abuse are high among incarcerated offenders (Wolff & Li, 2012). Further, childhood abuse is highly correlated with AOD abuse and mental illness (Breckenridge, Salter, & Shaw, 2010; Ireland & Widom, 1994). In the present
study, dual offenders who had a history of AOD abuse were 88% more likely to experience a longer sentence duration, when compared to those who did not have history of AOD abuse, while dual offenders who were assessed as having a mental disorder in offending were 57% more likely to experience a longer sentence than dual offenders who were not assessed as having a mental disorder in offending. These results provide ongoing evidence for the disadvantage of certain demographic groups within society. Of particular interest, however, was the absence of differences between Internet and contact offending groups on these variables. These results are intuitive in many respects. Evidence suggests that dual offenders are the highest risk group of all sexual offenders namely because they tend to be the most sexually deviant towards children and are willing to contact offend (Babchishin et al., 2015). They also typically serve the longest duration in prison amongst all sexual offender groups. The present study provided further support for these risk patterns and revealed that dual offenders who were diagnosed with a paraphilia (i.e., sexual deviance) were over two times more likely to experience a longer sentence duration, when compared to dual offenders who were not diagnosed with a paraphilia. The findings overall suggest that while dual offenders are serving the highest sentence times among the custodial population, they have also experienced the greatest amount of past disadvantage which then impacts sentencing outcomes, when compared to the other groups. Therefore, longer sentences within this group are most likely attributed to the elevated risk profiles of dual offenders. The overrepresentation of dual offenders in custody with experiences of child abuse, AOD abuse and mental illness, as well
as diagnosed deviancy, indicate that this population requires a unique and intensive treatment regime, longitudinally, which targets these factors. As outlined earlier, deviancy in particular can be rigid and difficult to treat, while those with a history of AOD abuse will forever be at an increased risk of relapse when compared to a non AOD abuse population (Queensland Government, 2013). Likewise, the trajectory of permanent recovery from mental illness is variable. It must also be noted that this population may be subject to judicial bias and/or discrimination as a consequence of their elevated risk profile. Research examining attitudes of judge’s and magistrates regarding demographic characteristics of sexual offenders in the context of sentencing is required to address possible indications of bias.

**Relationship findings.** Regarding relationships, dual offenders who were in a relationship at the time of offence were 36% less likely to experience a longer sentence duration, when compared to dual offenders who were not in a relationship at the time of offence. These findings provide some degree of evidence regarding the protective nature a relationship can have. While being in a relationship was not sufficient to keep this group out of custody, it does indicate that a relationship can potentially serve to reduce the severity of an offender’s level of risk level. Alternatively, however, consideration of judges’ attitudes towards offenders who were in a relationship at the time of offending is worthy. In the present research, this hypothesis could not be assessed as it was not known if every judge had access to psychological evaluations/personal histories of offenders at the time of sentencing. Future research should seek to examine
attitudes of judges as they relate to certain offender profiles. In particular, it is worthy to note whether judges view offenders who are single, separated or divorced at the time of offending differently to those who are partnered – presumably due to the pro social value of a relationship – and whether this has any bearing on sentences.

While this particular variable did not seek to determine if offenders were still in a relationship at the time of sentencing, being in a relationship at the time of offending appears to offer some protective value against a longer sentence, most likely because it serves as a proxy for greater stability in life. Certainly, research has previously indicated that being married or partnered serves as a protective barrier and discourages criminal activity, dependent upon the nature of the marriage or partnership (Wise, Harding & Morenoff, 2014). For example, individuals who are in a meaningful, loving relationship with a pro social partner are much more likely to desist from offending (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Warr, 1998; Wise, Harding & Morenoff, 2014). However, the inverse can apply where individuals have partners who are themselves invested in anti-social behaviours.

**Findings related to attitudes and offence specific factors.** Offender attitudes were explored in the context of sentencing and revealed that Internet offenders who indicated pro criminal attitudes were five times more likely to experience a longer sentence duration, when compared to Internet offenders who did not indicate pro criminal attitudes, while Internet offenders who denied their offending were two times more likely to experience a longer sentence duration, when compared to Internet offenders who did not deny their offending. Similarly,
contact offenders who justified their offending were 78% more likely to experience a longer sentence duration, when compared to contact offenders who did not justify their offending, while contact offenders who indicated pro criminal attitudes were one and a half times more likely to experience a longer sentence duration, when compared to contact offenders who did not indicate pro criminal attitudes. Interestingly, no group differences were seen for dual offenders with regards to attitudes. These results suggest that Internet and contact offenders in custody are more likely to experience distorted thoughts or anti-social attitudes which go on to determine the duration of their sentence, in contrast to dual offenders who appear to have their sentence predicted more accurately by demographic and psychological factors.

Pro criminal attitudes have long been known to increase the incidence of criminality and recidivism (Banse, Koppehele-Gossel, Kistemaker, Oberlader, & Schmidt, 2013). From a criminological lens, Sykes and Matza’s (1957) Neutralisation Theory proffers that pro criminal attitudes (i.e., rationalisations, justifications, minimisations) precede and subsequently cause criminal behaviour. Basne et al. (2013), however, argue that from a psychological perspective, it is more likely that pro criminal attitudes arise as a consequence of and not as a cause for criminal behaviour. While the veracity of either argument is mostly of academic concern, it is clear that pro criminal attitudes are best considered a dynamic risk factor that can and should be targeted in treatment where possible.

Returning to the i-SOTP (Mandeville et al., 2009) (discussed in chapter two), pre- and post-treatment assessments saw significant improvement in deficits
concerning socio-affective functioning and a decrease in pro criminal attitudes including victim empathy distortions and cognitive distortions among Internet offenders. While it is not known if these gains were sustained over time or reduced reoffending, they nonetheless indicate promise. The results of the present study, together with the outcome from the i-SOTP indicate support for continuing to target this domain within the Internet offender population. This is not to discount the merit of targeting pro criminal attitudes within contact and dual offender populations. Traditionally, such attitudes have been targeted in offline sex offender programs with variable outcomes (Bäckström, & Björklund, 2008; Beech, Mandeville-Norden & Goodwill, 2014; Berman, 2004). However, the current study indicates that to reduce the incidence of longer sentencing outcomes, it may be of greater value to emphasise pro criminal attitudes with Internet and contact offender populations, while dual offenders may require more specific interventions with respect to psychological variables.

Lastly, contact offenders who were experiencing family problems at the time of offending were 63% more likely to experience a longer sentence duration, when compared to contact offenders who were not experiencing family problems at the time of offending. Family problems were defined as financial strain, conflict or tension in the family home between partners (whether it led to separation or not), family violence, excess AOD use by anyone in the household, etc. This finding can be connected to a longstanding literature base which suggests that individuals experiencing discord in the family home are at an increased risk of criminality, notably due to problematic familial environments
during the developmental span which are then carried across inter-generationally (Vaughn, Salas-Wright, DeLisi, & Qian, 2015). In the study by Vaughn et al. (2015), it was revealed that individuals with the highest level of criminality among three groups reported the youngest mean age (34.16 years), the highest incidence of being in a racial minority (Hispanic), the lowest likelihood of earning >$70,000 USD per annum, the most likely to be living in a rural area and the lowest incidence of marriage. While these findings do not directly speak to conflict in the family home, they do illuminate circumstances of strain which can cultivate a more stressful environment for all of its occupants. Certainly, criminological strain theory proffers that due to a lack of means to survive and thrive in one’s environment, an individual may be more likely to commit crimes (Merton, 1957). Examining the specific circumstances amounting to ‘family problems’ should be further considered in order to create a deeper understanding as to how to support such individuals moving forward.

The overall aim of this research was to develop a better understanding of the characteristics of Australian sexual offenders in order to determine: (a) if characteristic differences predict group membership; and (b) if discrete intervention pathways are indicated for varied sexual offender groups. The findings discussed above illuminate these two aims. First, it is clear from the research that characteristic differences do in fact predict group membership. Internet offenders appear to be more pro social, than contact and dual offenders; and predictably appear to experience the least degree of psychosocial disadvantage. Prior research suggests that Internet offenders are the most
sexually deviant of all three groups (Seto et al., 2006), and that this factor accounts for their sexually criminal behaviour, however, the present research was unable to substantiate these claims. The present research should be replicated on a larger sample size moving forward to allow for the achievement of greater statistical power when examining the same variables.

Discrete intervention pathways are indicated on the basis of the present findings. While future research should seek to address differences in education levels between groups, as well as measure intellectual differences within and between groups, there is reasonable evidence to suggest that overall, Internet offenders are higher functioning individuals who experience different dynamic risk factors to contact and dual offenders. The current research did not necessarily illuminate too many treatment targets that should be addressed with Internet offenders, but rather revealed which treatment targets should not be directed at this group. Criminogenic factors such as AOD use, unemployment, anti-social peer associations and lack of victim empathy are not so important for Internet offenders. Future research should seek to establish a greater understanding as to what degree of utility there is in targeting variables that this research was unable to adequately examine. These should include: cognitive distortions, problematic sexual scripts, fantasy management and other offence specific factors with Internet offenders. Next, this chapter will address implications and future research.
Implications and Future Research

The current research suggests that Internet offenders are characteristically unique when compared to contact and dual offenders. While differences were also noted between contact and dual offenders, their profiles appear to align more closely than that of Internet offenders. There is utility in this finding for both the development of risk assessment tools as well as the advancement of intervention frameworks. Notably, in the context of risk assessment, this research illuminated that the Static 99 may not suitable for administration with Internet offenders, although further analysis incorporating recidivism data would be needed to verify this. Many organisations still engage in this practice such as Corrections Victoria. The research highlighted that the Static 99 appears to grossly overestimate the risk of Internet offenders, therefore, any determinations made on the basis of this tool need to be balanced with appropriate adjunct measures. New risk assessment measures developed moving forward specific to Internet offenders should take into account the unique profile of this population and make adjustments accordingly. Indicators of risk (static or dynamic) for offending that emerged as a result of this research included the presence of negative mood states, diagnoses of mental illness, varying pro criminal attitudes, social isolation and an absence of intimate partner relationships.

Regarding intervention frameworks, the risk factors identified above can certainly be addressed as a unique set of treatment targets for this group. It is notable that while previous literature (Babchishin et al., 2015) has found Internet offenders to be well educated and hold white collar roles of employment, the
present research yielded mixed findings. The proliferation and accessibility of the Internet itself are the most likely explanations for the changes in this trend and this needs to be taken into account on an individual basis given the degree of heterogeneity on these constructs in the present research.

Internet offenders appear to have a sound ability to integrate into society externally, yet internally appear to be experiencing problem mood states. The understanding of such characteristics provides promise and indicates new opportunities for both further research and treatment. For example, it is understood that many Internet offenders are socially anxious (Babchishin et al., 2015). Despite this, they are still often treated in group settings with contact and dual offenders. Further research should examine the impact of placing Internet offenders into mixed groups and examining treatment outcomes. Such insights contribute to the construction of a more holistic picture of the Internet offender. Future research must start considering how to better engage this group to bring out their best. One consideration moving forward to enhance rapport building, for example, might involve expanding treatment into the virtual world; this avenue has not yet been examined in Australia. Yet this is where Internet offenders frequent the most to access CEM. Based on their known characteristics, it might be possible to conceptualise a prevention style i-SOTP which commences online, or even virtually, in order to mitigate any anxiety relating to trust, feelings of guilt and shame. Once a therapeutic engagement begins to strengthen, phase two of the treatment can transition the individual from the virtual world into the real world.
and develop treatment modules that map to the individual’s unique treatment targets, while concurrently addressing offence specific domains.

When turning our attention to the outcomes of the third study – characteristic predictors of sentence duration - it is clear that certain sexual offender groups (with particular characteristics) are more likely to receive heavier sentences than others. For the community sentence sample overall, it is evident that offenders with particular demographic and relationship variables serve longer sentences than offenders who do not have these same characteristics. These findings suggest that efforts need to be directed at assisting this lower risk population (comparative to the custodial sample) to improve their daily functioning, as their offending, and subsequent sentencing, appears to be impacted mostly by an emotional and psychological disadvantage connected to their external world (insofar as this elevates their level of risk). Adverse life events, relationship status and education appeared to result in the greatest delineation within this group regarding shorter vs. longer sentences. However, when considering the custodial sample of offenders, there was a clear split between Internet/contact offenders and dual offenders. Internet/contact offenders who had rigid pro criminal attitudes/cognitive distortions experienced a heavier sentence length. Markers of denial, minimisation, justification and overall pro criminal attitudes can possibly be explained by a cognitive dissonance that needs to be reconciled through maladaptive means. While dual offenders who were abused in childhood, experienced AOD abuse as an adult or a diagnosis of mental illness or pedophilia, were more likely to serve a longer custodial sentence.
Therefore, when differentiating between Internet and contact offenders in the community vs. custodial sample, it appeared that those who received a custodial sentence had more entrenched anti-social views of their external world, while those who were in the community were more psychologically disadvantaged due to life events or circumstances. Similarly, dual offenders in custody were also more psychologically disadvantaged due to life events or circumstances. This difference is important and has critical implications for treatment. Greater psychological support for community Internet, contact and dual offenders, as well as custodial dual offenders is indicated. Internet and contact offenders in custody, however, appear to hold anti-social attitudes which likely serve to fuel their offending. Shifting these views no doubt requires a more robust approach that maps onto personality types/constructs of the individual. Addressing early maladaptive schemas, cognitive distortions and pro criminal attitudes is a more complex process than working through psychosocial disadvantage.

To this end, several suggestions for future research are evident. First, it is clear that ethnicity is not a (sexually) offence specific construct based on the current study. If this is so, then perhaps risk assessment and intervention programs do not need to be culturally normed in the way they would for other treatment programs. Further research should continue to assess group differences for the variable to aid in the development of clinical tools moving forward.

The determination of discrete profiles of sexual deviancy between offender types remains unclear. Further research examining whether this construct
is homogenous (or not) between groups will have utility in the assessment of risk and implications for treatment. The current research provided support for the meta analytic findings by Babchishin et al. (2015) indicating that dual offenders are the most deviant, however, Seto et al. (2006) found the strongest support for deviancy in an Internet offender population. Therefore, reproducing the present analysis on a larger sample would be ideal.

The indication of mood states among Internet offenders was not straightforward. While the present study did differentiate between groups on this construct, further analysis determined that only 50% (approximately) of the Internet offender group did in fact experience a mood state. These findings therefore suggest differences between groups, however, a indicate a large degree of heterogeneity within group. Nonetheless, this construct has laid groundwork for further exploration. Understanding the depth of a problematic mood state which precipitates the commission of an offence can have great utility in the treatment of online offenders. At the present time, the complexities relating to this variable are not well understood. Further research examining specifically which mood states prove the most problematic should be considered. Also, understanding what events/thoughts might precipitate a mood state may also provide important information in determining how to respond. There is particular utility in addressing this construct in a preventative population – that is, with individuals who have not yet offended but who are experiencing significant distress as a result of their proclivity to fantasise about children sexually.

Strengthening our understanding of the interplay between negative mood states
and sexual offending provides a promising avenue for varied treatment modalities including DBT.

Internet offenders have been repeatedly shown to be more insular, socially anxious individuals. Yet, treating them in the same groups as contact and dual offenders who are often more extraverted and verbose in nature has proven popular among Correctional programs, notably due to resourcing constraints. While some evidence suggests that this can be a pro-social/adaptive outlet for such personalities and help Internet offenders to develop social skills they previously may not have had, the inverse risk that such an environment may seek to increase an offender’s anxiety and inhibit treatment gains may also apply. Research examining the degree of therapeutic engagement of Internet offenders in such settings is critical for determining how effective group settings are for this population or whether we are in fact slowing the process of rehabilitation for this group.

A novel area of research is the examination of characteristic predictors of sentence duration between offender groups. Emerging literature has so far provided insights into the presence of judge/magistrate bias in sentencing offenders, particularly when certain information may be missing. However, this was not directly studied in the present research. Rather, the current research found that the group of offenders sentenced to the community were more likely to be at a psychosocial disadvantage (rather than hold rigid pro criminal attitudes) and that these variables (while not causal) resulted in longer sentence times. Similarly, dual offenders - often deemed the highest in risk – who were sentenced to custody
were also particularly psychosocially disadvantaged. What is not yet clear is whether these offenders experienced longer sentences due to psychosocial disadvantage (i.e., genuinely elevating their risk profiles), or whether other factors were responsible for longer sentence duration. Future research should seek to examine whether offenders are (consciously or unconsciously) stereotyped by judges/magistrates and deemed to pose a greater risk to society as a consequence of their psychosocial background. Research examining attitudes of judges/magistrates, as well as processes of sentencing in the absence of all the necessary information would be valuable moving forward in mitigating discriminatory practices which may place this already at-risk population at a greater risk.

Lastly, at the research design phase of the project, it was intended that a retrospective and prospective study design would be adopted resulting in a two-phase research project. The current research results are the outcome of phase one which involved the retrospective data collection of a set of offender characteristics and various treatment related data. Phase two was prospective in nature and required the execution of semi-structured interviews with offenders. The aim of this phase was to collect data specific to offender treatment engagement and outcomes. Prolonged organisational delays in obtaining ethical clearance, however, resulted in phase two of the research being abandoned, and as such, limited the comprehensiveness of the final pool of data. Future research should seek to incorporate semi structured offender interviews for a thorough assessment
of treatment engagement, progress and longitudinal treatment outcomes. This chapter will now address the limitations of the research.

**Limitations**

Several limitations were evident in the current research that should be taken into account when considering the results. The collection/recording of offender data at Corrections Victoria was inconsistent. Missing data, particularly psychometric scores (pre-and post-treatment), prevented the possibility of an analysis of psychometric score changes before and after offender treatment. Other variables relating to offender characteristics had missing data: (i) offender non-response where offenders did not answer the entire psychometric battery (unit non-response) or refusal to answer specific questions (item non-response); and (ii) differences in assessor practice. Different psychologists and psychiatrists, for example, are seasoned to conducting offender assessments in varied formats. This is likely to have created data gaps which were impossible to reconcile given the retrospective nature of the data.

One possible way to have proceeded in the presence of such missing data was to analyse the complete data only. However, when attempted, this significantly reduced the power of any regression models that were trialled as the final $N$ value was ultimately too small. Due to the large volume of missing data and in consultation with statistical experts, multiple imputation (MI) was decided as the best remedy. A sensitivity analysis to determine the viability of MI was technically best practice. However, relevant methods such as those by Carpenter,
Kenward, and White (2007) are not currently available within STATA, and they have recently been debated as problematic in Hayati-Rezvan, White, Lee, Carlin and Simpson (2015). Subsequently the benefits of MI in the current research were assumed. This may have resulted in skewed or biased results, not representative of the original sample.

The present findings are limited by the fact that they are solely obtained from qualitative data sources which are subject to bias. For example, the data were collected from psychological or psychiatric reports, which are largely based on self-report. Self-report data may result in biases regarding: (i) genuine or selective memory issues (i.e., deliberately or genuinely failing to recall experiences or events that occurred at some point in the past); (ii) telescoping, for example, recalling events that occurred at one time as if they occurred at an alternate time; (iii) attribution biases, for example, attributing positively viewed phenomena to one's own agency but attributing negative events to external factors; and (iv) exaggerating events as more significant than they actually were. An offender’s level of insight and/or willingness to be honest or engage in impression management may, therefore, all be factors that affected the veracity of the data.

To a limited degree, some corroborating information was available, such as multiple expert assessments/opinions on any particular offender (i.e., psychologists’ reports, Psychiatrist’s reports, police summary briefs and judge’s sentencing comments). These factors may have attenuated biases in the data somewhat, however, ultimately covariates were created from imperfect data.
Further, as with any study design involving human data collection, the data utilized in this study were prone to human error at various points such as data collection/coding, data entry, and data cleaning/screening.

The data obtained were initially obtained from Corrections Victoria between 2000 and 2014. Throughout this time, significant operational changes occurred, which, inevitably had an impact on the nature of data assessed and stored. Between 2000 and 2012, all data were stored in paper files. This meant that certain reports and documents may have been lost or not accurately filed with no mechanisms in place to verify this possibility. Between 2012 and 2014, data storage processes migrated to electronic format. It is possible that certain documents were not accurately saved and stored electronically, again, impacting upon the accuracy of available information for this research. A future study should consider utilising data that have been exclusively filed electronically to mitigate such risks.

The sample population was overwhelming Anglo-Australian. This resulted in the three corresponding studies being largely representative of an Australian sample, and having cultural limitations around broader generalisability. However, given the transnational nature of Internet offending, this limitation is somewhat diminished in this sub population. For contact and dual offenders, however, identified characteristics, dynamic and static risk factors may be more culturally specific to Australian offenders. Caution is suggested when applying the results of these findings to cross-populations and future research should considering collating data from a more culturally diverse population.
Conclusion

The results from the current research reiterate many of the findings in the meta-analysis by Babchishin et al. (2015). However, the present study added further value by examining offender characteristics quantitatively and evaluating the meaning of these variables through predictive modelling. In addition to demographic, psychological, psychometric, legal and treatment factors, this research also examined unique offender attitudes and mood states at the time of offending. Lastly, in a first of its kind, this research examined characteristic predictors of sentence duration among sexual offenders.

The research found that Internet offenders are characteristically different to contact and dual offenders. Internet offenders tend to have a higher education; be lower functioning in terms of relationships; are less likely to be abused and experience childhood or adult adversity; are less likely to use alcohol or other drugs; are more likely to have a mental illness diagnosis; are less likely to have a paraphilia diagnosis; are more likely to experience mood states at the time of offending; are less likely to have direct access to victims; are more likely to have the highest mean score on the Static 99; are more likely to be sentenced to a community order than custody; and are likely to complete the lowest number of treatment sessions. Predictive modelling indicated that when compared to a contact offending group, offenders are more likely to be Internet offenders if they do not abuse alcohol; have a lower number of charges; do not have direct access to victims; are not in a relationship – married; and experience mood states at the
time of offending. When compared to the dual offending group, offenders are more likely to be Internet offenders if they have fewer charges; do not have direct access to victims; and minimise their offending.

Similarly, this research found that contact offenders are different to dual offenders. Contact offenders tend to be higher functioning in relationships; more likely to use alcohol; less likely to experience a mood state at the time of offending; and more likely to have a lower Static 99 overall score. Predictive modelling found that when compared to dual offenders, individuals are more likely to be contact offenders if they are married; abuse alcohol; do not have direct access to victims (as opposed to indirect access); have fewer charges; and minimise the nature of their offending.

Examining characteristics of sentencing outcomes revealed that Internet offenders who experienced adverse life events are more likely to be sentenced to a longer duration in the community, while Internet offenders who demonstrate pro criminal attitudes and deny their offending are more likely to end up with a longer custodial sentence. This is not necessarily reflective of conscious sentencing practices, but rather a reflection of the distinction in severity of risk profiles of those who experience psychosocial disadvantage vs. those who hold pro criminal attitudes/beliefs.

These results reinforce the conclusions made by Babchishin et al. (2015) and indicate unique intervention pathways for Internet offenders. The current research provides strong support for this outcome on the basis of characteristic group differences. Treatment should place greater emphasis on improving pro
criminal attitudes and negative mood states, while perhaps recognising that
demographic and psychological characteristics are of less importance in this
population (with exception to mental illness which was indicated within this
group). Demographic and psychological factors appear to be of most relevance to
dual offenders. The consideration of Internet specific characteristics should be
further examined for dual offenders and considered as an adjunct to pre-existing
treatment frameworks for this group.
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LETTERS OF APPROVAL FROM ETHICS COMMITTEE

From: Keith Wilkins
Sent: Friday, 11 July 2014 6:24 PM
To: James Ogloff; Marie Henshaw
Cc: RES Ethics
Subject: SHR Project 2014/133 Swinburne Ethics Clearance

To: Prof James Ogloff/Ms Marie Henshaw, FHAD

Dear Jim and Marie

SHR Project 2014/133 The socio-demographic, personal history and offending characteristics of online child pornography offenders: A comparison with contact-only and dual sexual offenders
Prof James Ogloff, CFBS/FHAD; Ms Marie Henshaw et al
Approved Duration: 11/07/2014 to 31/01/2015 [Adjusted]

I refer to the ethical review of the above project protocol by Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee (SUHREC). Your responses to the review, as emailed on 8 July 2014, were put to the Committee delegate for consideration.

I am pleased to advise that, as submitted to date, ethics clearance has been given for the above project to proceed in line with standard ongoing ethics clearance conditions outlined below. The clearance is given on the understanding that relevant pages of the finalised research agreement with Victoria Police is submitted for the record. Evidence of clearance from Justice HREC for the project protocol (consistent with the Swinburne-approved protocol) should be submitted as soon as practicable for the record.

- All human research activity undertaken under Swinburne auspices must conform to Swinburne and external regulatory standards, including the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research and with respect to secure data use, retention and disposal.

- The named Swinburne Chief Investigator/Supervisor remains responsible for any personnel appointed to or associated with the project being made aware of ethics clearance conditions, including research and consent procedures or instruments approved. Any change in chief investigator/Supervisor requires timely notification and SUHREC endorsement.

- The above project has been approved as submitted for ethical review by or on behalf of SUHREC. Amendments to approved procedures or instruments ordinarily require prior ethical appraisal/clearance. SUHREC must be notified immediately or as soon as possible thereafter of (a) any serious or unexpected adverse effects on participants and any redress measures; (b) proposed changes in protocols; and (c) unforeseen events which might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project.

- At a minimum, an annual report on the progress of the project is required as well as at the conclusion (or abandonment) of the project. Information on project monitoring, self-audits and progress reports can be found at: http://www.research.swinburne.edu.au/ethics/human/monitoringReportingChanges/ (However, formats required by or submitted to Justice HREC in this regard may be acceptable all things being equal.)
- A duly authorised external or internal audit of the project may be undertaken at any time.

Please contact the Research Ethics Office if you have any queries about on-going ethics clearance, citing the project number. Please retain a copy of this email as part of project record-keeping.

Best wishes for the project.

Yours sincerely

Keith

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Keith Wilkins
Secretary, SUHREC & Research Ethics Officer
Dear Jim and Marie,

SHR Project 2014/133 The socio-demographic, personal history and offending characteristics of online child pornography offenders: A comparison with contact-only and dual sexual offenders
Prof James Ogloff, CFBS/FHAD; Ms Marie Henshaw et al
Approved Duration Extended to 31/12/2015
Modified: January-March 2015 (x2)

I refer to your requests concerning modifications to the above project protocol as per emails of 29 January, 4 and 25 February, and 4 and 17 March 2015. The modification documentation was put to a SUHREC delegate and, as appropriate, to the recent meeting of Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee (SUHREC) held 6 March 2015. The Swinburne consideration significantly noted the external approvals granted, including the applications put to and approved by Justice HREC (see JHREC Ref CF/13/6727 dated 4 February and 16 March 2015 and Corrections Victoria Research Committee Ref CD/15/11967 dated 20 January 2015). Significantly, SUHREC considered that the case accessing additional sensitive information was consistent with the rationale for approval previously issued by SUHREC.

I am pleased to advise that, as modified to date, the project may continue in line with ethics clearance conditions previously communicated and reprinted below.

Please contact the Research Ethics Office if you have any queries about on-going ethics clearance, citing the project number. Please retain a copy of this email as part of project record-keeping.

As before, best wishes for the project.

Yours sincerely,

Keith

----------------------------------------
Keith Wilkins
Secretary, SUHREC & Research Ethics Officer
Swinburne Research (H68)
Swinburne University of Technology
P O Box 218
HAWTHORN VIC 3122
Tel +61 3 9214 5218
Fax +61 3 9214 5267
To: Prof James Ogloff/Ms Marie Henshaw, FHAD

Dear Jim and Marie

**SHR Project 2014/133 The socio-demographic, personal history and offending characteristics of online child pornography offenders: A comparison with contact-only and dual sexual offenders**
Prof James Ogloff, CFBS/FHAD; Ms Marie Henshaw et al
Approved Duration Extended to 31/12/2015; extended to 31/01/2017 [August 2016]
Modified: January-March 2015 (x2); August 2016

I refer to your request for a simple extension of ethics clearance to complete the approved human research activity as per the report form received at Swinburne Research on 12 August 2016.

There being no change to the approved protocol as submitted to date, I am authorised to issue the clearance for the extension to 31 January 2016. The standard ethics clearance conditions previously communicated and reprinted below still apply.

Please contact the Research Ethics Office if you have any queries about on-going ethics clearance, citing the SUHREC project number. Copies of clearance emails should be retained as part of project record-keeping.

As before, best wishes for the project.

Yours sincerely,
Astrid Nordmann
Professor James Ogloff
Director, Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science
Swinburne University of Technology and Victorian Institute of Forensic Mental Health Services
505 Hoddle St
Clifton Hill VIC 3068

19 May 2014

Dear Professor Ogloff

Research application: The socio-demographic, personal history and offending characteristics of online child pornography offenders: A comparison with contact-only and dual sexual offenders

The Corrections Victoria Research Committee (CVRC) considered your application for the above project on 8 May 2014. CVRC believes that this project may contribute new and valuable information to knowledge regarding sexual offending behaviour.

CVRC has provided support for this project, and the application can now progress to the Justice Human Research Ethics Committee (JHREC). Please contact the JHREC Secretariat for further information regarding submission to JHREC on ethics@justice.vic.gov.au.

Please ensure that you familiarise yourself with the Corrections Victoria Social Media Policy. Please sign the Agreement between Corrections Victoria and Researchers and mail this form c/o: Laura Wilson CVRC Secretary, Level 22, 121 Exhibition Street, Melbourne.

Pending JHREC approval, please contact Jenny Hosking, General Manager, Sex Offender Management Branch, on Jenny.Hosking@justice.vic.gov.au, to discuss the implementation and commencement of the research, specifically regarding data collection, research timeframes, costing and process. Please also contact Shasta Holland, Manager, Forecasting and Statistical Analysis on Shasta.Holland@justice.vic.gov.au, regarding the management of the data linkage.

If you have any queries about this letter, please contact Laura Wilson, CVRC Secretary, on 8684 6567 or cvrc@justice.vic.gov.au.
20 January 2015

Professor James R P Ogloff
Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science
505 Hoddle Street
Clifton Hill
VICTORIA 3068

Dear Professor Ogloff

Amendment to project (CD/14/435171) – The socio-demographic, personal history and offending characteristics of online child pornography offenders: A comparison with contact-only and dual sexual offenders

The Corrections Victoria Research Committee (CVRC) considered the amendment request for this project at the CVRC meeting on 24 October 2014. The CVRC has provided in-principle support for your amendment request, the details of which are as follows:

Amendment Request 1: Addition of researcher Angela Sorotos
CVRC fully supports this amendment request.

Amendment Request 2: Application to collect additional information from the Specialised Offender and Treatment Service (SOATS)

a) Amendment to Data Linkage Phase: CVRC supports this amendment request in-principle, subject to the availability of the data. Certain demographic variables will only be available after a database linkage that is scheduled to occur at the end of March. Please also note that the integrity of the data may not be robust due to a recent transition to a new risk assessment tool throughout Corrections Victoria. There may also be issues with the quality of data relating to religion and ethnicity.

b) Manual Data Collection Phase: CVRC supports this amendment request.

If you have any queries regarding this letter, please contact Andy Chiang, Acting CVRC Secretary, on (03) 86846671 or cvrc@justice.vic.gov.au.
14 January 2014

Professor James Ogloff
Director, Centre for Forensic Behavioural
Science
Monash University and Forensicare
505 Hoddle Street
Clifton Hill 3068
Victoria Australia

Dear Professor Ogloff,

Re: Application to the Research Coordinating Committee for RCC 692, "The socio-demographic, personal history and offending characteristics of online child pornography offenders: A comparison with contact-only and dual sexual offenders."

I write to advise you that the Victoria Police Research Coordinating Committee (RCC) has approved your request to undertake the above research involving Victoria Police.

This approval is conditional on:

- The Research Organisation signing a Research Agreement outlining the conditions governing the conduct of research involving Victoria Police.

You will need to ensure the completion of the Research Agreement and return it to Victoria Police before the research can commence. The Research Agreement will be forwarded to you electronically in due course.

If you have any queries or require further clarification please contact the RCC Secretariat on the contact details above.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr David Ballek
Secretariat, Research Coordinating Committee
APPENDIX THREE

DATA CODING PROTOCOL

Online child pornography offending data collection protocol

General response key unless otherwise indicated– no = 0; yes = 1; maybe = 3; unknown = 4; N/A = 5; Both = 6

Any response unknown that is listed below as numeric = 0

JAID - numeric

Participant Code: N/A Coder: Date:
numeric numeric

Date of psychiatric / psychological report(s): numeric

Sentencing date: numeric

Length of sentence: numeric

NPP: numeric

Type of sentence: CCO = 1, ESO = 2, DSO = 3, CBO = 4, ICO = 5, Incarceration/Custodial = 6, Parole = 7, RRO = 8, Unknown = 9,

EED: numeric

EDD: numeric

1. Demographics
Gender: Male = 1 Female = 0
Year of birth: numeric
Age at first offence ever : numeric Age at index offence: numeric

Ethnicity:
Australian / Caucasian = 0 Indigenous Australian = 1 CALD (Specify:) = 2 Unknown = 3

Education:
Incomplete secondary schooling - Highest year level completed is year 11: = 12
Incomplete secondary schooling - Highest year level completed is year 10: = 11
Incomplete secondary schooling - Highest year level completed is year 9: = 10
Incomplete secondary schooling - Highest year level completed is year 8: = 9
Incomplete secondary schooling - Highest year level completed is year 7: = 8
Completed secondary school - Year 10 = 7
Completed high school - Year 12 = 6
Completed Certificate / TAFE course = 5
Incomplete tertiary education = 4
Completed tertiary degree = 3
Incomplete post-graduate degree = 2
Completed post-graduate degree = 1
Unknown = 0

Employment status at time of offence:
Unemployed = 0 Casually employed = 1 Part-time employment = 2 Full-time employment = 3 Unknown = 4 Full time student at high school = 5

Profession:
Unknown = 0
Trainee = 1
Public servant = 2
Self-employed = 3
Unskilled = 4
Technician = 5
Hospitality = 6
N/A = 7
Retired = 8

Relationship status at time of offence:
Single = 0 Partnered = 1 De facto = 2 Married = 3 Separated = 4 Divorced = 5 Widowed = 6 Unknown = 7

2. Personal History
Childhood adversity (tick any that apply):
Family dysfunction (none = 0; parental separation = 1, parental mental illness = 2, substance use or incarceration = 3; domestic violence = 4; parental absence = 5; Bullied = 6; relocation = 7; lack of peer network = 8 consumed alcohol young = 9 Unknown = 10; lacked warmth/emotion = 11; incontinence = 12; witness to murder or death (suicide) = 13; parental death = 14; abusive environment = 15; placed in foster care = 16; abandonment = 17; mental illness = 18; Felt like loner = 19; refugee = 20; lonely = 21; emotionally distant from parent = 22; felt unsafe at school = 23; academically challenged = 24; left home young = 25; Never met parent = 26; illegitimate child = 28; exposed to sex early on = 29; family member died = 30; other family member with mental illness = 31; learning disability = 32; ill parent requiring care = 35; didn’t get along with siblings = 36; Strict parent = 37; raised during war time = 40; Sexually abused sibling = 41; Suspended from school = 42; Very unhappy childhood = 43)

Abuse: Abuse No = 0 Severe Neglect = 1; Verbal / emotional = 2; Sexual = 3; Physical = 4; Unknown = 5
**Adverse life events:** (None = 0; Parental death = 1; war survivor = 2; Parental mental illness [not in childhood] = 3; Significant loss = 4; physical ailment = 5 Unknown = 6; Adopted = 7; socio-economic disadvantage = 8; sexually abused as adult = 9; physically abused as adult = 10; emotionally abused as adult = 11; engaged in prostitution = 12; disabled parents = 14; homeless = 15; psychiatric patient = 16; ill/disabled child = 17; bullied = 18; incontinence = 19; death of child = 20; lost access to children = 21; child with mental illness = 22; had an accident = 23; mental breakdown = 24; early sexual experience = 26; migrated = 28; mental illness = 29; assaulted = 30; expelled from school = 31; attempt assault (victim) = 32; rejected by significant person = 33; parent was prisoner of war = 34; separated from parents by country = 36; Incorrectly incarcerated = 37; difficult marriage = 38; broken relationship with children = 39; racially abused = 40; carer of family member = 41; Declared bankruptcy = 42; confused about sexuality = 43; parent commit serious crime = 46; relocation = 47; lack of friends = 48; Divorced = 49)

**Relationship History:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Number: numeric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever been in a significant relationship?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been married?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever lived with a partner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mental Health and Substance Use:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Specify:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Depression = 0; Anxiety = 1; Aspergers = 2; Borderline Personality Disorder = 3; Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder = 4; Bi-polar disorder = 5; Schizoid Personality Disorder = 6; Attention deficit disorder = 7; Panic disorder = 8; Pedophilia = 9; Dysthymic Disorder = 10; Personality Disorder with Obsessive and Schizoid Features = 11; Paranoid psychotic illness = 12; Auditory hallucinations = 13; Grief counselling = 14; Social anxiety = 15; Adjustment disorder = 16; Alcohol dependency = 17; Cannabis dependency disorder = 18; ADHD = 19; Antisocial PD = 20; Paranoid personality disorder = 21; Paraphilia not otherwise specified = 22; Psychosis = 23; Sexual disorder not otherwise specified = 24; Substance dependence = 25; Passive aggressive personality disorder = 26; Hoarding disorder = 27; Social phobia = 28; Frotterism = 29; Voyeurism = 30; Autism = 31; Fetishism = 32; Urophilia = 33; Eating disorder = 34; Dependent personality = 35; Autism spectrum disorder (high functioning) = 36; Agoraphobia = 37; Drug induced psychosis = 38; Anger = 39; Narcissistic personality disorder = 40; Schizoaffective disorder = 41; Cross dressing fetishism = 42; Anxiety mood = 43; Depressed mood = 44; Psychotic features = 45; Dissociative disorder = 46; OCD = 47; Acquired situational sexual dysfunction behaviour = 48; Schizophrenia = 49; Cannabis abuse disorder = 50; Grief related/bereavement = 51

Any history of mental illness noted? Yes No

| Depression = 0; Anxiety = 1; Aspergers = 2; Borderline Personality Disorder = 3; Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder = 4; Bi-polar disorder = 5; Schizoid Personality Disorder = 6; Attention deficit disorder = 7; Panic disorder = 8; Pedophilia = 9; |
Dysthymic Disorder = 10; Personality Disorder with Obsessive and Schizoid Features = 11; Paranoid psychotic illness = 12; Auditory hallucinations = 13; Grief counselling = 14; Social anxiety = 15; Adjustment disorder = 16; Alcohol dependency = 17; Cannibus dependency disorder = 18; ADHD = 19; Antisocial PD = 20; Paranoid personality disorder = 21; Paraphilia not otherwise specified = 22; Psychosis = 23; Sexual disorder not otherwise specified = 24; Substance dependence = 25; Passive aggressive personality disorder = 26; Hoarding disorder = 27; Social phobia = 28; Frotterism = 29; Voyeurism = 30; Autism = 31; Fettishism = 32; Urophilia = 33; Eating disorder = 34; Dependent personality = 35; Autism spectrum disorder (high functioning) = 36; Agoraphobia = 37; Drug induced psychosis = 38; Anger = 39; Narcissistic personality disorder = 40; Schizoaffective disorder = 41; Cross dressing fetishism = 42; Anxiety mood = 43; Depressed mood = 44; Psychotic features = 45; Dissociative disorder = 46; OCD = 47; Acquired situational sexual dysfunction behaviour = 48; Schizophrenia = 49; Cannabis abuse disorder = 50; Grief related/bereavement = 51

Specify:

ABI: Yes No

ID: Yes No Maybe

History of suicide attempts of ideation. Specify: Unknown = 0 No = 1 Yes = 2 Ideation = 3

History of excessive alcohol use / abuse? Yes No Unknown

History of substance use / abuse? Yes No Unknown
Cannabis = 0; Amphetamines = 1; Heroin = 2; Ecstasy = 3; Benzos = 4; Methamphetamines = 5; Recreational mushrooms = 6; LSD = 7; GHB = 8; Cocaine = 9; Prescription medication = 10; Acid = 11; Hallucinogens = 12; Valium = 13; Serepax = 14; Steroids = 15; Opiates = 16; Dexamphetamines = 17; Chroming = 18; ethanol = 19

If so, list all substances

2. Personal History continued…

Tier level: 2

Sexual Preferences / Deviance:
Any paraphilia diagnoses made in report? Yes No

Hypersexuality indicated? Yes No

Atypical sexual interests or behaviours? Yes No

Specify:
Exposure = 0; Voyeurism = 1; Violent/Sadism = 2; Young males = 3; Pre-pubescent children = 4; Animals = 5; Masturbating with child’s socks and sneakers = 6; Masturbating with children’s books = 7; Exhibitionism = 8; Cross-dressing = 9; Watching child porn = 10; Pubescent females = 11; Post pubescent females = 12; Male to female transsexuals = 13; Transvestic fetishism – female infantile cross-dressing = 14; Up-skirting = 15; Writing and sending provocative letters/pictures = 16; Fetish of soiled undergarments = 17; Adoption of a female alter ego = 18; Making erotic home videos with both adults and child = 19; Hebephilic sexual interest = 20; Incest pornography = 21; taking adult female underwear off clothing lines = 22; sex with biological daughter pre pubescent = 23; Incest = 24; Watching females urinating = 25; Necrophilia = 26; Rape = 27; Torture = 28; Exposure to elderly = 29; Fetish for women’s underwear = 30; Foot fetish = 31; master/slave fetish = 32;

Sexuality: □ Heterosexual = 0; □ Homosexual = 1 □ Bi-sexual = 2 □ Unknown = 3
Sexual preference for children? Unknown = 0 □ Yes = 1 □ No = 2
Preferred age range numeric or □ Unknown = 0
Preferred Gender: Unknown = 0 □ Male = 1 □ Female = 2 □ Both = 3

**Type of offender:** Internet = 0; Contact = 1; Mixed/dual offending = 2

### 3. Offence characteristics

#### Contact offences:
Number of victims: numeric Age(s) of victim(s): numeric
Gender of victims: □ Unknown = 0 □ Male = 1 □ Female = 2 □ Both = 3 N/A = 4

List of current offences
None = 0
Rape = 1
Murder = 2
Incest by parent = 3
Use phone to harass = 4
Indecent act child = 5
Indecent act child under 14 years = 6
Stalking = 7
Incest by step parent = 8
Attempted incest by step parent = 9
Indecent act with child under 16 = 10
Make/produce child porn = 11
Indecent act in presence of child under 16 = 12
Incest = 13
Expose child to indecent act = 14
Indecent treatment of child under 1 = 15
Rape of child under 16 = 16
Unlawfully and indecently dealt with a child under the age of 16 years = 17
Procure child to commit indecent act = 18
Import child pornography = 19
Wilful exposure = 20
Fail to comply reporting obligations = 21
Breach CCO = 22
Sexual penetration of a child under 12 = 23
Knowingly possess child pornography = 24
Indecent assault = 25
Sexual penetration of a child under 16 = 26
Incest by lineal ancestor = 27
Unlawful assault = 28
Wilful and obscene exposure = 29
Maintaining a relationship with a child under 16 years = 30
Sexual penetration of a child between 10 and 16 years = 31
Committing an indecent act with a child under 16 years = 32
Sexual penetration of a child under 16 in care/sup/auth = 33
Sexual penetration = 34
Indecent assault on a male person = 35
Digital penetration = 36
Committing an indecent act against boy under the age of 16 years = 37
Bestiality = 38
Attempted bestiality = 39
Sexual penetration of a child under 10 = 40
Aggravated cruelty = 41
Cruelty = 42
Fail to appear = 43
Supplying a drug of dependence to a child = 44
Stalk another person = 45
Wilful and obscene exposure in public = 46
Indecent act with a female child = 47
Gross indecency in the presence of a child under 16 = 48
Gross indecency with a person under 16 = 49
Gross indecency with a male = 50
Maintain sexual relationship with a child under 16 = 51
Attempted sexual penetration of a child under 16 = 52
Indecent act with a child under 16 while under supervision/authorised care = 53
Behave in an indecent manner in public place = 54
Use postal service to offend = 55
Administer drug for sexual penetration = 56
Procure child under 16 for sexual penetration with another = 57
Child stealing with intent = 58
Attempted incest by parent = 59
Taking part in an act of sexual penetration with a child under 16 = 60
Child stealing = 61
Attempted sexual penetration of a child under 10 = 62
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Description</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>False imprisonment</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted sex offender loitering</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer drug for sexual penetration - self</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procure child under 16 for sexual penetration with self</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted incest</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use service to groom child under 16</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buggery</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent sexual abuse of a child under 16</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic drug of independence</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross indecency</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent assault of a person under the age of 16 years</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted assault of a person under 16 years</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to answer bail</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach suspended sentence order</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procure for sexual penetration by threat/intimidate</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procure for sexual penetration by fraud</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make threats to kill</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionally cause serious injury</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent exposure</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to commit an act of gross indecency</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing an indecent act in the presence of a child</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causing a child to take part in prostitution</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual penetration of a child</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent act</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted rape</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawfully assault a girl</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loiter public place frequented by a child</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a carriage service to harass</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fail to comply with CBO</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committing an indecent act with, or in the presence of, girls under 16 years of age</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit an indecent act in the presence of a child under 16 years</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent act with a child under 16 or 17</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property damage</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive payment for sex services provided by a child</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induce child take part in prostitution</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent act with or in the presence of a child under 16</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compelling sexual penetration</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit an indecent act with a child under 16</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackmail</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess drug of dependence</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual penetration of a child under 16/17 under the care/sup/auth</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempt to pervert the course of justice</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually capture PSN genitals – up skirting</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent act with a child under 16/17 in care/sup/auth</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compel another to take part in an act of sexual penetration = 108
Intentionally threaten serious injury = 109
Abduct child under 16 to sex penetration = 110
Common law assault = 111
Known sex offender loiter in public place = 112
Possess cannabis not more than 50 grams = 113
Possess unregistered handgun = 114
Possess imitation handgun = 115
Unlicensed store firearm = 116
Possess controlled weapon without excuse = 117
Drive while auth suspended = 118
Indecent act with a 16 year old under care/sup/authority = 119
Party to comm. Of indecent act under 16 = 120
Supply liquor to minor = 121
Purchase tobacco for person u 18 = 122
Possess cannabis = 123
Use cannabis = 124
State false address when requested = 125
Incest by parents = 126
Possession of firearm = 127
Unlicensed store firearm in a non-secure manner = 128
Breach ICO = 129
Attempted murder = 130
Arson = 131
Indecent act with child in care/sup/auth = 132
Traffic drug of dependence to a child = 133
Cultivate narcotic plant = 134
Exhibit in private to minor RC film = 135
Indecent assault on a female = 136
Gross indecency with a girl under 16 years = 137
Commit indecent act with a child under 16 = 138
Carnal knowledge with girl under 10 = 139
Indecent act of a person under 16 in care/sup/auth = 140
Sexual penetration of a child under 13 = 141
Indecently dealt with a child under 13 years = 142
Indecent assault on a child under 16 = 143
Indecent assault on a male under 16 years = 144
Indecent assault of a child under 10 = 145
Digital rape of a male under 16 = 146
Breach intervention order = 147
Cultivate cannabis = 148
Unlawfully/indecently assault a girl = 149
Maintain relationship with child under 16 = 150
Recklessly cause injury = 151
Aggravated burglary = 152
Stalking – keep a person under surveillance = 153
Possess prohibited weapon without exemption = 154
Non proh possess unreg cat a longarm = 155
Convicted sex offender loiter school = 156
Gross indecency with a child under 17 years = 157
Carnal knowledge = 158
Contravene an intervention order = 159
Distribute image PSN genitals upskirting = 160

**Child pornography offences:**
Age of children depicted: □ Infant = 0; □ Pre-pubescent minor = 1; □ Pubescent minor = 2; □ Unknown = 3; N/A = 4
Gender of victims: □ Unknown = 0 □ Male = 1 □ Female = 2 □ Both = 3 N/A = 4

List current offences –

None = 0
possess child pornography = 1
Use server to procure under 16 for sexual act = 2
Use server to groom under 16 for sexual act = 3
Knowingly possess child pornography = 4
Use carriage service to access child pornography = 5
Use carriage service to transmit child pornography = 6
Make/produce child porn = 7
Take indecent photo of child under the age of 16 years = 8
Make child pornography = 9
Intentionally import child pornography = 10
Use online information to transmit child porn = 11
Possess cannabis = 12
Stalking = 13
Contravene a family violence order = 14
Possess drug of dependence = 15
Procure minor to make/produce child porn = 16
Cause minor making/production child porn = 17
Use online info to publish child porn = 18
Producing child pornography = 19
Procuring a minor for child pornography = 20
Suspected person loiter in public place = 21
Behave in indecent manner public place = 22
Stalk another person = 23
Install surveillance device without consent = 24
Use service to procure under 16 for sexual act = 25
Invite minor making/production of child porn = 26
Use carriage service to procure a person under 16 = 27
Use online service to transmit objectionable material = 28
Use of carriage service to groom person under 16 = 29
Use optical surveillance device = 30
Use carriage service to make child porn material available = 31
Use a carriage service to access child porn material = 32
Use carriage service to offend = 33
Import tier 2 goods comprise child porn = 34
Import tier 2 goods child abuse material = 35
Maintain optical surveillance device = 36
Use of Internet to access child porn = 37
Use of Internet to access child abuse material = 38
Use service to transmit indecent communication to under 16 = 39
Cause child porn transmit to self – use service = 40
Access child porn using carriage service = 41
Intentionally import prohibited tier 2 goods = 42
Make available child porn using carriage service = 43
Fail to comply with order = 44
Production of child porn = 45
Fail to comply with reporting obligations = 46
Possess prohibited weapon without approval = 47
Procure a child for porn = 48
Procure minor for making porn = 49
Att. Procure minor for child porn = 50
Procure a minor for child porn = 51
Breach CBO = 52
Procure child porn = 53
Use a carriage service to menace = 54
Use online info to transmit material to a minor = 55
Transmitting child porn = 56
Procure child for making child porn = 57
Use service to groom child under 16 for sexual act = 58
Print child porn = 59
Use online info service make available obj material = 60
Use a carriage service to cause child pornography material to be transmitted = 61
Produce child porn for use-carriage service = 62
Groom child under 16 for sexual activity o/s Australia = 63
Transmit child porn using carriage service = 64
Import any prohibited imports = 65
Import tier 2 goods child porn = 66
Dissemination of child porn = 67
Procuring a child to commit an indecent act = 68
Make a communication for a prurient purpose = 69

Further findings –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Movies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Motivation to offend:
5. Attitudes and beliefs regarding offence:
Offence justification: Yes No Unknown N/A:
Minimise the nature of their offending Yes No Unknown
Minimise or deny impact of their offending on the victim Yes No Unknown
Condone or support offending or criminal lifestyle Yes No
Minimise impact of offending on self Yes No Unknown
Drug or alcohol abuse apparent, does the person deny it’s a problem Yes No
Person reject sentence or believe it’s too severe Yes No
Does the person show hostility to the assessor/fail to co-op Yes No

6. Offence specific factors:
Involvements with criminal associates Yes No unknown
AOD in offending Yes No unknown
Mental disorder in offending Yes No
Direct access to previous victims Yes No
Mood states present Yes No If yes, explain:
Financial pressure related to offending Yes No
Pro criminal/anti-social attitudes Yes No
Family pressure as factor in offending Yes No
Inability or unwillingness to think about consequences of offending on victim Yes No Unknown

7. Risk of recidivism and other psychometric tests
Static 99: XXXX risk
LOW = 0; LOW MODERATE = 1; MODERATE = 2; MODERATE HIGH = 3; HIGH = 4; Unknown = 5; None = 6
Score - NUMERIC
- Young (0/1)
- Ever lived with lover for a least two years (0/1)
- Index non-sexual violence - any convictions (0/1)
- Prior non-sexual violence - any convictions (0/1)
- Prior sex offences (0,1,2,3)
- Prior sentencing dates (0/1)
- Any convictions for non-contact sex offences (0/1)
- Any unrelated victims (0/1)
- Any stranger victims (0/1)
- Any male victims (0/1)

MSIP
Sexual deviance scales
Exhibitionism type = 0

Child molest type = 1

All the below are numeric
- Social/sexual desirability – /35
- Sexual obsessions – /20
- Lie child molest/rape – /13
- Cognitive distortions – /21
- Justifications /24
- Treatment – /8
- Sexual knowledge/beliefs – /24
- Fantasy – /10
- Cruising/grooming – /10
- Sexual assault – /9
- Aggravated assault – /6
- Incest type OR sado mas OR adv assault – /4

Paraphilia
Numeric
- Fetish – /9
- Voyeurism – /9
- Obscene calss – /4
- Bondge – /6
- Sado mas – /10

Sex dysfunction
Numeric
- Sexual inadequances – /8
- Prem ejaculation – /4
- Physical disabilities – /8
- Impotence – /12

i. Sexual fantasy scale (items endorsed only) numeric

ii. WAIS – N/A numeric – only include the full scale IQ (FSIQ)

iii. Abel and Becker – numeric (<50 indicates deviant cognitions)

iv. Burt Rape Myth Acceptance – numeric (M 53.4, SD 18)
v. Fear of negative evaluation – numeric

vi. Fear of intimacy – numeric (Mean 78.75, SD 21.82)

vii. The relationship Q’aire – numeric
- Fearful –
- Secure –
- Preoccupied –
- Dismissing –

viii. Social avoidance and distress scale – numeric

ix. Wilson sex fantasy q’aire numeric
- Intimate – (M 16.9)
- Exploratory – (M 8.1)
- Impersonal – (M 7.6)
- Sado maso – (M 2.3)
- TOTAL -

x. Child molester empathy scale numeric
- Story 1 total; M 277.62; SD 61.06
- Story 2 total; M 284.76; SD 101.47
- Story 3 total; M 173.59; SD 127.42

xi. Hostility towards women – numeric

Victim empathy: Unknown = 0; Low = 1; Moderate/low = 2; Moderate = 3; Moderate/high = 4; High = 5; None = 6

8. Treatment completed – YEAR – numeric
Modular Management and Intervention Program (MMIP) = 0
Maintaining change program = 1
Skills Based Intervention Program (SBIP) = 2
Community Psychologist = 3
SOATS other = 4
Private psychologist = 5
None = 6
Unknown = 7
Better lives program (BLP) = 11
Not yet commenced = 12
Disability supported pathways (SOP) = 13
Refused treatment = 14
Not recommended = 15
MIP = 16
Other Group based intervention = 17
Not yet completed – withdrew due to illness = 18
Intensive Sex Offender Program (ISOP) = 19
Completed, but treatment type unknown = 20
Referred elsewhere = 21

9. No. of sessions completed - numeric
10. Attitudes during treatment – engaged = 0; positive = 1; negative = 2;
disengaged = 3; removed from treatment prior to completion = 4; denial = 5;
minimising = 6; satisfactory = 7; reserved = 8; anxious = 9; impression
management = 10; stressed = 11; justified behaviour = 12; superiority attitude =
13; passive aggressive = 14; resent authority = 15; instability = 16; ambivalence =
17; resistant = 18; empathic = 19; frustrated = 20; antagonistic = 21; distracted =
22; cooperative = 23; hesitant = 24; remorseful = 25; untrusting = 26; immature =
27; unknown = 28; Defensive = 29; unsatisfactory = 30; removed from group =
31; rigid attitudes = 32; self-focused = 33; quiet/shy = 34; unable to apply
knowledge learnt = 35; low self-esteem = 36; Difficulty with distress tolerance =
37; limited engagement with other members = 38; victim blaming = 39; angry =
40; physically aggressive = 41; incongruent = 42; unrealistic = 43; reoffended
during treatment = 44; lied/disingenuine = 45; withdrew = 46; social anxiety = 47;
treatment gains = 48; limited gains = 49 progressively engaged (over time) = 50,
accepted responsibility = 51, victim empathy = 52, some engagement = 53

11. Does offender have children? Numeric

12. Prior offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODING</th>
<th>Offence type</th>
<th>YES/NO – N/A-exclude</th>
<th>FREQUENCY Numeric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Drug offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Murder/manslaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Possession of weapons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sexual offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Criminal negligence – ie. driving offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fraud, forgery, impersonation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Escape, breach bail conditions etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Obstruction of justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Treason, espionage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vandalism, property damage, recklessly cause injury etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Stalking offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Unlawful possession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Deal property proceeds of crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Other: Possess prohibited goods etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Notes – N/A