

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT SEXUAL REOFFENDING AND SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT AND TREATMENT?

Webinar Transcript: Internet-Facilitated Sexual Offending

Bethany Broida: Welcome everyone. My name is Bethany Broida and I am the Director of Communications of the National Criminal Justice Association. It is my pleasure to welcome you to What Do We Know About Sexual Offending and Sex Offender Management and Treatment? Internet-Facilitated Offending. This webinar is the second in a nine-part series that is designed to provide policy makers and practitioners with trustworthy, up-to-date information they can use to identify and implement what works to combat sexual offending and prevent sexual victimization.

Each webinar in this series focuses on evidence from state-of-the-art research, knowledge gaps, unresolved controversies, and the implications of key research findings for policy and practice. These webinars take place every three weeks or so, and there's a schedule on the NCJA website. Registration is currently open for the next three webinars in the series, so go ahead and register for any of the upcoming ones. Also, if you missed the first webinar, which was on Incidents, Prevalence, and Adult Etiology, the webcast from that session is also available on the NCJA website.

Before I go any further, I want to thank our wonderful partners at the SMART Office in the Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs for making this webinar possible.

Before we begin, let me quickly cover a few logistical items. First and foremost, we'll be recording today's session for future playback. The recording and the slides for this session we posted on the NCJA website at NCJA.org/webinars. It will also be emailed to everyone who registered for this session. Today's webinar is being audio cast through the speakers on your computer. If you do not have speakers or would prefer to use your phone, please use the number contained in your registration email or on the event info tab located on the top left hand side of this screen. If you use the audio through your computer and are having trouble, please feel free to call in using the phone. Due to the number of people joining us today, we have muted all participants to reduce background noise.

If you have questions for the presenters, we encourage you to send it to them using the chat feature on the right hand side of your screen. Please select host and presenter from the drop down menu next to the text box. We have also included a time for a question and answer period at the end of the presentation, so if we don't answer your question during the main presentation, we will try to get to it during the Q&A. You may submit your question at any time. If you would like to communicate with NCJA staff during the webinar, please submit your comment using the chat feature to Bethany Broida or host.

The session is scheduled for an hour and a half, and we will end promptly at 3:30 pm. Eastern Time. If you have technical difficulties or disconnected during the session, you can reconnect using the same link that you used to join the session initially, or you can call Web Ex technical support at 866-229-3239. In the last five minutes of the question and answer period, we will ask you to complete a short

Need Help? <mailto:support@rev.com>

[Get this transcript](#) in a non-paragraph format

survey. The answer you provide will help us plan and improve future webinars.

At this time, I would like to briefly introduce our speakers today's webinar:

In November 2014, Luis deBaca was appointed by President Barack Obama as the Director of the Justice Department's Office of Sex Offenders Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking. Otherwise known as the SMART Office. Mr. deBaca previously coordinated US Government activities in the global fight against contemporary forms of slavery as Ambassador at Large for the State Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of Persons. He's served as counsel to the House Committee on the Judiciary, where his portfolio for Chairman John Conyers Jr. included national security, intelligence, immigration, civil rights, and modern slavery issues. At the Justice Department from 1993 to 2006, he led the investigation and prosecution of cases involving human trafficking, official misconduct, and hate crimes, as well as money laundering, organized crime, and alien smuggling. He is the recipient of the Secretary of State's Distinguished Honor Award, the Attorney General's Distinguished Service Award, the Attorney General's John Marshall Award, and a Director's Award from the Executive Office of the United States Attorneys. He has received the leading honor given by national human trafficking service provider, a comm

In November 2014, Luis deBaca was appointed by President Barack Obama as the Director of the Justice Department's Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking, otherwise known as the SMART Office. Mr. deBaca previously coordinated U.S. government activities in the global fight against contemporary forms of slavery as Ambassador at Large for the State Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons. He served as Counsel to the House Committee on the Judiciary, where his portfolio for Chairman John Conyers, Jr. included national security, intelligence, immigration, civil rights, and modern slavery issues. At the Justice Department from 1993 to 2006, he led the investigation and prosecution of cases involving human trafficking, official misconduct, and hate crimes, as well as money laundering, organized crime, and alien smuggling. He is the recipient of the Secretary of State's Distinguished Honor Award, the Attorney General's Distinguished Service Award, the Attorney General's John Marshall Award, and the Director's Award from the Executive Office of United States Attorneys. He has received the leading honor given by the national human trafficking victim service provider community--the Freedom Network's Paul & Sheila Wellstone Award--and has been named the Michigan Law School's Distinguished Latino Alumnus.

Next, we have Scott Matson who is the Senior Policy Advisor at the SMART Office. Mr. Matson advises thirty-seven states and the District of Columbia in adopting the standards for the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, otherwise known as SORNA. In addition, he leads the Office efforts on the Sex Offender Management and Planning Initiative. Before joining SMART, Mr. Matson was a project manager at the JEHT Foundation, where he developed and managed a criminal justice portfolio on issues such as sentencing and corrections policy, reentry, wrongful convictions, and the death penalty. Prior to joining JEHT, he was Associate Director

of the Vera Institute of Justice's Center on Sentencing and Corrections. Mr. Matson served as a research associate at the Center for Sex Offender Management, where he provided training and technical assistance to a wide range of international, national, state, and local audiences. He began his career at the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, where he researched issues of importance to the state legislature, including sex offender registration, community notification, and civil commitment policies.

Finally, Dr. Michael Seto is a registered clinician and forensic psychologist and research director with the Royal Ottawa Health Care Group. He also serves as the editor-in-chief of *Sexual Abuse*, a journal of research and treatment, and has adjunct professor appointments at four universities: the University of Toronto, Ryerson University, Carleton University, and the University of Ottawa. Dr. Seto has published extensively on pedophilia, child pornography, and sexual offending, and regularly presents at scientific meetings and professional workshops on these topics. He authored well-received books on pedophilia and sexual offending against children in 2008, and on internet sex offenders released in June 2013.

I will now turn the presentation over to Director deBaca.

Luis deBaca:

Thank you and thanks everybody for coming. This is the second of the webinars, and we're very happy that NCJ is pulling these together and want to welcome, as was said, Michael Seto from the Institute of Mental Health Research to join us today.

I simply want to launch with a couple of quick thoughts. I think one of the things that we've seen, even just in the growth of the SMART Office and the growth of the first Megan's Law and then Adam Walsh Act that fueled a lot of the things that people think of when they think of the SMART Office, have kind of gotten to at the same time as the growth of the internet. Really we're talking about a phenomenon that is less than twenty years old. Which I think while you've got a lot of resources, certainly the federal and state levels have put into investigating internet-facilitated crimes against children. You've got more than tripling of the arrests over the last years in this area. At the same time, we don't necessarily know as much as we could about these offenders. We don't necessarily know what the offender profile is, much less how we can have the appropriate interventions. I'm very excited about this aspect of the SOMAPI project, and I think that today that we'll hopefully key up not only what do we know, but what are the big questions that we need to be wrestling with.

Because of the realms of use of the internet, because of the realms of use of these law enforcement interventions, a lot of the offenders are not necessarily out of custody yet. They are necessarily receiving the types of services or other interventions where we could learn more about them. There isn't a great amount of research out there. I think that we're going to hear today about some of the different types of offending. The differences between, say for instance, pedophiles and solicitation offenders and how that plays into the things that we know, or things that we're starting to know more about sex offenders in general.

I want to turn it over to Scott and to again thank everybody for joining us on this second part of the webinars.

Scott Matson: Thanks Lu. Before we launch into the contents Dr. Seto's going to provide, I want to provide a bit of background about OJTs, efforts in this area, and SMART Office's efforts as well, and a little bit about the project we have been working on over the last few years.

For those of us, or pretty much anybody who's been paying any attention over the past twenty years or so, it's pretty evident that sex offenders and the crimes they have committed have received a lot of attention from policymakers in the public and practitioners even. We've seen a growth in the number and types programs designed to control sexual violence and sex offenders, but we don't know a whole bunch about what works in controlling sexual violence and sexual offending. We do know that there's widespread recognition that overall crime control strategies are most effective when they're based on scientific evidence or research.

OJP, the Office of Justice Programs within the Department of Justice, has been really focused on this issue for almost twenty years now. OJP sponsored hundreds of research projects, presentations, and training curricula related to sexual assault and sex offender management, contributing comprehensive approaches to Sex Offender Management Grant Program, which was administered by the Center for Sex Offender Management, and various OJP offices and Bureaus over the years. Funds have been provided to hundreds of state, local, and federal jurisdictions through their Sex Offender Management programs.

In 2006, the SMART Office was established by the Adam Walsh Act. Their primary mission is to assist state tribes and territories in the implementation of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, which is Item One of the Adam Walsh Act. We were the first federal office solely devoted to sex offender management related activities. We see it as a secondary mission of our office to provide assistance across the whole spectrum of sex offender management related activities that are necessary to ensure public safety.

To those ends, we started the Sex Offender Management Assessment and Planning Initiative, or as we lovingly refer to it, the SOMAPI project. That's a bit of a joke, sorry. The goal of the project is really to identify what types of research is out there to support sex offender management programs. What types of things we should be looking at in our planning programs and quality decisions. We envision the project as a multi-phase project. We contracted with the National Criminal Justice Association and they contracted with a host of subject matter experts to conduct a literature review for us. Also they released an inventory, or survey if you will, inquiring about types of policies and programs and research that might be out there on different types of practices that are being used to manage sex offenders.

Then in 2012, we brought together about sixty national experts to basically vet and review what we had put together, to provide guidance to us about what we should

be focusing on with our funding and policy decisions, as well as making sure the literature and the research that we had in the report was up to date and current.

Here are the topic areas that the SOMAPI project, the report, was focused on. We recognized that it's important to distinguish between adults and juveniles. There are two sections in the report. We have eight topics related to adults sexual offending, and five topics strictly related to juvenile sexual offending.

All of this information, our entire SOMAPI report, is up on SMART Office website. I've got the link there. We've included all the literature reviews, the recommendation we received through the discussion forum, and also future research needs have been identified by experts that have reviewed the report and got pieces of the literature reviews. We're also working on producing a series of research briefs, which are basically stand alone documents that are the summaries of each of the literature review chapters and those should be available in the next month or so. Also, on that same website link you see there. We've been releasing this information to a variety of meetings. We've been attending regional and national conferences, providing information about the SOMAPI project and the SMART Office efforts. This is, as Lu and Bethany mentioned, this is the second in a series of webinars designed to release all the contents of the report.

Just a little bit of information about the literature review methods. I'll just take a second to thank all the authors that were included in the report that conducted the literature reviews for us as well as NCJ and Kristen and Roger who really served as the shepherds for the project. We really wanted all the authors to be basically consistent in how they approached the literature review. We wanted to look at current research, the studies that were primarily conducted over the last fifteen years or so. The studies were found common social science abstracts, databases, by consulting with other subject matter experts and key organizations in this field. We really, where possible, stressed the need to focus on synthesis and that analyses research as well as studies that utilized rigorous research methods.

With that, I will turn it over to Dr. Michael Seto to go through the contents of the report and we'll finish up with the Q&A afterwards. Michael?

Michael Seto: Yes, thank you very much. Thank you to everyone for joining us today. We don't have a lot of time, so what I hope to do in the next fifty to sixty minutes is provide you an overview of our current understanding of internet-facilitated sexual offending, provide a little context in terms of why we're focused on this topic, then talk a bit about the new work that's coming forward on the characteristics and motivations of internet offenders, how that connects to what we're learning about risk factors for sexual offending in this population, and also to talk about risk assessment, of course a key component of activities in terms of effective sex offender management, then talk about what's being done in terms of intervention and treatment programming and then end with some time for discussion and Q&A.

I've already mentioned, I think one of the things certainly that grabbed my interest in this population and that's been a big part of the last ten, fifteen years of my

research program, was this sense that there were rapidly increasing numbers of people who were getting into trouble with the law for internet-related sexual offending. As I mentioned earlier in the introduction by Mr. deBaca, in the United States, arrests for internet-related sexual offenses tripled from 2000 to 2010. I have a sense if you look at the latest numbers that that trend has continued since 2010. This has to all be put in the context of the fact that the internet in some ways, it feels like it's been around for a long time. We're doing all this over the internet. A lot of us have web-enabled smart phones and tablets and all these kinds of devices all around us so it seems like such a big part of our lives, but it is important to point out that twenty years ago, a lot of people did not have internet access, and if they did, it was slow dial-up access. This is an area where I think technology and criminal behavior have really been closely tied together.

Reflecting that rapid increase in the number of arrests for internet sexual offenses, it's the fastest rising offender type in federal custody. If you look at a recent report from the U.S. Sentencing Commission, I believe it was published in 2013, it's available online. If you look for it, it's a report to Congress on their data at the federal level on child pornography offenders. Looking at characteristics and a number of other questions, it's very clear that this is a significant group to be thinking about.

I think reflecting that tie between technology and this kind of criminal behavior is the sense that in particular for the the kind of offending that I'm going to spend most of the time today talking about, child pornography offending, that internet in itself has had a facilitating effect because of what's been called the AAA Engine or these three factors all starting with the letter A. The first, as I've commented on is the rapid increase in the accessibility of child pornography content, or in ways to contact minors online, to sexually solicit them, have sexual chats, suggest meeting them in the real world. It's almost pervasive. It's highly available in work places and schools. As I've mentioned, a lot of people have access to internet in their back pockets or jacket pockets. Certainly in terms of accessibility, it's a big change in the last twenty years, from almost no access to very prevalent access.

Tied to that increase in access of course is the affordability. Certainly in the early days, when people were starting to pay attention to the problem of online child pornography, there was a lot of discussion among policymakers and sort of the public concerns about a commercial for child pornography. There is a commercial market in terms of websites that charge fees to access the content. It's a very small, relatively speaking, small market. Most of the child pornography content online is freely available for those who know how to find it. The ability to accrue thousands, tens of thousands, even larger collections of child pornography, images and videos, it's very affordable. It's the cost basically of having high speed access.

Then I think as part of this kind of criminal behavior, but also sort of part of any social behavior in general, there really is something to this idea of what's been called an online disinhibition effect, the sense that people behave in ways when they're online because it seems like they're "anonymous." I put that in scare quotes because they aren't truly, as many an offender has discovered to his or her dismay

when law enforcement is able to track their activities. There's a sense that you're sitting in your home, you're alone, you're not using your name or any identifying information as far as you know, there is a sense that this online activity is anonymous, and it seems to disinhibit riskier behavior or more antisocial behavior. I think that that certainly is a more contributing force as well.

As I mentioned, most of this talk is going to focus on online child pornography offending, but there's other kinds of offending that I also just want to make sure that we talk about or mention, I should say. The first having to do with what's been called sexual solicitation offending or luring offending. Those are those kinds of offenses where adults are contacting minors online and engaging them in some kind of sexually inappropriate behavior, whether that's trying to get them to send images of themselves, engage in sexually explicit chat, or suggesting meeting in offline in order for a sexual encounter to take place. Then there's also internet involvement in some sexual assaults of adults and we're becoming aware in at least an anecdotal way that there's internet technologies involved in things like sex trafficking of minors and women, sex tourism involving juveniles and so forth.

The reason I'm going to focus on online child pornography offending is one, because that's the large majority of cases that is known to us in clinical and criminal justice settings and also because most of the research reflecting that population is focused on online child pornography offending.

My last comment in terms of introducing this topic is just to recognize that this is a complex kind of offending for a variety of reasons. Not the least of which is that it's often cross-jurisdictional. It's a bit of a cliché to say it, but some clichés have lots of truth in them. I think this cliché does have truth in it, which is the internet doesn't have borders. One of the complexities for law enforcement and for getting a better handle on this problem in terms of policy and research is that it's often cross-jurisdictional. For example, there might be a suspect in Canada who's trading child pornography content with another individual in the United States, both of them are using a service where the server is based in Eastern Europe, and they may be connected with other folks in Europe as well, so you can imagine the cross-jurisdictional issues that come into play in terms of subpoenaing records, or extradition agreements and so forth. One of the challenges being that we know that a lot of child pornography servers are hosted in jurisdictions where there are no explicit laws prohibiting child pornography.

In a recent review conducted by the International Center for Missing or Exploited Children, near Washington, DC, they found about half of the countries they surveyed, 180 odd countries that they surveyed, had specific child pornography laws. A number of the other countries of course could prosecute offenses under their obscenity or illegal pornography laws, but there were nonetheless a significant portion of countries that didn't specifically prohibit child pornography possession. It would be at least quasi-legal in those jurisdictions to have child pornography content.

What do we know about internet offenders? This is based on not individual studies

now, but a systematic reviews of available studies. One thing that's very clear is that most internet offenders are male. We knew that about sexual offending in general, where it's highly skewed towards males, both in adolescents and adults, but there's something going on in internet offending where it's even more so. If you look at self-report surveys, if you look at criminal justice data, something like 80 to 90 percent typically of sex offenders against children are male, the remainder being female. Here, it's not uncommon to find samples of child pornography offenders in particular where it's 99 percent plus male. It's a highly skewed phenomenon. We're not quite sure what's going on here.

I think that some of it has to do with the role that pedophilia plays, and we'll talk about shortly, where we know that pedophilia is a much more common clinical disorder amongst males than females. Pedophilia being sexually attraction to prepubescent children. It might have something to do with the fact that we're talking about pornography crimes where we know that there's a gender difference in terms of the interest in visual pornography at least. It also may reflect a bit about involvement in the internet and sort of familiarity with these different kinds of technologies. Taking all this into account, it's just very clear that this is a highly male skewed phenomenon.

Unlike a lot of other offender populations, it's also very clear from multiple studies both in the United States and elsewhere that internet sex offenders are disproportionately Caucasian, which is actually the opposite of what we typically find in sex offender or general offender data, where it's typically disproportionately visible minorities are represented. Again, there's something going on here. I don't think it's quite clear. It might reflect again internet access, involvement online, interest in visual pornography, but it is quite unusual in that regard as well.

I don't think the next point is unusual where we're talking about of course the use of computers and internet technologies that on average, internet sex offenders are higher in education than the typical contact sex offenders found in clinical or criminal justice settings.

Another thing that's quite clear is that internet sex offenders, again on average, have less criminal history than typical contact sex offenders. In a meta-analysis that we did that was published several years ago of all available studies, we found that approximately one in eight online offenders, and again most of those being child pornography offenders, had an official criminal record for contact sexual offending. In the subset of six studies that had self-report information, typically through treatment participation, so they might be asked as part of treatment to disclose previously undetected sexual offending or to talk about it. They might be as part of treatment or supervision be asked to participate in polygraph interviews. In that subset of six studies, a little more than half, 55 percent, admitted to a history of contact sexual offending. One thing I'll point out there is that clearly you can see the gap between what people admit versus what's officially know, 55 percent versus one in eight.

The second part I'll point out is that's not, even if you accept that of course some of

the remaining 45 percent were still lying, unless you think that they all lied, which I think is probably not actually a tenable position to take, if not 100 percent have also got a history of contact sexual offending. There are some individuals who have committed only online sexual offenses as far as we know.

In a recent meta-analysis that's actually just appeared about six weeks ago by Kelly Babchishin and her colleagues. They looked at research that compared online offenders with contact offenders on a number of psychological factors. Consistent with this finding, that there's less criminal history for internet sex offenders, it was also the case that on average, internet sex offenders' scores is less antisocial than typical contact offenders. Antisocial in terms of personality traits, like impulsivity or callousness or risk-taking. Also less antisocial in terms of some of the attitudes and beliefs they have about children or about sex with children.

The same meta-analysis by Babchishin and her colleagues also found that on average, internet offenders are more likely to be sexual deviant or to be paraphilic, meaning that they have unusual sexual interests or unusual sexual arousal patterns, so even more so than the typical contact offenders against children, a higher proportion of internet offenders are likely to meet the diagnosis of pedophilia. Child pornography offenders are likely to meet the diagnosis of pedophilia, and we'll talk about that shortly.

The last thing I'll mention is that in that meta-analysis, there were some data on some so-called mixed offenders or dual offenders, which is a group that we'll come back to. Mixed or dual offenders are those individuals who have both committed online offenses and contact sexual offenses, and it turned up to, I think makes a lot of sense that those mixed or dual offenders were the most likely to be sexually deviant and they also tended to score high in terms of antisocial characteristics. That's a group where we have, if you will, evidence from two kinds of offending. Both their contact sexual offending and also their online behavior to suggest a sexual interest in children and a willingness to act on that sexual interest in children. It will come as a surprise in a few slides when I talk about risk factors and risk assessment that that comes into play.

I've already talked a bit about this: that the majority of child pornography offenders are pedophiles, i.e., sexually attracted to prepubescent children. Not all of them though. In one study that we published in 2006 where we looked at the [inaudible 00:30:40] metric test results of child pornography offenders and contact offenders, so [inaudible 00:30:46] metric testing involving them coming into the laboratory and being presented with different kinds of stimuli depicting children or adults and then measuring their sexual arousal in the laboratory. What we're interested in of course is how much arousal they show to the children relative to the adults. What we found is that about two-thirds of the child pornography offenders clearly showed a preference for children over adults in the lab. That was a higher percentage than we found for the contact offenders where it was about 50 percent or so.

Our explanation for that finding was that for contact offenders, we know from

several decades of research now in terms of looking at motivations and risk factors, for contact sexual offending against children that this is a mixed group or heterogeneous group of individuals. We've got pedophilic individuals in there, but we also have highly antisocial non-pedophilic men who are interested in sexual gratification and aren't concerned about the consequences of their behavior. We know that some of the contact sexual offenders are incest offenders who tend not to be pedophilic but are acting out for other kinds of reasons, having to do with family functioning and other issues. With contact offenders, we've got this more mixed group of individuals, some pedophilic, some not. When you average it out, it's about typically 50 to 60 percent of contact sex offenders show that preference for children over adults in the lab. We found it was almost 70 percent in our study. Consistent with what I just mentioned in the previous slide, those mixed offenders in the sample, so they had both child pornography offenses and contact offenses, they had the greatest relative arousal to children.

Child pornography laws, and I didn't mention this in my introduction, but child pornography laws both say in Canada and the United States, which is where a lot of this research is coming from, a lot of these data come from in both Canada and the United States, child pornography laws refer to visual depictions of anyone who appears to be under the age of eighteen. Now, it is the case though that if somebody has child pornography only focusing on adolescents, especially older adolescents, so people who I think a lot of people would judge to be under age, but it's not a sure thing in terms of making that discrimination, so somebody who looks I'll say fifteen, fourteen, fifteen, maybe sixteen years old, but conceivably could also be a young adult who just looks very young for their age. Individuals with only that kind of imagery are unlikely to be successfully convicted because of the ambiguity. Unless the identity of the persons depicted in the content is known, which it often isn't, there is some ambiguity as to whether that content is quote on quote fairly legal pornography depicting young looking adults, or in fact, child pornography.

One of the factors that I think goes into this finding that a large majority of child pornography offenders are pedophilic, are sexually attracted to prepubescent children is that, when you look at the kinds of images that are identified by law enforcement that result in criminal charges and conviction, it's on the younger end. It is predominately of prepubescent children, sometimes children in the eleven to thirteen year range or pubescent age children. It's very rare to make a conviction for somebody who's only got content depicting adolescents, as I said.

Now in contrast, sexual solicitation offenders, more limited data, but the data that we do have, in terms of both those who are interacting with undercover policy officers posing as minors or actual minors, they're predominately interested in adolescents and the majority of the time, it's adolescent girls.

In a particularly important series of studies from the Crimes Against Children Research Center at the University of New Hampshire, which is a resource that I would recommend for those of you who are interested in finding out more about sexual solicitation offenders in particular and looking at some of their research

reports online. They found that when you look at the law enforcement cases involving real children, none of the minors involved in those cases were under the age of twelve. I think that makes sense in some ways because one, it also has to do with opportunity or access. It's not common for children under the age of twelve to be online a lot, and it certainly would be unusual I think for children under the age of twelve to be online with no parental supervision, whereas once we talk about minors hitting the adolescent years, it's understood that they're going to be whatever they're going to be doing. They're going to be on Facebook, although Facebook's not cool anymore. They're going to be on What's App or Kik or the various kinds of social media platforms that are popular with younger people. A lot of the time it's going to be interacting with each other invisible to their parents who may not be as familiar with these technologies or may not be as concerned as if their younger child was spending any time online. That's one part of it.

I think the other part of it is, my sense, from as I said, a smaller set of studies, is that sexual solicitation offenders in some ways at least are like the statutory sexual offenders in the offline world. They're not likely to be pedophilic, attracted to prepubescent children. They're more interested in this group of teenagers who are under the legal age of consent. For whatever reasons, perhaps because they're more vulnerable, they are attractive to this set of individuals. It's sexually motivated but it's a different age group that solicitation offenders appear to be interested in.

The other thing I'll say about solicitation offenders, this has only been shown in one study so far, but I'm quite curious about how well this is going to play out and I do hope the others pick this up is in a 2011 paper, researchers looked at a sample of solicitation offenders in the United States, and they distinguished between a group that they called fantasy-driven solicitation offenders and a group that they described as contact-driven. The labels are pretty descriptive.

The fantasy-driven offenders seem to be individuals where their motivation for interacting with minors or undercover officers posing as minors, was the online interaction itself. They were interested in the fantasy of sexual chat with a young person, possibly exchanging images with, possibly webcams, masturbating while webcams. The focus on their behavior was in having some kind of sexual interaction online only.

In contrast, the contact-driven offenders, they were shorter interactions. They tended to be single session as opposed to multiple session interactions. For the fantasy-driven individuals, where they were really interested in trying to find a young person who might be interested in meeting in real life, where presumably they were interested in some kind of sexual encounter taking place.

I think that that's an important distinction because we're at least initially starting to get a sense more of some of the typologies of online offending. Certainly broadly there's a distinction between child pornography offenders and solicitation offenders, so that some child pornography offenders have also committed solicitation offenses and some solicitation offenders have also committed child

pornography offenses, but they tend to be the minorities. We're talking about at least two distinct online groups there. I suspect that we're going to over time as more research emerges, going to get a better sense of the typology where maybe it is the case that among solicitation offenders, we're going to see a distinction between fantasy-driven and contact-driven solicitation. Possibly among child pornography offenders, we're also going to see a distinction as well.

Okay, what do we know about Risk to Re-offend among internet offenders? This is from a 2011 meta-analysis that I've mentioned already, where in the available studies at that time, there were nine studies that reported on recidivism in terms of official criminal charges or convictions. You can see there a total sample of a little over 2,600 individuals. Short follow-up time. For those of you who follow this kind of research in terms of looking at recidivism rates, three years is relatively short, certainly for sex offenders. That was what was available at that time. You can see here the sexual recidivism rate was just short of 5 percent, with 2 percent committing a new contact sexual offense during that follow-up period, and 3.4 percent committing a new child pornography offense.

A couple of points to make here in terms of risk to re-offend. The first is that these are relatively low recidivism rates as opposed, to say, typical contact sex offenders after three years. You would typically see a higher sexual recidivism rates. Then the second point that I wanted to make from these data are that if a online offender, internet offender, does sexually re-offend, it's more likely to be another child pornography offense than specifically a contact sexual offense.

Now, this is as I said, on average, shorter follow-up periods. There are a few studies that have gone longer in terms of a follow-up time. For example, with my colleague Angela Eke, and another colleague of ours, we published in 2011 a follow-up study of 201 adult men who had been convicted of child pornography offenses in Canada. At that time, I'm still pretty sure that it's the longest follow-up data that we have so far, that group had been followed for six years, and the sexual recidivism rates in that sample were 6 percent new contact sexual offense and 10 percent new child pornography offense. Of course, longer follow-up period, the percentages were higher, but again, not as high as they typically are for contact sex offenders who are followed for about six years. Again, the rate for child pornography offending, 10 percent, was higher than the rate for contact sexual offending, 6 percent.

What do we know about risk factors for internet offenders who then go on to commit another sexual offense? This is my summary of a number of studies. The one I just mentioned actually is in here. Another one that I'll talk about next is represented here. There's also some data here from a sample of federally sentenced child pornography offenders in the United States. Where a lot of these factors I hope are looking familiar to you from the sexual offending but also general offending research that's been done.

Things like offender age, where the younger they were at the time of their first arrest, so in other words, the earlier their involvement in the criminal justice system, the more likely they are to actually re-offend. If they're single, if they have

lower education levels, they're more likely to re-offend. If they have more extensive criminal justice involvement in terms of prior criminal history or failing on bail or probation or parole, they're more likely to sexually re-offend. If they admit they're sexually interested in children, so recall that not all child pornography offenders would meet the clinical diagnosis of pedophilia, but if they admit yes, I was sexually attracted to children or I am sexually attracted to children or I am sexually aroused by the child pornography, that seems to be related to the likelihood of sexually re-offending.

In our most recent work, we found that the ratio of child pornography content focusing on boys relative to girls, so of course a lot of individuals might have some mixed content, but consistent with what we know about contact sex offenders who are attracted to boys as opposed to girls, turns out that those who have child pornography collections that suggest they're more interested in boys are more likely to sexually re-offend.

In fact, not mentioned in any slides because these were prepared a little while ago, but I think in the last week or so, maybe even shorter than that, we just had a peer reviewed paper appear in the Journal of Law and Human Behavior describing our development of a child pornography offender specific risk tool. In fact, it's called the Child Pornography Offender Risk Tool or C-PORT, and it combines a number of the items that we found to be significant predictors of any sexual recidivism in our five year follow-up period. This is a different sample, overlapping, but a different sample than what I've been talking about so far, 266, I apologize, just shy of 300 child pornography offenders. In our five year follow-up period we found 11 percent sexual recidivism rate, 3 percent contact, 9 percent new child pornography offenses.

The C-PORT has seven items. We tried to make it as easy to use as possible so it's hopefully simple, simply scored as yes or no. We had their offender age. Were they under the age of 35 at the time they were investigated for the child pornography offending? Any prior criminal history? Any prior contact sexual offending? Any conditional release failures? Again, failing to meet the conditions of bail or probation or parole. Admitting or being diagnosed with pedophilia. Having more child pornography focusing on boys than girls, and also having more other child content focusing on boys rather than girls.

In this study where we collected data to develop the C-PORT, we had access to the police investigation files. When a case is initiated and a person's being investigated, at some point search warrant is executed and the police come in and basically seize everything they think might be relevant. They seize the computers, the portable devices, CDs, DVDs, any actual video tapes, books, magazines, and so forth. We had in those police case files then information about the child pornography content which is why we were able to code this factor. Of course, a lot of individuals might also have other kinds of content focusing on children that wouldn't meet the legal definition of child pornography, so they might be publicly available images of children at the beach or celebrities or clippings from magazines or so forth. It turned out that just as how much of an interest there was in boys in terms of a

child pornography seemed to matter, if you look at the other child-related content, the ratio of boy to girl content mattered as well. We found in our development data that the C-PORT was a significant predictor of any sexual recidivism after five years, and we're currently working with a number of people to look at cross-validating that risk tool.

Okay, in terms of what we know about intervention, it is the case that I'd say really, most of the research on internet sexual offending has appeared in the last ten years or so. There's a few studies earlier than that, but most of it has appeared in the last ten years, so it's a very fast moving at least in terms of the research world, it's pretty fast moving area where there's been definitely more focus on things like the characteristics of offenders, what are their possible motivations for offending, what are the risk factors involved. Then there has been on this end, which is now that we've identified them and they're before us, clinically or in terms of criminal justice, what are we going to do about it? My sense of the field is that what's mostly happening is that people are adapting or modifying existing sex offender treatment programs to try and account for some of these differences that we've been talking about. In terms of the characteristics of offenders, in terms of maybe some differences and the importance of say pedophilia as a motivation, and also in terms of some of the risk factors that we're talking about.

I would say one of the better developed and better described programs is the internet sex offender treatment program that was developed in the United Kingdom as their standard program available through probation for internet sex offenders. This is a program that is a modification of their standard probation program for contact sex offenders where they've made some changes, as you can see here, to reflect this consensus that's beginning to emerge about this population.

The first thing is, and I think this makes sense in terms of risk levels and in terms of the importance of some risk factors or risk domains, that it's a separate stream. I've been asked more than once by clinicians and front-line folks, what do I think about the idea of combining internet offenders and contact offenders, let's say in the same group format. I think that these research results that I've been describing to you for the last little while, to me at least, they all point in the direction of having separate tracks with some overlap perhaps, certainly overlapping content, but I think the argument is valid to have separate tracks for internet and contact offenders because some of the concerns are different and because on average, internet offenders are lower risk. Also, one of my concerns is if somebody is an internet-only offender, so they've only committed child pornography offenses let's say, I don't necessarily want them to be getting ideas from contact offenders who might be describing their grooming techniques or describing the processes by which they committed contact sexual offenses.

Reflecting that idea, the internet sex offender treatment program is a modification of the standard program for internet-only offenders. If it comes out in the course of treatment for example that they've committed undetected contact sexual offenses, they'll be referred to the standard program. It's a less intense program, so there's

fewer sessions, fewer treatment hours. If we look at the content, which I'll do in the next slide, more of it focuses on internet-related behavior, just because that is one of the major areas that are different.

As described in a program manual and I think two or three, actually maybe a few more publications in terms of book chapters and journal articles, this is how the Internet Sex Offender Treatment Programme is organized over the sessions. It will be six modules, and we'll read the labels here, but I think there's a number of things to point out. One is that a fair amount of the content does correspond to the kinds of content that we would expect to see in contemporary sex offender treatment programs. In terms of there's a module specifically having to do with interpersonal skills and sort of the psychosocial area of functioning. There's obviously a key module in terms of developing a relapse prevention plan and developing strategies and skills towards improving self-regulation.

There's some areas that focus on the internet part of it. In particular, modules two and three, where one of the things we know about online offending and particularly child pornography offending is that it is a pretty consuming activity. In one small clinical study that I'm thinking of right now, the average amount of time that child pornography offenders spend online in terms of some kind of involvement with child pornography was in the fifteen to twenty hour range a week, which is a significant amount of time. That behavior was obviously serving a significant role in this person's life to filling certain kinds of needs both the perhaps sexual need in terms of interest and seeking out content, but also if they're doing any kind of training or interaction in online forums, there's a socializing aspect as well. Module two kind of recognizes that, and if the person either has to eliminate or certainly restrict their online behavior, how are those needs going to be met and does the person have the wherewithal to meet those needs in the offline world?

Module three, victim awareness, is not uncommon in contemporary programs, but here, a lot of it has to do with this idea that I've certainly heard from a lot of child pornography offenders, that it's a so-called victim-less crime because they're only looking at pictures. They're only looking at images rather than any kind of real contact, contact with real children. That somehow they're not causing any harm, or that what they're doing is victim-less in that sense. Part of the program addresses that set of attitudes and beliefs.

Another thing that I think is quite notable about the Internet Sex Offender Treatment Programme is that up front, there's a module having to do with motivation to change, and that's something that I do see in contemporary sex offender treatment programs, but not uniformly or systematically and I think that that is an area that, kind of getting off topic a little bit here, but that in sex offender treatment programming, I think there's increasing recognition in recent years of the importance of addressing that motivating to change. It's one thing to show somebody better strategies, more effective skills, trying to teach those skills. It's another thing to get that person to translate that into their lives and actually implement those strategies and skills once they're back in the community or once they leave the treatment program. I think that's a notable quality here.

The other thing I'll mention about the internet sex offender treatment program is that by and large, the specific treatment targets that are addressed across these modules, map onto what we know about so-called dynamic risk factors for sexual offending. I don't think I've talked about this before, but we have the sense in the sex offender risk assessment literature that there is this broad distinction between static risk factors and dynamic risk factors. Static risk factors being things like criminal history or antisocial personality that aren't changeable or aren't likely to change. It turns out that those kinds of static risk factors are very good in terms of predicting long term outcomes, so we use those. That's why those kinds of factors are in risk assessment tools, like the C-PORT, like other veteran-known risk tools.

However, those historical or unlikely to change factors don't help people out much when we're talking about trying to do treatment or trying to do effective management, and so there's this whole other literature that focuses on so-called dynamic factors which are factors that can change over time that we can try to address through treatment and through supervision, including these areas below being some of the more important ones. Those treatment modules do map onto both specifically sexual and general self-regulation skills and strategies, attitudes and beliefs that might condone sexual offending versus not, and then those interpersonal deficits.

I see that there's a question there, but if it's okay with the questioner, I'm going to make sure I get through these slides and then we will certainly have time for Q&A.

The other thing I'll mention is that there is simultaneously a fair number of programs that I would describe as taking more of a sexual addiction or compulsivity perspective on online offending. There's certainly a lot of overlap in terms of some of the content, certainly the online behavior part of it, the fact that can be quite compulsive or impulsive behavior that the person has possibly tried to restrict their online behavior unsuccessfully. There's some overlap but there's also some differences in terms of those frameworks. I'm not going to say a lot about it except that I think that idea certainly of sexual compulsivity does play a role for some individuals, but my sense from looking at the small set of studies that have looked at explanations for offending or motivations for offending, is that it's a smaller piece than some people would suggest. Certainly it's a smaller piece than what a lot of offenders will tell us themselves, where, I think quite understandably, when asked to explain their offending, either by police or by clinicians or by probation or parole officers, it can be more palatable to claim a sexual addiction or pornography addiction or compulsive sexual behavior than it is to admit sexual attraction to prepubescent children.

There's also some self-help efforts that are going on. One that was developed by professionals in Europe at croga.org. I would encourage you to take a look at that because the materials are freely available and I think at least some of the materials there could be useful for those of you who are responsible for developing treatment programs. When you go to that site, there's sort of two ways to get into it. One is as a person who's concerned about their online sexual behavior, and the

other one is as a professional, and if you go through the professional route, you can actually look at some of the questionnaires they use and so forth.

Then of course, there's individual service providers who have experience working with online offenders. I think a really important point to make, important enough that I underlined it and put in asterisks by it as well, is that reflecting how new this literature is, there really hasn't been much in the way of rigorous peer-reviewed evaluation of these programs. That's clearly an important gap in terms of the research and clearly in terms of future direction. something that we need to be working on is there's different kinds of programs going on, this Internet Sex Offender Treatment Programme in the UK, other people have modified their existing programs. There's some sexual addiction compulsivity based approaches. There's these self-help approaches online. Do they work? If they can work, what parts of them are the effective components? We really need to figure that out.

Okay, in terms of the practical implications of some of the research that I've been summarizing for you is that I think that one of the things that is I think coming across is that there's some overlap, but the online offender population is different in some important ways from typical contact sex offenders. It does make sense that there might be some value in developing online offender specific tools, not only risk assessment, but also in terms of clinical assessment of other domains. I think there is a logic to the idea of developing different treatment tracks and adjusting supervision in terms of online offenders. For example, I know that a common question is sort of the value of using the various kinds of monitoring software that's available for online offenders where they, I mean of course some might just be restricted from ever going online, but that's actually getting harder and harder to do in terms of the workplace and in terms of interacting with government, let's say. If the person does have some access, how can we monitor or restrict their online behavior in a way to more effectively manage that and to avoid that person getting into trouble again.

Now in terms of, I don't know if I want to say limitations, but certainly the gaps in the research, there's a lot of a number of areas that I've already hinted at, but I haven't spent some time talking about some of these. One is, as I said, most of what we know about risk factors for sexual recidivism among online offenders and this child pornography offender specific risk assessment is specific to that population. The solicitation offender group, which is a growing group as well, I think they're different enough in that we need more research focusing on that group in particular. What is their risk to re-offend? My hunch would be that it's going to depend on both the age of children that they're interested in, but also on maybe if there's a real distinction there, the fantasy-driven versus contact-driven distinction. It's also going to depend on whether the solicitation offenders also have other kinds of criminal history and so forth. We don't know very much about them, so we need more work in terms of their understanding their likelihood of sexually re-offending and the risk factors associated with that.

We know in terms of research at least, almost nothing about these other groups of internet-facilitated sexual offenders, so people who use online technologies for sex

trafficking, conspiracy to commit sexual crimes, sex tourism, committing sexual assaults of adults. For example, we again, anecdotally we know of individuals who will use dating services or casual encounter kinds of services as a way of interacting with potentially vulnerable adults and creating opportunities to commit sexual assaults. That's all we know about them basically anecdotally. I'm not aware of any peer-reviewed research focusing on this other group of individuals where, just like the internet is now more and more part of our work, our education, our entertainment, you name it, a bigger and bigger part of our lives, it would be no surprise to me to imagine a future, a near future, where to some extent the internet is involved in a lot of sexual offending because that's where people meet each other. That's where people interact with each other. That's where people find out about each other.

I've already talked about this question about types of online offenders, so at least right now I think it's comfortable to say that there's a distinction between child pornography offenders and solicitation offenders. Can there be finer distinctions there and are there differences in terms of the pathways to offending and the likelihood of re-offending and therefore, maybe treatment or supervision targets for these different types of offenders.

We do have a pretty good sense of the extent of overlap between online and offline offending for child pornography offenders, but we don't have that for solicitation offenders or for these other offender groups. That's from a policy point of view and from a practical point of view is an important question.

The last point is that the child pornography offender risk tool is as far as I know the first child pornography offender specific risk assessment tool. I think an open question is whether, having put the time and energy into preparing it, I think a live question is whether we need one. There's been some efforts I'm aware of, ongoing efforts, I don't know how far along they've gotten to be honest, but I'm aware of ongoing efforts to look at how well-modified versions of existing sex offender risk assessment tools might perform. For example, the best I think developed one so far is in the United Kingdom again where they have a standard risk assessment tool use in their prison service, the Risk Matrix 2000. It's used much less widely in Canada and the United States, but it's a standard tool there. Well they showed in peer-reviewed research that a modified version of their Risk Matrix 2000 was a good predictor, just as good a predictor of sexual recidivism amongst internet offenders. It may be the case that some years, a few years down the road, that we may find that modified versions of better known tools, like Aesthetic 99R Aesthetic 2002R, might do just as well. It's not clear to me yet that we need internet offender specific risk assessment tools given so many of the factors do make sense in terms of criminal history, failure on conditional release, offender age, and so forth.

Okay, I'm going to stop there. The next couple of slides, just so you're aware, as I was going through there were annotations to specific points that I made in the presentation. These are the references that go with that. I would be happy to share for those of you who want to get copies of the work that I've been involved in, if you email me and you can find my email online. It's also michael.seto@theroyal.ca,

I'd be happy to share PDFs of those with you. Thanks very much for your attention and we'll now turn to look at some of the questions.

Okay, there's a couple that I don't think, they were sent to the host so you wouldn't be able to see them all. The first question I'll read: Should offenders and treatment programs for internet-only offenders be moved to the hands-on program if full sexual history polygraph reveals prior hands-on offenses? I think that makes sense. That's what the internet sex offender treatment programme does. I think I mentioned that it was designed for internet-only offenders based on their criminal record, but if in the context of the program, they don't go for polygraph as much as the United States does, but if in the context of the treatment program, there's a disclosure or if there's a sexual history polygraph that reveals sexual offending, to me, they're no longer suitable for that internet-only track. I think the internet-only track is really for that subset of let's say 45 to 50 percent of internet offenders where no official record of contact offending and no disclosure of contact offending.

The second question was, let's see: Does the Static-99 address child pornography? Well there's two ways to think about that question. The first is, does the Static-99 incorporate information about child pornography offending, and it does. There's an item on the Static-99 about non-contact sexual offending and child pornography offending or solicitation offending if there was no sexual contact could qualify. The other part of the question though is does the Static-99 predict sexual recidivism among child pornography offenders and as I said, I'm aware there was a group that was interested in looking at that, but I don't know how far they've gotten. I haven't heard from them in a while so I wonder if they've gotten stuck.

Scott Matson: We've opened up the Q&A now, so if you have any questions, please send them in. We received a number of questions during the registration period and some of the questions submitted will be covered during future webinars, so we'll ask you to resubmit those and hold those for now. There were a couple of them that came in I thought were fairly relevant. Dr. Seto you talked about treatment interventions quite a bit, but are there any specific supervision-type strategies for internet-related offenders, that is probation, parole kinds of strategies?

Michael Seto: I think that's still being worked out. I definitely have gotten that question a lot presenting to probation, parole officers and people responsible for community supervision, what are the differences involved. I would say there's a few things to think about. One that I didn't mention is that in our follow-up research we know that failure on conditional release is a significant concern. In that sample that we used to develop the C-PORT, we found that one in four had a conditional release failure during the follow-up period. Again, they were failing bail conditions or probation and parole conditions. We weren't able, we actually, thanks to my colleague Angela Eke who works with police service, we were able to find out more than just oh well the person gets, for example, revoked probation or their parole revoked. We actually for about half of those cases, we were able to find out what it was for. About a little more than half of the times that probation or parole was revoked, it was for either being around kids unsupervised or going online again

even though it was against their conditions. I think that that's clearly an issue.

Somebody's got to turn off their speakers because I'm getting a vicious echo.

The issue, thank you, just to reiterate. In a significant number of cases when somebody does fail, let's say their supervision, their probation or parole, it is for two of the bigger considerations. One being being around children unsupervised or going online again, so I think that that's a salient issue for probation/parole officers.

I think the other thing which I did mention is that because a lot of this problematic behavior involves online activity, there's a real question about using software or other kinds of technology if they're going to be online to monitor them. The challenge there is that depending on how tech savvy a person is, if they're not very tech savvy, then those are probably going to be pretty effective certainly as a deterrent. If the person's really tech savvy, there's ways around any technology and they could skirt those.

The other issue I know is cost. These kinds of monitoring software programs aren't cheap, and also actually for a probation officer with a large caseload. What are you going to do with all that data coming in about the person's online activities, emails, texts, all that sort of stuff. There's some practical issues there.

Scott Matson: Thank you. I think you've seen a number of questions come in. I think some of the participants have questions about the name of your tool again.

Michael Seto: I'll type it out so that everybody can see it.

Scott Matson: You know if you're going to be doing any training on it such as ...

Michael Seto: Well what we're going to do is we're, the paper just came out and we're in the process of developing a scoring guide that we hope is going to address a lot of the questions about that and then I think we will end up doing some training about it. I'm hoping to convince my colleague to do it because I don't want to travel as much, but we are, I mean now that it's out, there's two or three efforts I'm already aware of because there has been a real demand for this kind of tool. I already know from two or three people that they're interested in looking at cross-validating the measure, and then we'll see how well it performs in that and then sort of spreading the word about that.

Scott Matson: Great. There's a question specifically related to the recidivism slide that you had up. You referred to several studies on that slide. Do you know if the offenders that were sampled in those studies were actually on probation or not?

Michael Seto: This is I think the slide that you were talking about, the different records have been shown. I would say, I mean I can't give you the exact percentage because it was across different studies, but the majority, it's rare for a child pornography offender to return to the community without any supervision. I think I'm quite comfortable saying that the large majority if not most were under some kind of supervision.

Scott Matson: Great.

Michael Seto: I'm sorry the other question that might go with that is how many of these guys were in treatment. Again, I would say not all necessarily, but a significant portion of them were also involved in treatment as part of either while in custody or post-return to the community.

Scott Matson: Great. I found another interesting question that came up related to risk factors and the breakdown of male versus female images oftentimes reports that are given don't have a breakdown of those types of images, is that a significant factor, and for pre-sentence investigation reports, should that be considered as priority in making reports?

Michael Seto: I'm sorry, a little part of it clouded up. What about the content?

Scott Matson: I think we've got a question from an officer who conducts pre-sentence investigation reports. They have, they can get most of the risk factors you described but they don't often have a breakdown of the image types for child pornography offenders. Is that a significant risk factor and should they consider making it a priority in there reports?

Michael Seto: Oh, okay. Thank you very much for that. I actually wanted to say that when I was talking about those items. It is important information. I'll remind everybody that two of the items on the C-PORT are about the relative amount of content focusing on boys compared to girls in both child pornography and other child content. One of the things I've been saying whenever I speak with law enforcement is that that's information that they're going to have as part of their investigation, they're going to know about the nature of the collections. Now, they're not necessarily in the position of having to fully account the ratio or specific ages or anything like that. Although, I think that depends on the jurisdiction and the practices of law enforcement investigations of course.

One of the things I've been saying to law enforcement is, even some brief descriptive information upstream would be tremendously valuable to treatment providers and to supervisors, probation/parole supervisors, because we don't necessarily have this content. In terms of the clinics that I'm involved in, when child pornography offenders come out of the courts or come out of jail to us, we just know that they've committed a child pornography offenses. We might know a little bit about say some of the most egregious content because that would be part of the synopsis that went to court in terms of sentencing, but we don't necessarily know beyond self-report how much interest or how much of the content was focused on boys, let's say, or focused on prepubescent children versus older adolescents. Even a brief description of the content from the forensic analyst or from the investigating officer, whatever however that turns out. There's hundreds of images seized from the suspect and a majority of the images and videos focused on boys. That would be very valuable corroborative evidence downstream because we don't want to be making risk assessment judgments based on self-report alone.

Scott Matson: Thanks for that. There was an interesting question that also came up about the child pornographer, online child pornographer rate that you defined in your study is 55 percent at that is that the child pornographer refers, excuse me. The contact rate is 55 percent from child pornography to contact, and Bourke and Hernandez study showed an 85 percent child pornography to contact rate. Were things defined differently or did you just see a major difference in your samples?

Michael Seto: Yeah, so that's a question about the I think it was this slide here talking about that 55 percent admitting to history, whereas the so-called Butner Redux Study by Bourke and Hernandez found it closer to 85 percent. That's been the object of a lot of controversy in terms of what is the meaning of that, is there something about that sample or that study? I think the thing I'm comfortable saying is that in our six studies that have self-report information, that Butner Redux Study was a statistical outlier. It was unusual for having that high a rate of admissions for contact offending. I don't if that's because their sample is maybe more selected or less representative or whatever it is, there's something going on though that that value, I know it gets mentioned in courts a lot. It's US data, it's federal data, so it obviously has relevance, but it is an outlier in terms of that rate.

I've heard, like I said, I'm not going to reiterate them all here, but I've heard different stories, both from Michael Bourke and Andres Hernandez and other people, critics, about what might be going on. I don't think that anybody knows for sure. All I know is that in our statistical analyses that's an outlier.

Scott Matson: Great. Another question came in. What are your views on allowing offenders with child pornography convictions who are under probation and parole to view adult pornography?

Michael Seto: I think that that is, it's not one of those things that can be a blanket. It's a bad idea or it's a good idea. I think it really is a case by case determination because it has so much to do with what's that person's offending pattern. What do we know about the path or trajectory that they took to get to offending, and also what do we know about them in terms of their sexual interests.

For example, what do I mean by that? If a person is convicted of child pornography and their pattern, their offending pattern is one of dis-inhibited behavior online, problems with sexual self-regulation. They were not only going online for child pornography but were having, trying to have sexual chats with minors. They were interacting with other pedophilic individuals or child pornographic offenders online. There's all sorts of these kinds of things, I'm just going to be more cautious about that person going online to look at adult pornography than somebody who doesn't have that same kind of pattern and who let's say, maybe does have a sexual interest in children but it's a non-exclusive one where they also have a sexual interest in adults. Exposure to adult pornography for them might actually be one way of kind of shifting their sexual behavior more in the adult direction. Obviously, supervised, obviously, closely monitored. I wouldn't say, well it's just a bad idea for them to ever have access to adult pornography. I also wouldn't say it's fine, it's not

a concern. I think it very much depends on that individualized assessment.

Scott Matson: Thanks. We're getting close to the end of our time here on the webinar, but before we ask final questions, I'm going to open up a poll and we'd appreciate your participation in completing that for us.

Let's see, there was another question. I just lost it. Where'd it go? Related to your C-PORT, is that the acronym you're using? Can it be used with female offenders in those rare instances?

Michael Seto: The question is about the C-PORT and if it's possible valid to female offenders, and basically we don't know. As I mentioned in an earlier slide, most of the child pornography offenders that have been researched, that we've seen clinically are men. In the follow-up sample I was talking about, I think there were two female offenders and either one or both of them, I can't remember now, were co-offending with a male accomplice. That's a long-winded way of saying the short answer is we have no idea if the C-PORT would work for female offenders at this point.

Scott Matson: Okay. All right. There's one last question here we can ask since we have a couple minutes. You noted a low recidivism rate of 4.6 percent for internet offenders. Do you know if the polygraph was used in that study?

Michael Seto: The recidivism rates? Oh, yes. All the recidivism studies that I'm talking about are based on criminal records, so official data. Of course, we know that those would be under estimates of true offending. Some people have committed sexual offenses that they were detected for, but in that follow-up research, they're free and clear. The only way we know about them ... Well actually they're not necessarily free and clear, but from the research perspective, we don't know about them unless they get new criminal charges.

Scott Matson: Okay, great. I want to thank Michael as well as everyone in the audience for joining us today. We hope you'll join us for the next webinar in the series that will be on May 11. That one's going to be focused on juvenile risk assessment and juvenile recidivism. Registration is currently open for that webinar. You can visit www.ncja.org/webinars to register. We actually have a link listed up there that shows where you can access a recording of the webinar and the slides from today's webinar. Thank you again for joining us. Have a great afternoon and we hope to see you on May 11. Thank you Dr. Seto.

Michael Seto: Thank you very much.