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Introduction
- Currently working for Queensland Police Service (QPS) and PhD student at Griffith University
- Presenting research from Honours program (2018)
- A comparative study:
  - Men arrested for Contact Child Sexual Abuse (CCSA) and;
  - Men arrested for Child Exploitation Material (CEM)

Other comparative research
- Similar research in other international jurisdictions
- Not been done in a Queensland (QLD) or Australian context
- Studies have found CEM offenders to be:
  - Predominantly men (Wolak, Finkelhor & Mitchell, 2011)
  - Caucasian (Wolak, Finkelhor & Mitchell, 2011)
  - Less likely to have antisocial or psychopathic traits than CCSA (Henderson, Hanson & Hermann, 2011)
  - Less likely to have a criminal history than CCSA (Henderson, Hanson & Hermann, 2011)
  - More likely to be well educated than CCSA; and
  - Less likely to be in significant long term relationships than CCSA

Why Queensland?
- Population of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (ATSIs) Indigenous peoples based in Qld
- Large geographical sparseness = remote communities
- Management of child sexual offenders
  - DPSOA Act 2003 – Robert Fardon

Why CEM?
- Internet and technology has greatly increased CEM access
- 2-4% of men estimated to have viewed CEM (Beech, Bartels & Dixon, 2013)
- CEM offenders more likely to be paedophilic (Farron, Carter & Moshard, 2006)
- Paedophilia does not mean CSA (Farron & Moshard, 2006)
- Assumption of escalation – is this true?

Escalation from CEM to CCSA
- Pornography precursor to contact offending dates back to before internet (Marshall, 2000)
- Desensitisation, breaking down barriers to CCSA (Henderson, Hanson & Hermann, 2011)
- Lack of empirical evidence of a direct causal link (Malamuth, 2018)
- Perhaps one of many contributory factors in already developed sexual deviancy (Marshall, 2000)
- Low prevalence - based on charge and conviction data is 2 to 4.6% (Farron, Hanson & Hermann, 2011)
- Rates of CCSA amongst CEM offenders much more prevalent in studies involving self-report or polygraph data (Beck, 2010; Beck & Hernandez, 2009; Henderson, Finkelhor, Schaefer, Moshard & Hanson, 2011)
**Risk in an actuarial age**

- Actuarial risk assessment – likelihood of reconviction
- Most abuse is not reported:
  - Approximately 10-18% is reported (London, Bruck, Ceci & Shuman, 2005)
  - 44% of CSA cases in US were dropped (Stroud, Martens & Barker, 2000)
- Scale of CSA is huge:
  - 12% of females and 4.5% of males (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2005)
  - As high as 30% of children (Cutajar, Mann, Mullen & Ogloff, 2012)
- Risk of what, and how do we factor in harm?

**Why is this important?**

- Law Enforcement Agencies (LEA) have become reliant on actuarial risk assessment
- This is based on likelihood of further sexual charges or convictions
- LEA allocate most intensive resources towards the highest risk
- CEM offending rates of recidivism is very low
- Therefore, CEM offenders are:
  - Less likely to receive SO treatment programs through prison;
  - More likely to maintain access to relationships, including with children, and;
  - Less intensive community supervision from LEA

**Methodology**

- Sample of 199 men:
  - 100 charged exclusively with Child Exploitation Material (CEM)
  - 99 charged exclusively with Contact Child Sexual Abuse (CCSA)
- Sample retrieved from administrative data from the QPS:
  - QPRIME (QPS police database)
  - National Child Offender System (NCOS)
  - Criminal histories
  - Sentencing reports
  - Court briefs

**Measurement**

- Variables:
  - Age
  - Ethnicity – Indigenous, Non-Indigenous
  - Occupation skill level – tertiary required, non-tertiary required, unemployed
  - Marital Status – married, de-facto, single, unknown
  - Access to children – direct, indirect, minimal, unknown
  - Criminal History prior to sexual offence arrest
  - Supervision violations and
  - Drug / alcohol use

**Results - Univariate**

- Age:
  - CEM group were 5 years older:
    - 41.76 (SD = 13.16) CEM group
    - 36.91 (SD = 14.20) CCSA group
  - A quarter of the CCSA group were under 25, compared to 10% for the CEM group.
  - 29% of the CEM group were over 50, compared to 18% CCSA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CEM (n)</th>
<th>CCSA (n)</th>
<th>Cramer’s V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Status</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation skill level</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded with Criminal history</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and alcohol use</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct access</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term relationship</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results - Multivariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wald</td>
<td>Odds</td>
<td>Wald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>6.576**</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>4.822**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to children</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td>1.894</td>
<td>5.611**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary occupation</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>3.853*</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>1.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision violation</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>1.318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

- CEM offenders have different characteristics to known CCSA offenders;
- These differences often mean CEM offenders score lower on actuarial risk;
- Heterogeneity of CSOs - Focus on intervention and supervision needs – not just grouping people into categories;
- Further research required on behavioural indicators for predatory and persistent CSOs;
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### Notes

- Further research required on behavioural indicators for predatory and persistent CSOs;