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- 18,887 reports of child sexual exploitation
- > 8,000 UK-based transactions of Child Sexual Exploitation Material
- 70,000 still and moving images (two-fold increase on previous year)
  - 20% self generated
  - 19% of online child sexual exploitation involves webcams
- For 2013-14, the UK Crown Prosecution Service (2014) reported a total of 20,373 child abuse image offences (where a prosecution was commenced)

How many were investigated? How long did that take? How many were identified and not investigated?
Europol 2012 - Trends

- Decrease in criminal networks producing pay-view CSEM
- Self produced material by children / groomed online
- Use of mobile devices / hijacked / sexting
- Use of TOR / dark web
- Peer-to-peer sharing
Dutch children's charity Terre des Hommes used a computer-generated 10 year old child *Sweetie* who was “available” for online for sexual behaviour.

⇒ identified 1,000 people willing to pay for online sexual exploitation.
"There are very significant volumes of people viewing this material in this country and abroad. We are going to need to understand as a society how we are going to confront this issue. We are not going to be able to arrest our way out of it. The numbers are significant, the volumes are huge."

Phil Gormley, Deputy Director General of the UK National Crime Agency
Who? are the users of child sexual exploitation material

What? are their clinical and risk-relevant propensities

Why? [motivation, function, & situational factors]

Risk? ...??
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Opportunity matters!
Routine-Activity Theory (Felson & Cohen, 1980)
Focus on Situational Crime Prevention (Wortley & Smallbone, 2006)

Babchishin et al. (2015)
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Characteristics of CSEM Users

Potential Risk Indicators

- Sexual interest in children
- High levels of antisociality
- Access to children
- Few psychological barriers of acting on them (e.g., cognitive distortions)

Babchishin et al. (2015)
### Subgroup Classification of CSEM Users

#### Contact-driven
- high score on criminal history
- preference for male victims (CSEM & contact)
- high scores on criminal or antisocial lifestyle (antisocial personality; offenders who have used violence against their partners)
- highest score in attempts to directly or indirectly contact a minor for sexual purposes

Focus on **direct sexual contact with a victim**
Profile suggests some **stability in criminal behaviours** and a **lack of insight** in the harmf hosefulness of their actions

#### Fantasy-driven
- low scores on general criminal activity
- low scores on conventional risk predictors
- high levels of sexual deviancy (e.g., usage of CSEM for sexual arousal; consumption of deviant pornography other than CSEM)
- involved engagement with CSEM (e.g., long hours spent online viewing/collecting), and social contact to other CSEM users

Low endorsement of conventional risk profile and **disregard of direct sexual contact with a minor**

“new” offender type?
How can we identify individuals with high vs. low risk of reoffending?
Behavioural Indicators of Risk

Meta-analyses on the criminal history of CSEM users:

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

Reoffending rates of CSEM users

- Seto et al. (2011; n = 2630): 5% sexual reoffending: 3.4% CSEM, 2% contact sex offence (international data)
- Faust et al. (2014; n = 638; 428 CSEM index): follow-up 1-9 years; recidivism: 3% contact sex offence, 1.6% CSEM (US data only)
Risk Assessment

Existing risk assessment tools not developed and validated for CSEM Users

- e.g., RM2000 not predictive of reoffending (Middleton et al., 2005, 2009; Osborn et al., 2010; Wakeling et al., 2011; Webb et al., 2007)
- Biased items: e.g., stranger victims, non-contact offending
- Do not account for distinction of risk of re-offending versus risk escalation

Focus: Prioritisation of Police Work

Herts Police (Grubin, 2014)

KIRAT (Long, Alison, & McManus, 2012)
Motivation-Facilitation Model

Paedophilia

Antisociality

Situational factors

Contact Sex Offences against Children

Seto (2013)
Sample of 266 CSEM offenders, with fixed 5 year follow-up for recidivism data

Risk predictor analysis revealed 7 items:

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

But: only predictive for CSEM with criminal history!

Seto & Eke (2015)
Pathways Model of CSEM Offending

Initial sample \( (n = 20) \):
Male participants recruited from
- the Lucy Faithfull Foundation “Inform-Plus” groups (post-arrest and generally pre-conviction): all men have acknowledged their offending behaviour
- Lincolnshire Probation Services (post-conviction): all men have / are engaged in treatment for online sex offending

Procedure:
(Approximately 3-4 hours)
- Interview: life & sexual history, relationship, substance use, offending details, circumstances leading to offending
- Psychometrics: personality / disorder, mental health, offending behaviour & beliefs
- Sexual interests assessment

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

- Developmental context

Motivation
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- Internet environment
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Sexual Arousal

offending behaviour

Evaluation of consequences

further offending behaviour

desistance
Prevention Project Dunkelfeld

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

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

Findlater (2014)
Longer film
Combating Sexual Exploitation of Children Online
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Broad Aims of the Consultation

- Appraise current practice and approaches to the management of online child sexual offending across a range of disciplines

- Policing & prosecution; offender management; prevention; with a view to identifying:

  1. **Key practical or policymaking challenges** to the management of online child sexual offending

  2. Current examples of **good practice**
Delphi Survey (May-July 2016)

Demographics:

Role (Check all that apply)
21% were law enforcement
19% were Academics/ Researchers
14% were Policy Makers/ Government Bodies
12% worked in Charity organisations
17% were Treatment/ Intervention
17% worked in Mental Health Services

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

**Over-arching conclusions:**

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