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Self-Regulation Model

- SRM originally developed as alternative model of offence process to overcome shortcomings with RP (Ward & Hudson, 1998)
- Revised SRM-R (Yates & Ward, 2008)
- Assessment scheme developed and validated (Yates, Kingston, & Ward, 2009)
Self-Regulation Model

- **SRM/SRM-R**
  - 10-phase model
  - 4 pathways to offending based on offence goals and strategies
  - SRM-R fully integrated with Good Lives Model

- **GLM**
  - Goods promotion
  - Risk management
PHASE 1: LIFE EVENT

PHASE 2: DESIRE FOR OFFENSIVE SEX

PHASE 3: GOALS FOR SEXUAL OFFENDING

PHASE 4: PLANNING STRATEGY

AVOIDANCE GOALS

- AVOIDANT-PASSIVE
  - Underregulation
  - Decr skill, covert plan

- AVOIDANT-ACTIVE
  - Misregulation
  - Inapprop. strategy

APPROACH GOALS

- APPROACH-AUTOMATIC
  - Underregulation
  - Impulsive

- APPROACH-EXPLICIT
  - Intact regulation
  - Systematic plans

PHASE 5: HIGH RISK SITUATION

AVOIDANT-PASSIVE
- Feels out of control

AVOIDANT-ACTIVE
- Renewed effort

APPROACH-AUTOMATIC
- Going with the flow

APPROACH-EXPLICIT
- Explicit planning

PHASE 6: LAPSE

AVOIDANT-PASSIVE
- Give in, go to approach

AVOIDANT-ACTIVE
- Loss of control, Go to approach

APPROACH-AUTOMATIC
- Increased efficacy

APPROACH-EXPLICIT
- Increased efficacy

PHASE 7: SEXUAL OFFENCE

PHASE 8: EVALUATION

AVOIDANT-PASSIVE
- AVE, shame, goal failure

AVOIDANT-ACTIVE
- AVE, guilt, goal failure

APPROACH-AUTOMATIC
- Goal success, beh stable

APPROACH-EXPLICIT
- Goal success, refine plans

PHASE 9: ATTITUDE TO FUTURE OFFENDING
SRM - Four Offence Pathways

Avoidant Pathways (Inhibitory Goals)

- Focus is to not achieve particular state, or to avoid undesired outcome
- Individual desires to avoid offending
- Individual is anxious or fearful about possible occurrence of undesired outcome
- Loss of control, disinhibition, negative affect when desire, opportunity to offend emerge

Avoidant-Passive

- Under-regulation or disinhibition pathway
- Lacks internal capacity (skills) to avoid offending

Avoidant-Active

- Mis-regulation pathway
- Actively attempts to avoid offending, but strategies are ineffective or increase risk
- Possesses ability to monitor and evaluate behavior
SRM - Four Offence Pathways

Approach Pathways (Acquisitional Goals)
- Does not desire or attempt to avoid offending or desires to offend
- Seeks out offending or proxy/offence-related behaviors

Approach-Automatic
- Under-regulation or disinhibition pathway
- Offending activated by situational cues, based on entrenched cognitive and behavioral scripts, may be impulsive

Approach-Explicit
- Intact self-regulation
- Holds offence-supportive, harmful goals, attitudes, values
- Implements conscious, explicitly planned strategies
Research

- Four pathways empirically validated (Bickley & Beech, 2002, 2003; Proulx et al., 1999; Ward et al., 1995; Webster, 2005)
- Pathways differentially associated with offender type, offence characteristics and history, victim type, psychopathy, static and dynamic risk, motivation, treatment change, GLM (Kingston, 2010; Kingston et al., 2009; Lambine & Leguizamo, 2010a, 2010b; Simons et al., 2008, 2009; Stotler-Turner et al., 2008; Yates et al., 2009; Yates & Kingston, 2006)
- SRM and GLM assessment protocol validated (Kingston et al., 2009)
Symposium

- New research validating SRM
- Relationship between offence pathway, risk, offence and victim characteristics, criminal versatility/specialisation, treatment change, attaining GLM treatment targets
- Three independent samples of sexual offenders
- Clinical and research implications
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Outline

- Treatment of Sexual Offenders
- Offence Process Models
- Correctional Service of Canada Sex Offender Programs
- Assessment of Offence Pathway
- Present Study
Treatment and Management of Sexual Offenders

- Programs originally focused on eliminating deviant sexual preference (Laws & Marshall, 2003)
- Contemporary programs are multifaceted
  - Cognitive-behavioural
    - Cognitions, affect, and behaviour
    - Skill acquisition/rehearsal and development of pro-social attitudes
  - Risk, need, responsivity (Anderss & Bonta, 1998)
- Treatment effectiveness (Variance across programs)
CSC’s Sex Offender Programs

- CBT/SRM
  - SRM implemented starting in 1999
  - High, moderate, low, maintenance intensity levels
  - Based on assessed risk/needs
  - Treatment targets = general and sexual self-regulation, cognitive strategies, intimacy, empathy

- Outcome Data
  - Pre-post change (Nunes et al., in press)
  - Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness (Nafekh et al., 2009)
Assessment of Pathway to Offending

- SRM Assessment Protocol
- Interview (90-120 minutes)
- 7 items:
  - Offence-related goal (desire to prevent offending/schema, cognitive distortions, post-offence evaluation)
  - Offence strategies (self-regulation skills, control over offending behavior)
- Recently validated
  - Kingston (2010); Kappa = .70
Present Study

- **Purpose:** Examine SR model with respect to change on dynamic risk and its utility with various types of sexual offenders

- **Sample**
  - 275 adult males serving sentence ≥ 2 years
  - 30.9 % rapist
  - 21.8 % child molester
  - 36.7 % incest offender
  - 10.5 % mixed
Measures

- Risk Assessment
  - Static and dynamic risk
- Criminogenic Needs
  - Denial and minimization
  - Cognitive distortions
  - Intimacy deficits
  - Empathy
  - Aggression/hostility
## Results: Offender Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Type</th>
<th>Avoidant Passive</th>
<th>Avoidant Active</th>
<th>Approach Automatic</th>
<th>Approach Explicit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapist</td>
<td>3.5% (3)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>57.6% (49)</td>
<td>38.8% (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Std. Residual</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-familial Child Molester</td>
<td>8.3% (5)</td>
<td>20.0% (12)</td>
<td>21.7% (13)</td>
<td>50.0% (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Std. Residual</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-familial Child Molester</td>
<td>43.6% (44)</td>
<td>26.7% (27)</td>
<td>5.9% (6)</td>
<td>23.8% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Std. Residual</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>6.9% (2)</td>
<td>20.7% (6)</td>
<td>24.1% (7)</td>
<td>48.3% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Std. Residual</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Actuarial Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avoidant Passive</th>
<th>Avoidant Active</th>
<th>Approach Automatic</th>
<th>Approach Explicit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Static-99</td>
<td>1.19±1.43 (54)_{a, b}</td>
<td>1.53±1.42 (45)_{c, d}</td>
<td>4.33±1.94 (75)_{a, c}</td>
<td>4.38±2.32 (101)_{b, d}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable 2000</td>
<td>5.59±1.96 (46)_{a}</td>
<td>5.38±2.58 (39)_{b}</td>
<td>6.48±2.10 (65)</td>
<td>7.23±2.09 (79)_{a, b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRS: Total Score</td>
<td>20.81±7.98 (34)_{a, b}</td>
<td>21.35±8.51 (34)_{c}</td>
<td>26.33±9.83 (46)_{a}</td>
<td>30.10±9.52 (69)_{b, c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRS:F1</td>
<td>7.58±3.67 (33)_{a}</td>
<td>8.21±4.13 (34)_{b}</td>
<td>4.91±4.09 (44)_{a, b, c}</td>
<td>9.59±3.85 (63)_{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRS:F2</td>
<td>5.36±4.23 (33)_{a, b}</td>
<td>4.85±3.69 (34)_{c, d}</td>
<td>10.30±4.42 (44)_{a, c}</td>
<td>8.87±5.12 (63)_{b, d}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRS:F3</td>
<td>4.79±1.65 (33)</td>
<td>4.71±1.87 (34)</td>
<td>4.86±1.94 (44)</td>
<td>4.98±2.00 (63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results: Pre-treatment Needs

- Criminogenic needs/treatment targets
  - SOARS: Acceptance of Offence Planning
    - Approach-automatic pathway < all other offence pathways
  - SOARS: Acceptance of the Sexual Offence
    - Approach-explicit offence pathway > avoidant-passive and approach-automatic
Results: Pre-Post Change

- Dynamic risk changed
- Most criminogenic needs changed
- Interactions
  - SOARS (ASO)
  - Bumby Molest Scale
Implications for Assessment

- Risk/Need/Responsivity (Andrews & Bonta, 1998)
- Assessment of Pathways (Yates, Kingston, & Ward, 2009)
  - Directs treatment strategy
Implications for Treatment

- Treatment individualized to risk factors and offence dynamics
- Some RP principles applicable for Avoidant goal offenders
- Approach goal offenders ≠ RP
  - Attitudes supporting sexual aggression
  - Effective emotion management
  - Higher levels of supervision
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Previous Validation of the SRM

- Studies have supported the utility of the model by differentiating pathways by offender type, offense characteristics and history, victim type, psychopathy, static and dynamic risk, motivation, treatment change, and GLM (Kingston, 2010; Kingston et al., 2009; Lambine & Leguizamo, 2010a, 2010b; Simons et al., 2008, 2009; Stotler-Turner et al., 2008; Yates et al., 2009; Yates & Kingston, 2006)
The sexual abuse/offender literature assumes that sex offenders become proficient in that type of crime and subsequently “specialize” in it (e.g., Peterson & Braiker, 1994). Thus, they are thought to exhibit Specialization.

Theories regarding sexual offending tend to rely on social learning, conditioning, and sexual deviance, and assume specialization (e.g., Laws and Marshall, 1990).
On the other hand, in the criminology literature, sex offenders are considered to be criminals who engage in diverse criminal behaviors, including sexual offenses. Thus, they are thought to exhibit criminal versatility. Criminal behavior is conceptualized as being caused by the presence of opportunity, low self-control, impulsivity, and the pursuit of short-term gratification (e.g., Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Lussier, Proulx, & LeBlanc, 2005).
Specialization Thresholds

- Previous thresholds have been established as the percentage of a subject’s criminal history that is comprised by a particular type of crime.

- This threshold, when applied to sexual offenders, has been set at 50% (Cohen, 1986; Harris, Mazerolle, & Knight, 2009), 66% (Wikstrom, 1987), 50%, 75%, and 100% (Miethe, Olson, & Mitchell, 2006; Harris, Smallbone, Dennison, & Knight, 2009), and 80% (Harris, Dennison, Knight, and Smallbone, 2010).
Versatility/Specialization Among Sex Offenders

- Despite what would be expected from the sex offender literature, even sex offenders referred for civil commitment exhibit considerable versatility. However, higher rates of child molesters were classified as specialists than rapists (Harris, Smallbone, Dennison, & Knight, 2009).

- Versatile offenders have been found to display antisocial behaviors, whereas specialists, particularly child molesters, exhibit more sexual deviance (Harris, Mazerolle, & Knight, 2009).
Goals/Hypotheses

- Exploration of the utility and psychometric properties of the SRM Coding Scheme.
- Analysis of offense pathways by offender type.
- Provide support for the constructs developed by the SRM using the criminal versatility/specialization approach
  - Hypotheses: Offenders following avoidant pathways will exhibit specialization; offenders following the approach automatic will exhibit more versatility; offenders following the approach explicit pathway will exhibit more specialization.
Methods

- **Participants**
  - 163 Adult male convicted sex offenders serving state prison sentences at the Massachusetts Treatment Center.
    - Rapists- 57.1% (n=93) Child Molesters- 31.9 (n=53) Mixed Offenders - 11% (n=18)
    - Age at the time of evaluation: 21-76 (M = 41.76, SD = 9.80)
    - Ethnicity: Caucasian- 72.4% (n=118) African American- 17.2 (n=28) Latino- 10.4% (n=17)
    - Marital Status: Single- 46.6% (n=69) Married- 8.8% (n=13) Separated- 6.8% (n=10) Divorced- 37.2% (n=55)
    - Average Level of Education: 10.34 (SD=1.92)

- Subjects participated in comprehensive assessments as part of their participation in treatment.
Measures

- Demographic data gathered from assessment reports obtained at the Massachusetts Treatment Center

  - SRM coding performed by one primary and one secondary rater. Inter-rater reliability was substantial (ICC = .830).

- Versatility/Specialization was assessed by obtaining the percentage of all charges for which subjects were convicted that were sexual. It was analyzed in the following ways: 1) as a continuous variable; 2) using the 80% specialization threshold; and 3) using the percentage that fell in the 75th percentile for this sample.
Results

- Confirmed utility of the SRM Coding Protocol (94.5% of sample was assigned a pathway).

- Psychometrics

  - The components of the SRM exhibited good internal consistency (Cronbach’s alphas = .83 for goals and .84 for strategies).

  - Confirmatory Factor Analysis yielded two components. One was comprised of the goal items while the other of the strategy items.
Groups differ significantly on rates of pathway assignment ($X^2 = 22.77$, $p < .01$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Type</th>
<th>Avoidant Passive</th>
<th>Avoidant Active</th>
<th>Approach Automatic</th>
<th>Approach Explicit</th>
<th>CND*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapists n = 93</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1)</td>
<td>43 (46.2)$^a$</td>
<td>45 (48.4)</td>
<td>3 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Molesters n = 52</td>
<td>1 (1.9%)</td>
<td>4 (7.7)$^b$</td>
<td>10 (19.2)$^c$</td>
<td>34 (65.4)</td>
<td>3 (5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Offenders n = 18</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>3 (16.7)</td>
<td>11 (61.1)</td>
<td>3 (16.7)$^d$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a z=2.0$, $^b z=1.9$, $^c z=-1.9$, $^d z=2.0$

* Could not determine pathway (either goal, strategy, or both)
SRM Pathway and Criminal Versatility/Specialization as a Continuous Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Automatic n = 50</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Approach Explicit n = 77</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of sexual charges</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>76.69</td>
<td>1332.50</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The avoidant pathways were not included in the analyses given the low number of subjects who followed them.
## SRM Pathway at Specific Specialization Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Approach – Automatic n (%)</th>
<th>Approach – Explicit n (%)</th>
<th>$X^2$ (1df)</th>
<th>Fisher’s Exact</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At 80% (86thile)</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>15 (19.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p = .027$ (1-sided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$z = -2.1$</td>
<td>$z = 2.1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 75thile (66%)</td>
<td>5 (10)</td>
<td>22 (29.7)</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible Confounding Variables?

- Analyses were performed to ensure that the above results were not influenced by offender type.
- Among offenders who followed the approach automatic, we found no significant difference in the percentage of rapists or child molesters.
- The same was true for those who followed the approach explicit pathway. Of note, the difference between number of rapists and child molesters approached significance at the 75\textsuperscript{th} percentile threshold, but disappeared at the 80\% threshold.
Discussion

- This study provided empirical support to the utility of the SRM Coding Protocol. The measure exhibited robust psychometric properties.

- Rapists had higher rates of assignment to the Approach-Automatic pathway than expected. The opposite was the case for Child Molesters.

- Child Molesters had higher rates of assignment to the Avoidant-Active pathway.

- Findings similar to those reported by Yates and Kingston (2006) for Rapists. Incest offenders could not be compared.
Discussion

- We found strong evidence of criminal versatility among sex offenders, in support of previous research.
- However, we also found strong evidence of the increased specialization for planful, well-regulated offenders who followed the approach explicit pathway, regardless of method used to assess specialization.
- Findings support the SRM constructs of low-self control, opportunism, and impulsivity among offenders who follow an approach automatic pathway, whereas the opposite was supported for those following the approach explicit pathway.
Treatment Implications

- Findings support for the notion that current treatment methods based on relapse prevention conceptualization of sexual offending may not be helpful to many sex offenders.
- Findings also underscore the need to assess and treat all of offenders’ criminogenic needs, beyond those associated with sexual offending.
- Although beyond the scope of this presentation, the SRM’s relationship with the Good Lives Model underscores the value of a holistic approach to the conceptualization and treatment of sexual offending.
Limitations

- The present study is retrospective and archival (did not utilize the interview protocol developed by Yates, et al., 2009).
- It did not include information/coding for the Good Lives Model, in which the Self-Regulation Model is embedded.
- Given the nature of the data, more offenders were assigned to the approach pathways than would likely be the case if we had more detailed information about the earlier phases of the subjects’ offense progression.
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Good Lives/Self-Regulation Model

*Treatment approach assists offenders*

- to identify valued and important goods (needs)
- to understand the relationship between these primary goods and sexual offending
- To develop strategies to obtain these goods using accepted non-offending needs

...will be less likely to re-offend if they learn more appropriate ways of meeting their needs (e.g., leisure activities, sex), have experienced success using pro-social methods, and value their accomplishments and progress.
Evaluation of GLM/SRM 2006

In contrast to offenders with RP plans, offenders who created a GLM plan:

- Less likely to quit or terminate treatment
- More likely to have social support in community
- Demonstrated improvements in treatment progress and reductions in dynamic risk factors
- Evaluated as significantly more motivated to participate in treatment.
PRIMARY GOODS (NEEDS)

Offenses occur as a consequence in a way in which they pursue primary human needs. Primary needs are important for fulfilling lives.

- **Biological (or life):**
  - Health (exercise, nutrition, medical needs)

- **Self**
  - Spirituality: meaning and purpose in life
  - Inner Peace freedom from turmoil
  - Happiness and pleasure (including sexuality)
  - Creativity
  - Knowledge (Intellectual stimulation)
  - Excellence at Agency/Autonomy, self-directiveness, self-esteem

- **Social**
  - Excellence and play and work (Recreation/work/financial)
  - Relatedness (friendship, family, intimacy)
  - Community (being part of something)
GLM/SRM Definitions

*Personal Identity:* is the priority or ranking to these primary goods (needs).
It spells out the kind of life sought and the kind of person he would like to be.

*Secondary Needs:* provide concrete ways of securing primary needs (types of work, specific relationships, or leisure activities).

*Secondary goods have been shown to be a protective factor against recidivism*

Willis & Grace (2007)
GLM/SRM Definitions: Flaws in Life Plan

1. Mean: Inappropriate method for meeting primary needs (often motivation for offending)
2. Scope: Not meeting all primary needs; one mean takes precedence over others
3. Conflict: Meeting one need jeopardizes the meeting of another need.
4. Capacity: Client has a lack of ability (skills) or resources to meet his needs.
Presentation Goals

Present Findings from ongoing studies that validate GLM/SRM approach

Study 1: Relationship among offender type, characteristics, and offense pathway using polygraph data

Study 2: Relationship among primary goods (needs) met through offending and offense pathway

Relationship among means to attain primary goods and offense pathway
Participants

- Studies 2008 - 2010 (data collected - ongoing program evaluation)
  - 96 Incarcerated adult sex offenders
- Participating in advanced treatment in a North American Prison (minimum restrictive)
  - Average time in treatment: 23 (min 7 mos.)
  - All received psycho-educational component and have advanced in treatment
  - Therapeutic Community (average 4 – 2 hour sessions per week)
- Treatment Priority: Lifetime Supervision
  - Treatment Criteria to receive recommendation for parole
## Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average age:</strong> 45.3 years</td>
<td><strong>Average age:</strong> 44.2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education:</strong> 12.6</td>
<td><strong>Education:</strong> 12.1 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity:</strong> 67% Caucasian, 21% Hispanic, 10% African American, 1% Other</td>
<td><strong>Ethnicity:</strong> 69.8% Caucasian, 16.7% Hispanic, 13.5% African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status:</strong> 45% divorced, 46% never married, 3% married, 6% other.</td>
<td><strong>Marital Status:</strong> 31.2% never married, 68.8 ever married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index Sex Offense:</strong> 74% CSA, 25% SA, 1% mixed</td>
<td><strong>Index Sex Offense:</strong> 81.2% CSA, 16.7% SA, 2.1% mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method

- Victims, Offenses, Offense Characteristics, Offender Type, Paraphilias:
  - Sexual History Baseline Polygraph Examinations
    - Pre-test disclosures during two baseline tests
  - Part I: Child victims prior to 18, since age 18, and family members.
  - Part II: Force, adult victims, bestiality, and/or additional paraphilias.
GLM/SRM Data Collection

Sex Offense-Specific Evaluation, PSIR, Offense Cycles, Psychological Testing

- External Conditions: Opportunities, Support, Education, Employment History
- Internal Capabilities: Psychological Issues, Personality, Values, Interests, Skills
- Treatment Issues: Sexual History and Criminogenic Needs (e.g., cognitive distortions, intimacy deficits, deviant sexual interests)
- Core Beliefs
- Criminal History/Substance Abuse
GLM Assessment

• Review Data Collection/GLM Explanation
• 60-90 minutes
• 32 questions/ 27 questions asked for each primary need
  - Identification/Value of each need to the individual (for each need)
  - Secondary Goods to meet needs: how client meets each need
  - Which needs were met through offending
  - Flaws in Good Life Plan
• Information included in treatment plan

Yates, Kingston, and Ward 2009
GLM Coding

All needs are assessed on the following:

- Value to client
- Internal obstacles: skill deficits, emotional regulation, sexual deviance
- External obstacles: resources to meet needs in appropriate manner
- Means: method of meeting needs in inappropriate ways
- Associated risk factors: criminal behavior, substance abuse, paraphilias
- Relationship to offending: Direct or Indirect
SRM Assessment

- Average of 90 minutes
- Nine phases of offense cycle
- Goals related to offense: Avoidant or Approach
- Self-Regulation Skills
- Skills/capabilities, degree of planning, control over offending
- Questions are ordered for coding not interview

Yates, Kingston, and Ward 2009
SRM Coding

- Items are scored to evaluate
  - Approach vs. Avoidant
    - Desire to Prevent Offending
    - Attitude Toward Offending/Offense supportive beliefs
    - Cognitive Distortions
    - Post-Offense Evaluation
  - Automatic/Passive vs. Active/Explicit
    - Self-regulation Skills
    - Offense Planning
    - Control over Offending Behaviors
Relationship among Offender Type and Pathway

Simons, McCullar, & Tyler 2008
# Prevalence of Pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathways</th>
<th>Avoidant Passive ( (n = 23) )</th>
<th>Avoidant Active ( (n = 13) )</th>
<th>Approach Automatic ( (n = 35) )</th>
<th>Approach Explicit ( (n = 25) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Revocation</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above illustrates the prevalence of different pathways, with the numbers indicating the percentage of individuals falling into each category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway by Victim/Offenses</th>
<th>AV Passive ($n = 23$)</th>
<th>AV Active ($n = 13$)</th>
<th>AP Automatic ($n = 35$)</th>
<th>AP Explicit ($n = 25$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incest (n = 16)</strong></td>
<td>1.43/15.00 30%</td>
<td>2.11/16.33 15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.58/126.14* 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children (n = 34)</strong></td>
<td>2.64/6.89 61%</td>
<td>3.71/6.14 54%</td>
<td>10.33/55.23* 17%</td>
<td>17.71*/48.2 3* 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult (n = 13)</strong></td>
<td>1.25/1.25 9%</td>
<td>2.50/2.50 31%</td>
<td>2.50/2.50 6%</td>
<td>5.80*/7.00* 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ch. &amp; Ad (n = 33)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.48*/41.8 9* 77%</td>
<td>7.67/29.50 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N = 96)</strong></td>
<td>2.13/8.82</td>
<td>2.92/6.53</td>
<td>13.08*/43.5 6*</td>
<td>9.20*/57.48*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
## Pathway by Victim Characteristics (Offender Type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AV Passive ($n = 23$)</th>
<th>AV Active ($n = 13$)</th>
<th>AP Automatic ($n = 35$)</th>
<th>AP Explicit ($n = 25$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Child</strong></td>
<td>83%*</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($n = 37$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Child</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($n = 7$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Female</strong></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%*</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($n = 11$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indiscriminant</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69%*</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($n = 28$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indiscriminant = both child & adult, both genders, 2 or more relationships

*p < .05
## Offense Pathway by Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AV Passive ((n = 23))</th>
<th>AV Active ((n = 13))</th>
<th>AP Automatic ((n = 35))</th>
<th>AP Explicit ((n = 25))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Behaviors ((N = 96))</strong></td>
<td>1.50 (.97)</td>
<td>.67 (.60)</td>
<td>3.60 (1.91)</td>
<td>.63 (.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Interest ((n = 32))</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolescent Offending ((n = 39))</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paraphilias ((N = 96))</strong></td>
<td>.43 (.66)</td>
<td>1.15 (.90)</td>
<td>4.80 (1.78)</td>
<td>2.44 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(p < .05\)
Offense Pathway by Offense Supportive Cognitions

- Avoidant Passive
  - Uncontrollability (50%)
  - Nature of Harm (sex offending not harmful) (55%)
- Avoidant Active
  - Sexual offending is wrong (64%)
  - Nature of Harm (62%)
- Approach Automatic
  - Sexual Entitlement (63%)
  - World as a dangerous place (63%)
- Approach Explicit
  - Children as sexual objects (63%)
  - Sexual entitlement (63%)

$p < .05$
Summary

- Incest across all pathways
- Approach automatic: more criminal, multiple paraphilias, hypersexual, impulsive, and more victims.
- Approach: more likely to begin offending during adolescence.
- Approach explicit: more likely to have a sexual interest in children, sexual entitlement, and male victims
- Avoidant passive: more likely to have incest or female victims
- Avoidant Active: more adult female victims (rape) and victim blaming
Relationship between Primary Goods met through Offending by Offense Pathway

Kingston, Yates, Simons, and Tyler 2009
Most Valued and Goods (Needs) Met Through Offending

- Of 10 primary goods, most valued:
  - Autonomy/Agency (36.5%)
  - Inner peace (25.0%)
  - Happiness (19.8%)
  - Relatedness (14.6%)
  - Community (3.1%)
  - Spirituality (1.0%)

- Of four primary goods, goods implicated in offending:
  - Happiness (35.4%)
  - Autonomy/Agency (31.2%)
  - Inner peace (17.7%)
  - Relatedness (15.6%)

N = 96
Primary Goods and Victims/Paraphilias

Significant differences between four goods implicated in offending on:

- **Number of victims** \((p < .01)\)
  - Happiness associated with greater number of victims than agency, inner peace, relatedness

- **Number of paraphilias** \((p < .001)\)
  - Happiness associated with greater number of paraphilias than agency, relatedness

\(N = 96\)
# Offense Pathway by Primary Needs Met Through Offending

*Offense Pathway by Primary Needs Met Through Offending*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Met Through Offending</th>
<th>Avoidant Passive</th>
<th>Avoidant Active</th>
<th>Approach Automatic</th>
<th>Approach Explicit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happiness (pleasure)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Peace</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 96*
Offense Pathway by Primary Goods

Significant differences between SRM pathway and four goods implicated in offending ($\chi^2 = 52.20, p < .001$):

- Approach-automatic = more likely to seek happiness/pleasure
- Approach-explicit = more likely to seek agency
- Avoidant-passive = more likely to seek relatedness

$N = 96$
Offense Pathway by Sexual Interest and Violence

Different pathways significantly differently associated with:

- **Sexual interest in children** ($\chi^2=18.9, \ p < .001$):
  - Both approach pathway offenders significantly more likely than avoidant pathway offenders to be interested in children

- **Interpersonal violence** ($\chi^2=22.4, \ p < .001$):
  - Approach-automatic pathway offenders were most likely to use interpersonal violence ($z = 4.4$)
  - Both avoidant pathway offenders were least likely to use interpersonal violence

$N = 96$
## Most Prevalent Means by Offense Pathway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avoidant Passive</th>
<th>Avoidant Active</th>
<th>Approach Automatic</th>
<th>Approach Explicit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse: Inner Peace</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Coping/Excitement: Happiness</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness: Relatedness</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power/Exploitation: Agency</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 49.5, p < .001\):
Summary

- Approach-Automatic: hypersexual, stimulus driven, mostly motivated by sexual, excitement, or release of pain
- Approach-Explicit: more pedophilic, more likely to achieve a sense of accomplishment/power or personal satisfaction through offending
- Avoidant-Active: lower self-esteem, substance abuse issues, more variable in motivations for offending
- Avoidant-Passive: wanting to fit in, sense of community and relatedness most important. Feelings of inferiority.
Treatment Implications

- Support for GLM/SRM in treatment
  - Resource driven treatment
  - Individualized interventions/plans
  - Less intense treatment and skill building for avoidant.
  - More motivation (needs/means focus) for approach explicit
  - Medication, intense treatment/supervision for approach automatic
Treatment Interventions

- Approach: promote underlying needs that is socially acceptable and personally satisfying

- Avoidant: RP, identify components of a good life, learn how to adapt to changing circumstances, manage problems, coping skills
Group Suggestions

- Avoidant and Approach Offenders should be separated.

- Avoidant Offenders: skills and opportunities to meet needs without offending (less intensive treatment)

- Approach: learn to meet needs without offending, more satisfying life goals, strategies to manage sexual deviant desires, mutual and genuine relationships (more intensive and individualized)
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