Nunes, K. L., Hermann, C. A., Maimone, S., Woods, M., Pettersen, C., Kostiuk, N., & Jung, S. (2013, October). Implicit identification with sexual offenders and sexual offending against children. In K. L. Nunes (Chair), *Implicit and explicit cognitions and sexual offending against children*. Symposium conducted at the 32nd Annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Chicago, Illinois.

Implicit Identification With Sexual Offenders and Sexual Offending Against Children

Kevin L. Nunes, Chantal A. Hermann, Sacha Maimone, Mandie Woods, Cathrine Pettersen, Nicole Kostiuk, and Sandy Jung

32nd Annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers

Aggressive Cognitions and Behaviour Research Laboratory Psychology, Carleton University

Main Questions

- Implicit and explicit identification (ID) of self as a sexual offender relevant for sexual offending?
- Cognitive consistency between implicit ID, attitude to sex offenders, and self-esteem?
- Cognitive consistency relevant for sexual offending?

2

Participants

- 28 adult male sexual offenders against children (SOC)
- 44 adult male non-sexual offenders (NSO)
- Federal and provincial prisons, probation offices, and forensic psychiatric hospital in western Canada

Sex Offender Identity IAT (SOID-IAT)

- Categories and stimuli
 - SELF: ME, MY, MINE, SELF, I
 - OTHER: THEY, THEM, OTHER, HIM, HE
 - Sex offender: rapist, rape, child molester, molest, sex offender
 - Not a sex offender: thief, theft, robber, drug dealer. murderer
- Higher positive scores = more sex offender ID

4

Sex Offender Identity Self Report (SOID-SR)

l am

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not a sex offender

Not a rapist

Not a child molester

Neutral

Neutral

A rapist

A child molester

Do SOC more strongly identify themselves as sexual offenders than do NSO?

Implicit ID

Explicit ID $\begin{array}{c}
0.7 \\
0.6 \\
0.6 \\
0.6 \\
0.6 \\
0.6 \\
0.7 \\
0.6 \\
0.7 \\
0.6 \\
0.7 \\
0.6 \\
0.7 \\
0.6 \\
0.7 \\
0.6 \\
0.7 \\
0.6 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\
0.7 \\$

1

Nunes, K. L., Hermann, C. A., Maimone, S., Woods, M., Pettersen, C., Kostiuk, N., & Jung, S. (2013, October). Implicit identification with sexual offenders and sexual offending against children. In K. L. Nunes (Chair), *Implicit and explicit cognitions and sexual offending against children*. Symposium conducted at the 32nd Annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Chicago, Illinois.

Consistency between ID, Attitude, and Self-Esteem

Consistent				Inconsistent		
Self	Attitude	ID	Self	Attitude	ID	
+	+	SO	+	+	NSO	
+	-	NSO	+	-	SO	
-	+	NSO	-	+	SO	
-	-	SO	-	-	NSO	

Cognitive Consistency Among SOC? Correlations

 Large and significant positive correlation between implicit ID and implicit attitude

	Attitude IAT	Self-esteem IAT
ID IAT	.72*	.13
Attitude IAT		.10

* p < .05

Cognitive Consistency Between Implicit
Measures Among SOC?
Multiple Regression Analyses

- Consistency would be indicated by **significant** and **positive** multiple R for interactions
- Self-esteem X Attitude → ID
 - Non-significant and negative R
- Self-esteem X ID → Attitude
 - Non-significant and negative R
- ID X Attitude → Self-esteem
 - Significant but negative R

Relationship Between Implicit Attitude and SelfEsteem in Opposite Direction Depending on
Level of Implicit ID Among SOC

1.5

--Low SO ID
---Mean SO ID
---High SO ID
Negative SO Attitude

Positive SO Attitude

Different Patterns of Implicit ID, Attitude, and Self-Esteem for SOC vs. NSO? Moderated Logistic Regression Analyses

- None of the possible interactions between IAT measures significantly differentiated SOC from NSO
 - ID x attitude, ID x self-esteem, attitude x self-esteem, and ID x attitude x self-esteem all non-significant

Different Patterns of Implicit ID, Attitude, and Self-Esteem for SOC vs. NSO? Median Splits and Frequencies og 40 30 20 10 0 ■ SOC SE+ SE+ SE-SE-SE+ SE-50% of all ATT+ ATT- ATT+ ATT-ATT+ ATT-ATT+ 54% of SOC ID+ ID-ID+ 48% of NSO Inconsistent Consistent

11

Nunes, K. L., Hermann, C. A., Maimone, S., Woods, M., Pettersen, C., Kostiuk, N., & Jung, S. (2013, October). Implicit identification with sexual offenders and sexual offending against children. In K. L. Nunes (Chair), *Implicit and explicit cognitions and sexual offending against children*. Symposium conducted at the 32nd Annual Research and Treatment Conference of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Chicago, Illinois.

Discussion

- Little evidence of cognitive consistency between implicit ID, attitude, and self-esteem
- Little evidence that cognitive consistency is relevant for sexual offending
- But, evidence consistent with the hypothesis that implicit ID is relevant for sexual offending

13

Limitations

- Small sample
 - Power, generalizability
- Unknown construct validity
- Maybe our ID measures are assessing "admitting" more so than self-concept?
- Cross-sectional correlational design leaves us guessing about causality

14

Future Directions

- Larger N and anonymous studies in community to more conclusively examine if ID and cognitive consistency play a role in sexual offending
- Refine measures
- Examine with other types of sexual offenders and other implicit measures

15

Acknowledgements

- Alberta Solicitor General
- Correctional Services of Canada
- MacEwan University Faculty of Arts & Science
- Northern Alberta Forensic Psychiatry Program
- Social Sciences and Humanities
 Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada Canadä

16

Kevin Nunes
Associate Professor
Department of Psychology
Carleton University
kevin.nunes@carleton.ca

Aggressive Cognitions and Behaviour Research Laboratory www.carleton.ca/acbrlab

17