


Implicit Measures of Pedophilic Sexual Interest


**Kevin L. Nunes, Chantal A. Hermann,
Cathrine Pettersen, & Kristen White**

**33rd Annual Research and Treatment
Conference for the Association for the
Treatment of Sexual Abusers
San Diego, California (2014, October)**




**Viewing Time and IAT Measures
Designed to Assess Pedophilic Interest**

- Do they really assess pedophilic sexual interest?
- Do they provide relevant complementary information to each other and to other assessment methods?
- Advantages and disadvantages?
- Strategy for future research




**Sexual Offending Against Children:
Association With Viewing Time**

- Small to large ($d = 0.33$ to $d = 1.15$)
 - $d = 0.33$ to 0.68 (Gress, 2005)
 - $d = 0.43$ to 0.86 (Mokros et al., 2012)
 - $d = 0.70$ (sexual recidivism) (Gray et al., 2014)
 - $d = 1.00$ (Harris, Rice, Quinsey, & Chaplin, 1996)
 - $d = 1.15$ (Babchishin, Nunes, & Kessous, 2014)
 - $r = .29$ to $.30$ (Abel et al., 2004)
 - AUC = $.61$ (Banse, Clarbour, & Schmidt, 2010)
 - AUC = $.64$ (Abel et al., 2004)
 - AUC = $.76$ (Fromberger et al., 2012)




**Self-Reported Pedophilic Interest:
Association with Viewing Time**

- Moderate to large ($r = .21$ to $r = .90$)
 - $r = .21$ to $.38$ (Mokros et al., 2012)
 - $r = .24$ to $.51$ (Schmidt, Gykiere, Banhoeck, Mann, & Banse, 2014)
 - $r = .32$ to $.90$ (Babchishin, Nunes, & Kessous, 2014)
 - $r = .46$ (Harris, Rice, Quinsey, & Chaplin, 1996)




SSPI: Association with Viewing Time

- Small to large ($r = .05$ to $r = .48$)
 - $r = .05$ to $.15$ (Mokros et al., 2012)
 - $r = .12$ (Babchishin, Nunes, & Kessous, 2014)
 - $r = .48$ (Schmidt, Gykiere, Banhoeck, Mann, & Banse, 2014)




Phallometry: Association with Viewing Time

- Inconsistent ($r = -.47$ to $r = .61$)
 - $r = -.47$ (Babchishin, Nunes, & Kessous, 2014)
 - $r = .28$ to $.61$ (Letourneau, 2002)



Sexual Offending Against Children: Association With IAT

- Small to large ($d = 0.27$ to $d = 0.96$)
 - $d = .27$ to $.32$ (Babchishin, Nunes, Hermann, & Malcom, 2013)
 - $d = 0.44$ (Babchishin, Nunes, & Kessous, 2014)
 - Average $d = 0.48$ to 0.96 (Babchishin, Nunes, & Hermann, 2013)
 - $d = 0.66$ to 0.89 (Kanters et al., 2014)
 - $d = 0.92$ (Brown, Gray, & Snowden, 2009)
 - $AUC = .72$ (Banse, Clabour, & Schmidt, 2010)




Canada's Capital University

7

Self-Reported Pedophilic Interest: Association with IAT

- Small to large ($r = -.04$ to $AUC = .89$)
 - $r = -.04$ to $.32$ (Schmidt, Gykiere, Banhoeck, Mann, & Banse, 2014)
 - $r = .22$ to $.35$ (Babchishin, Nunes, & Kessous, 2014)
 - Average $r = .27$ (Babchishin, Nunes, & Hermann, 2013, meta-analysis)
 - $AUC = .89$ (van Leeuwen et al., 2013)




Canada's Capital University

8

SSPI: Association with IAT

- Inconsistent ($r = -.17$ to $r = .33$)
 - $r = -.17$ to $-.05$ (Babchishin, Nunes, Hermann, & Malcom, 2013)
 - $r = -.09$ (Babchishin, Nunes, & Kessous, 2014)
 - Average $r = .28$ (Babchishin, Nunes, & Hermann, 2013, meta-analysis)
 - $r = .33$ (Schmidt, Gykiere, Banhoeck, Mann, & Banse, 2014)




Canada's Capital University

9

Phallometry: Association with IAT

- Small to moderate ($r = .11$ to $r = .43$)
 - $r = .11$ (Babchishin, Nunes, & Kessous, 2014)
 - $r = .22$ to $.43$ (Babchishin, Nunes, Hermann, & Malcom, 2013)




Canada's Capital University

10

Relationship/Overlap

- Generally, VT and IAT measures are moderately intercorrelated (e.g., Babchishin et al., 2013; Schmidt et al., 2014)
- Some evidence that different implicit measures and self-reported pedophilic interest are independently/complementarily associated with sexual offending against children (e.g., Banse et al., 2010)




Canada's Capital University

11

Advantages and Disadvantages


- More research on VT than IAT
- VT more flexible than IAT
- Relative nature of IAT does not indicate absolute level of interest in a given category
- VT scores are generally more reliable (internal consistency) than IAT scores (e.g., Schmidt et al., 2014)



Canada's Capital University


12

	<p>Based on Available Evidence...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Are they associated with sexual offending against children?⊗ Do they really assess pedophilic sexual interest?<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Do they provide relevant independent/complementary/non-redundant information?<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ for sexual offending against children?⊗ for pedophilic sexual interest?⊗ Substitute for phallometry?
--	---

 Carleton UNIVERSITY
Canada's Capital University

13

	<p>Strategy for Future Research on Validity of Implicit Measures Designed to Assess Pedophilic Sexual Interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Examine association with independent validated indicators of pedophilic interest• Examine association with indicators of presumably distinct constructs• Examine extent to which they provide complementary relevant information• Examine susceptibility to faking and detectability
--	---

 Carleton UNIVERSITY
Canada's Capital University

14

Aggressive Cognitions and Behaviour Research Lab

www.carleton.ca/acbrlab

kevin.nunes@carleton.ca

15