

Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment

Assessing Sexual Interest in Children Using the Go/No-Go Association Test

Journal:	<i>Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment</i>
Manuscript ID	SA-16-01-008.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Research Article
Keywords:	Go/No-Go Association Task, indirect measure, sexual interest, Sexual Offender, sexual fantasy
Abstract:	<p>The present study investigated whether a latency-based Go/No-Go Association Task (GNAT) could be used as an indirect measure of sexual interest in children. A sample 29 individuals with a history of exclusive extrafamilial offenses against a child and 15 individuals with either a history of exclusive intrafamilial or mixed offenses (i.e., against both adults and children) were recruited from a treatment center in the US. Also, a sample of 26 non-offenders was recruited from a university in the UK. All participants completed the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT, a Control-GNAT, and two self-report measures of sexual fantasy. It was hypothesized that, relative to the two comparison groups, the extrafamilial group would respond faster on the block that paired 'sexual fantasy' and 'children'. Also, GNAT scores were expected to correlate with child-related sexual fantasies. Support was found for both hypotheses. Response-latency indices were also found to effectively distinguish the extrafamilial group, as well as those who self-reported using child-related sexual fantasies. The implications of these findings, along with the study's limitations and suggestions for future research, are discussed.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RUNNING HEAD: ASSESSING SEXUAL INTEREST IN CHILDREN USING THE
GNAT

Assessing Sexual Interest in Children
Using the Go/No-Go Association Test

For Peer Review

ASSESSING SEXUAL INTEREST IN CHILDREN USING THE GNAT

Abstract

The present study investigated whether a latency-based Go/No-Go Association Task (GNAT) could be used as an indirect measure of sexual interest in children. A sample 29 individuals with a history of exclusive extrafamilial offenses against a child and 15 individuals with either a history of exclusive intrafamilial or mixed offenses (i.e., against both adults and children) were recruited from a treatment center in the US. Also, a sample of 26 non-offenders was recruited from a university in the UK. All participants completed the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT, a Control-GNAT, and two self-report measures of sexual fantasy. It was hypothesized that, relative to the two comparison groups, the extrafamilial group would respond faster on the block that paired 'sexual fantasy' and 'children'. Also, GNAT scores were expected to correlate with child-related sexual fantasies. Support was found for both hypotheses. Response-latency indices were also found to effectively distinguish the extrafamilial group, as well as those who self-reported using child-related sexual fantasies. The implications of these findings, along with the study's limitations and suggestions for future research, are discussed.

Keywords: Go/No-Go Association Task, indirect measure, deviant sexual interest, sexual offender, sexual fantasy

Assessing Sexual Interest in Children Using the Go/No-Go Association Test

Sexual interest has been defined as the predisposition to respond sexually to a preferred category (i.e., type of person, object, or activity) (Rullo, Strassberg, & Israel, 2010). This can include 'deviant' categories, such as children. A sexual interest in children is regarded as an important factor in the etiology of sexual offending (Ward & Beech, 2006), and has been shown to be a risk factor associated with sexual recidivism (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2005). In light of this, researchers and clinicians have devoted a great deal of effort into developing effective methods of assessing sexual interest in children.

Objective sexual arousal (i.e., the physiological response towards a target of sexual interest) is considered to be an indicator of sexual interest (Chivers, 2005). As a result, genital arousal measured via penile plethysmography (PPG) is often used to assess sexual interest in children. In addition, sexual fantasies (i.e., “mental imagery involving an elaborate sexual scenario or script”; Bartels & Gannon, 2011, p.553) are thought to generally express one's sexual interest (Chivers, 2005). Indeed, *individuals with a sexual offense against a child* (ISOCs) who report using sexual fantasies involving children also self-report a sexual interest in children (Stinson & Becker, 2008). Thus, self-report measures of sexual fantasy are also used as an assessment tool (Allan, Grace, Rutherford, & Hudson, 2007; Beggs & Grace, 2011; Hudson, Wales, Bakker, Ward, 2002; Gannon, Terriere, & Leader, 2012).

Although self-report and PPG have contributed a great deal to both the empirical literature and clinical practice, they suffer from some procedural problems (Kalmus & Beech, 2005). For example, self-report is susceptible to socially desirable responding, while PPG is an intrusive procedure. As a result, researchers have become interested in exploring the adaptation of socio-cognitive measures to indirectly assess deviant sexual interests (Thornton & Laws, 2009). Self-report measures require participants to deliberately respond to statements/items related to a sexual interest, with such responses taken as a direct indication

1
2
3 of one's level of interest. Indirect measures, on the other hand, typically require participants
4
5 to respond to a task that produces an outcome (e.g., response-latencies) that can be used to
6
7 infer one's level of sexual interest. Thus, given their indirect nature, indirect measures are
8
9 believed to be less intrusive and less affected by socially desirable responding (Snowden,
10
11 Craig, & Gray, 2011).

12
13
14 A widely used indirect measure is Viewing Time (VT). Here, sexual interest is
15
16 inferred from the length of time participants view different sexual stimuli, such as pictures of
17
18 adults and children. Researchers have found that ISOCs view images of children longer than
19
20 non-offending controls (Glasgow, 2009; Harris, Rice, Quinsey, & Chaplin, 1996; Mokros et
21
22 al., 2013; Cohen's *ds* from 0.43 to 1.15) and non-sexual offenders (Babchishin, Nunes, &
23
24 Kessous, 2014; Mokros et al., 2013; Cohen's *ds* from 0.57 to 1.15). For more information, see
25
26 a recent meta-analytic review by Schmidt, Babchishin, and Lehmann (in press). A limitation
27
28 of VT was recently highlighted by Imhoff, Schmidt, Weis, Young, and Banse (2012). They
29
30 found that the outcome data are mainly a function of task-specific effects (e.g., judging
31
32 whether stimuli possess attractive features) rather than stimulus-specific effects (e.g.,
33
34 schematic processes cued by sexual stimuli). They argued this "has strong implications
35
36 regarding the paradigm's robustness and susceptibility to faking" (p. 1396). Based on their
37
38 data, Imhoff et al. (2012) suggest that enhancing automatic effects (by speeding up the task
39
40 via the use of a time-constraint) may be more diagnostically beneficial.

41
42
43
44
45 Automatic effects are thought to be captured by another commonly used indirect
46
47 measure; the Implicit Association Test (IAT; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). The
48
49 IAT measures the strength of associations between two concept categories (Child and Adult)
50
51 and two attribute categories (Sexy and Not Sexy) using a sorting paradigm. A number of
52
53 published IAT studies have demonstrated that ISOCs associate children and sex more
54
55 strongly than adults and sex, relative to non-ISOCs (Babchishin et al., 2014; Babchishin,
56
57

1
2
3 Nunes, Hermann, & Malcom, 2015; Banse, Schmidt, & Clarbour, 2010; Brown, Gray, &
4
5 Snowden, 2009; Gray, Brown, MacCulloch, Smith, & Snowden, 2005; Nunes, Firestone, &
6
7 Baldwin, 2007). Moreover, most studies have found that child-sex IATs can distinguish
8
9 ISOCs from non-ISOCs, as shown by Babchishin, Nunes, and Hermann's (2013) in their
10
11 meta-analysis (M -weighted Cohen's $d = 0.63$). In addition, child-sex IATs show a positive,
12
13 albeit moderate, relationship with other measures of sexual interest, such as PPG (Babchishin
14
15 et al., 2015) and self-report (Babchishin et al., 2014; Schmidt et al., 2014).

16
17
18 A core limitation of the IAT is that it only measures the relative strength of the
19
20 associations. This is because it involves two target concepts (e.g., adult and child) and two
21
22 attribute concepts (e.g., sex and not sex). Thus, faster response-latencies when sex-related
23
24 words/child images are categorized by one key and non-sexual words/adult images are
25
26 categorized by the other key relative to when the response key assignment is reversed can be
27
28 interpreted in a number of ways. Participants may: (a) hold stronger child-sex associations;
29
30 (b) hold stronger adult-not sex associations; (c) lack a child-not sex association; and/or (4)
31
32 lack an adult-sex association. To address this, variants of the IAT have been developed. This
33
34 includes the Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP; Barnes-Holmes et al., 2006)
35
36 and the Single-Category IAT (SC-IAT; Karpinski & Steinman, 2006), both of which have
37
38 been applied to child-sex associations and were able to differentiate ISOCs from non-
39
40 offenders (Dawson, Barnes-Holmes, Gresswell, Hart, & Gore, 2009; Hempel Buck, Goethals,
41
42 & van Marle, 2013, respectively). It should be noted, however, that both studies were
43
44 designed to assess implicit beliefs about children rather than a sexual interest in children.

45 46 47 48 49 ***The Go/No-Go Association Task***

50
51
52 The first IAT variant to be developed was the Go/No-Go Association Task (GNAT;
53
54 Nosek & Banaji, 2001). The GNAT involves separate blocks typically displaying only one
55
56 target and one attribute concept category (rather than two of each as with the IAT). In each
57
58

1
2
3 block, stimuli are presented for a brief period. Participants must respond - using a single
4
5 response key - to stimuli representing a target concept and an attribute concept (*go* trials) but
6
7 withhold responses to other stimuli or 'distractors' (*no-go* trials). Response-latencies for all
8
9 'go' trials are compared across the separate blocks. If participants show faster responses-
10
11 latencies to the pairing of a target concept with an attribute concept in one block (e.g., child
12
13 and sex) relative to the other block (e.g., adult and sex), it is inferred that they hold stronger
14
15 associations between that particular target and attribute. Thus, the GNAT can measure both
16
17 the strength of a single association as well as the relative strength of the associations.
18
19

20
21 Moreover, the GNAT can be used to examine associations towards a single category (Nosek
22
23 & Banaji, 2001). This is useful for when there is no natural opposite for a particular category.
24
25 The GNAT has useful in studying numerous phenomena, such as phobias (Teachman, 2007),
26
27 body dysmorphic disorder (Buhlmann, Teachman, & Kathmann (2011), and self-harm
28
29 (Knowles & Townsend, 2012).
30
31

32
33 To the authors' knowledge, only one (unpublished) study has used the GNAT to
34
35 assess child-sex associations in ISOCs (Snowden, Gray, Brown, & Power, 2007). In this
36
37 study, Snowden et al. (2007) compared ISOCs ($n = 22$), rapists ($n = 19$), and non-offenders
38
39 ($n = 13$) on a GNAT (i.e., comparing child + sex, child + non-sex, adult + sex, and adult +
40
41 non-sex associations). None of the four response-latencies were able to differentiate ISOCs
42
43 from the two comparison groups. However, when sensitivity was used as the dependent
44
45 variable (i.e., the ability to discriminate 'go' stimuli from 'no-go' stimuli), ISOCs responded
46
47 in a manner that suggested a stronger child-sex association compared to rapists ($d = 0.73$).
48
49 This is interesting as response-latency GNATs are argued to result in greater internal
50
51 reliability relative to sensitivity-based GNATs because they produce a continuous outcome
52
53 (i.e., time in milliseconds) rather than a dichotomous outcome (i.e., correct vs. incorrect
54
55 responses) (Nosek & Banaji, 2001).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The reason why response-latencies were unable to differentiate ISOCs in Snowden et
4 al.'s study may be two-fold. First, a short response window was used to categorize stimuli
5 (i.e., 600ms and 750ms). Nosek and Banaji (2001) recommend extending the response
6 window when using response-latencies in order to “minimize errors and maximize the range
7 of possible response times” (p. 647). Accordingly, they used a response window of 2000ms,
8 although other studies have produced valid results using 1400ms windows (Teachman, 2007).
9
10 Second, in Snowden et al.'s (2007) study, approximately one third of the ISOCs were
11 intrafamilial offenders (i.e., abused a child they were related to). Such individuals typically
12 show lower levels of sexual interest in children compared to those with an extrafamilial
13 offense (i.e., sexual abuse of a child they are unrelated to), as measured phallometrically
14 (Firestone, Bradford, Greenberg, & Serran, 2000; Quinsey, Chaplin, & Carrigan, 1979) and
15 psychometrically (Beech, Friendship, Erikson, & Hanson, 2002). Recognizing this issue,
16 Snowden et al. (2007) recommended using entirely extrafamilial ISOCs in future research
17 using the GNAT.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Current Study**

35
36 The present study aimed to investigate whether a response-latency GNAT could be
37 used to assess sexual interest in pre-pubescent children. As mentioned earlier, sexual
38 fantasies typically reflect a sexual interest (Chivers, 2005). Therefore, we used ‘sexual
39 fantasy’ as the attribute label (instead of ‘sex’, ‘sexual’, ‘sexy’), with ‘Adult’ and ‘Child’ as
40 target labels. As there is no natural opposite to the concept of sexual fantasy (as a reflection
41 of sexual interest), we used a single-attribute GNAT that consisted of two blocks; one
42 assessing the association between child and sexual fantasy and one assessing the association
43 between adult and sexual fantasy. Furthermore, we: (1) used a response deadline that was
44 double the length of that used by Snowden et al., and (2) focused on exclusively extrafamilial
45 ISOCs. It was hypothesized that extrafamilial ISOCs would show a greater sexual interest in
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 children indicated by a stronger association between children and sexual fantasy compared to
4
5 non-offenders and an ISOC comparison group. It was also hypothesized that stronger
6
7 associations between children and sexual fantasy would be related to greater self-reported
8
9 child-related sexual fantasies.
10

11 Method

12 Participants

13
14
15 ISOCs were recruited from a secure treatment facility in the state of Wisconsin in the
16
17 US. Patients were confirmed as being ISOCs if their offense history included a conviction for
18
19 a sexual offense against a child. Information from the case files was also used to exclude
20
21 participants who failed to meet the inclusion criteria for the present study. For example, those
22
23 who had only offended against adults were excluded. Also, since the study focused on sexual
24
25 interest in pre-pubescent children and involved presenting pictures of pre-pubescent children,
26
27 we excluded anyone who offended against post-pubescent children (13 years old and over).
28
29 Patients with very low cognitive functioning and patients taking antipsychotic medication
30
31 that affected their motor skills were also excluded.
32
33
34
35

36
37 Due to the limited time-frame for data collection, as many ISOCs were recruited as
38
39 was possible through opportunity sampling. The final sample consisted of 44 child abusers.
40
41 From case files, 29 participants were identified as being exclusively extrafamilial ($M_{age} = 47$;
42
43 $SD = 10.60$). The remaining 15 consisted of six exclusively intrafamilial ISOCs and nine
44
45 mixed offenders (i.e., offenders with both an adult and child victim). Although intrafamilial
46
47 ISOCs tend to exhibit less sexual interest in children than extrafamilial ISOCs (Firestone et
48
49 al., 2000; Schmidt et al., 2014), it has been noted that there is a “lack of knowledge on the
50
51 preferences of ‘mixed’ offenders” (Michaud & Proulx, 2009, p. 330). However, it has been
52
53 argued that individuals who are less preferential in who they victimize harbor a more
54
55 nonspecific/general sexual deviance (Beauregard, Leclerc, & Lussier, 2012; Sjostedt,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Langstrom, Sturidsson, & Grann, 2004). In support, mixed offenders have been found to have
4
5 less pre-treatment sexual deviance than child victim-only offenders (Olver, Wong,
6
7 Nicholaichuk, & Gordon, 2007) and a similar phallometric response pattern towards stimuli
8
9 showing consensual adult sex, rape against adult females, and non-violent sexual activity
10
11 with a child (Michaud & Proulx, 2009). Based on this literature, it can be argued that mixed
12
13 offenders will hold a weaker association between children and sexual fantasy relative to the
14
15 extrafamilial ISOCs. Thus, we decided to collapse the mixed and intrafamilial offenders into
16
17 a single, composite comparison group labeled 'intra/mixed ISOCs' ($M_{age} = 45$; $SD = 9.90$)¹.
18
19

20
21 The non-offender comparison group, consisting of 26 male students, was recruited
22
23 from a UK university ($M_{age} = 20$; $SD = 1.90$). A number of previous studies have used both
24
25 students and non-sexual offenders as comparison groups. In each, the sex-related indirect
26
27 measure was able to discriminate sexual offenders from both comparison groups (e.g., Gress,
28
29 Anderson, & Laws, 2013; Mihailides et al., 2004; Price, Beech, Mitchell, & Humphreys,
30
31 2013). On this basis, a student/non-offender sample was deemed appropriate as a comparison
32
33 group for this initial study. As shown in Table 1, on average, participants identified as White
34
35 (extrafamilial = 86%; intra/mixed = 67%; non-offenders = 81%), and were single
36
37 (extrafamilial = 69%; intra/mixed = 73%; non-offenders = 65%).
38
39
40

41 **Insert Table 1 about here**
42

43 At the time of the study, the majority of the extrafamilial ISOCs were undergoing
44
45 treatment (90%) with the remaining 10% of offenders at the pre-treatment stage. Slightly
46
47 fewer of the intra/mixed group were in treatment (60%), with the remaining 40% at the pre-
48
49 treatment stage. Table 1 also shows the offense information for the two offender groups. As
50
51

52
53
54 ¹ Like the exclusive extrafamilial ISOCs, all of the mixed offenders in this study had an extrafamilial child
55
56 victim. However, only two of the mixed offenders had a male child victim (22%) relative to the extrafamilial
57
58 ISOCs (75%). Since having a male child victim is stronger indicator of a pedophilic preference (Seto &
59
60 Lalumière, 2001), this observation supports the view that mixed offenders (at least in this study) are less
sexually interested in children than extrafamilial ISOCs.

1
2
3 shown, extrafamilial ISOCs most often abused both male and female children, whereas
4
5 intra/mixed ISOCs tended to abuse female children more often, $\chi^2_{(2)} = 12.60, p < .002$. Table
6
7 1 also shows that, while both groups show similar rates of prior sexual offenses, more
8
9 intra/mixed offenders had committed violent offenses and nonsexual, nonviolent offenses.
10
11 However, none of these differences were significant. Based on case file information, the two
12
13 offender groups did not differ on Static-99R scores ($d = 0.12$).
14
15

16 Measures

17
18 **Sexual Fantasy-GNAT.** A response-latency GNAT was adapted to measure sexual
19
20 interest in children by assessing the strength of association between sexual fantasy and
21
22 children (relative to sexual fantasy and adults). The task was programmed using E-Prime
23
24 (Version 2.0) and administered via a laptop. The GNAT consisted of two blocks; one where
25
26 participants had to respond to stimuli representing the concept of ‘sexual fantasy’ and ‘child’,
27
28 and one where they responded to stimuli representing the concept of ‘sexual fantasy’ and
29
30 ‘adult. The concept labels were displayed in the top two corners of the screen and the stimuli
31
32 were programmed to appear in the center of the screen in a randomized order. Participants
33
34 were required to respond only to stimuli related to the categories present on-screen (by
35
36 pressing the spacebar), ignoring those unrelated to these categories. For example, when
37
38 ‘child’ and ‘sexual fantasy’ were displayed on-screen, participants had to respond to images
39
40 of children and words related to sexual fantasy, and ignore images of adults and words
41
42 unrelated to sexual fantasy (distractors). Each block consisted of 16 practice trials and 60
43
44 critical trials (Teachman, 2007). Stimuli for ‘go’ trials remained on-screen for 1400ms, while
45
46 ‘no-go’ trials remained on screen for 1000ms (Buhmann et al., 2011; Teachman, 2007). A
47
48 shorter response window was used for the ‘no-go’ items because the GNAT requires some
49
50 pressure to make quick responses (Nosek & Banaji, 2001). Thus, if all the items were
51
52 presented for an extended period of time, participants “could intentionally slow down and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 decrease the automaticity of their responses” (Nosek & Banaji, 2001, p.647). Error feedback
4
5 was displayed whenever participants made a mistake or did not respond in time.
6

7
8 Stimuli representing target concepts were computer modified images of 15 adults and
9
10 15 children. All of the children images were taken from the commercially available Not Real
11
12 People set (Laws & Gress, 2004). A set of computer modified adult images developed by Ó
13
14 Ciardha (2010) were also used. The stimuli for the concept of Sexual Fantasy were words
15
16 drawn from the literature on (and self-report measures of) sexual fantasy. Finally, 15
17
18 distractor words (i.e., words unrelated to sexual fantasy) were chosen in order to form half of
19
20 the ‘no-go’ trials. Each distractor word was matched with a Sexual Fantasy word on the first
21
22 letter, character length, and syllable length (see Appendix for the word list).
23
24

25
26 Following the recommendation of previous GNAT researchers (Nosek & Banaji,
27
28 2001; Teachman, 2007), trials with overly fast responses (< 300ms) or very high error rates
29
30 (more than 40% on each block or more than 30% overall) were removed. However, no
31
32 participants had error rates greater than this recommendation. Timed-out responses (i.e., ‘no
33
34 response’) for ‘go’ trials were recorded as zero. A conservative procedure was employed to
35
36 account for these timed-out errors, which involved changing the zeros to the duration
37
38 deadline for critical stimuli (1400ms), as recommended by Nosek (personal communication,
39
40 June 6, 2012). Responses for distractor trials were removed as they are considered noise
41
42 (Nosek & Banaji, 2001). We also screened for outliers using the ‘outlier labeling rule’
43
44 proposed by Hoaglin and Iglewicz (1987). One outlier was found in the Child block for the
45
46 non-offender group and removed from the final sample, resulting in 25 non-offenders being
47
48 used in the final sample.
49
50

51
52 Split-half reliabilities - using an odd-even split – were used to assess the internal
53
54 consistency of the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT (Williams & Kaufmann, 2012). First, we divided
55
56 the task into odd trials and even trials for each block of the GNAT, as well as for the overall
57
58

1
2
3 task. Second, Spearman–Brown corrected correlations were run between the odd and even
4
5 trials for each block and for the overall task. The resulting reliabilities were as follows:

6
7 Sexual Fantasy+Child, $r = 0.93$; Sexual Fantasy+Adult, $r = 0.85$; overall GNAT, $r = 0.94$.

8
9 Thus, the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT had a very good internal consistency, particularly for a
10
11 reaction-time measure (Nosek, Greenwald, & Banaji, 2007).
12

13
14 **Control-GNAT.** In order to corroborate that the GNAT had the capability to capture
15
16 child-related associations in general, a control GNAT was developed. This GNAT was
17
18 designed to assess and compare Child-Toy and Adult-Toy associations. It was hypothesized
19
20 that all participants would associate children and toys more strongly than adults and toys. The
21
22 15 stimulus words were common toys (e.g., *yoyo*). There were also 15 different distractor
23
24 words, matched to the Toy words on starting letter, syllable length, and character length (see
25
26 Appendix). Children and adult-related stimuli were images taken from the NRP set and Ó
27
28 Ciardha’s (2010) set, different to those used in the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT. The control
29
30 GNAT was subjected to the same scoring procedure as described above.
31
32

33
34 **Wilson Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire (WSFQ; Wilson, 1978).** The WSFQ is a 40-
35
36 item questionnaire that uses a 6-point scale - ranging from 0 (Never) to 5 (Regularly) - to
37
38 measure how frequently a respondent uses 40 specific fantasies. These fantasies are grouped
39
40 into four themes/subscales each comprised of 10 items; namely, Exploratory (i.e.,
41
42 Participating in an orgy), Intimate (i.e., Kissing passionately), Impersonal (i.e., Intercourse
43
44 with an anonymous stranger), and Sadomasochistic (i.e., Hurting a partner). In a sample of
45
46 ISOCs, Baumgartner, Scalora, and Huss (2002) found high internal consistencies for each
47
48 subscale (α 's ranging from .83 to .92). Moreover, Baumgartner et al. (2002) argued that there
49
50 are two child-related items on the WSFQ (“*Having sex with someone much younger than*
51
52 *yourself*” and “*Seducing an innocent*”), both of which were rated significantly higher by
53
54 ISOCs relative to non-sex offenders.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Thoughts and Fantasies Questionnaire (Thornton, unpublished).** This is an open-
4
5 ended questionnaire that assesses offenders' use of deviant sexual fantasies during their time
6
7 in treatment. The measure focuses on six specific fantasies; abduction, force, children under
8
9 13 years, children between 13 and 17 years old, sexual sadism, and past victims. If the
10
11 respondent admits to using a fantasy, they are asked to answer further open-ended questions,
12
13 such as what was the most often the fantasy was used in a month, when it was last used, and
14
15 how long it lasted for. It also asks the respondent to write out the fantasy in detail. Thus, this
16
17 measure is unique as it is able to establish whether respondents use elaborate imagery, as
18
19 opposed to fleeting sexual thoughts. For this study, only sexual fantasies involving pre-
20
21 pubescent children were of interest. Since this questionnaire does not provide continuous
22
23 data, a dichotomous variable ('deviant fantasizer' scored as Yes/No) was created. An
24
25 individual was deemed a deviant fantasizer if sexual fantasies of a pre-pubescent child were:
26
27 used more than once in a month; lasted longer than a few seconds; and were clearly elaborate
28
29 (i.e., involved a clear script/scenario).
30
31
32

33 34 **Procedure**

35
36 ISOCs were informed that a study was taking place examining responses to pictures
37
38 of people and words related to sex. They were informed that participation was voluntarily and
39
40 to indicate their interest using a sign-up sheet that was left on the wing. After the sign-up
41
42 sheets were collected, eligible participants were scheduled to come to a quiet room where the
43
44 study took place. The student sample was also recruited through opportunity sampling. Here,
45
46 participants signed-up (via the university's research participation scheme) to take part in a
47
48 study examining responses to pictures of people and words related to sex.
49
50

51
52 After entering the room/lab, each participant first read a brief form outlining the
53
54 nature and requirements of the study. After obtaining informed consent, demographic data
55
56 were collected (e.g., age, relationship status, ethnicity). Following this, three different
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 response-latency indirect measures (two GNATs, an Implicit Association Test (IAT), and two
4
5 Sorting Paired Features (SPF) tasks) were administered in a randomized order², along with
6
7 the two self-report measures of sexual fantasy. The control GNAT was always administered
8
9 before the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT. This allowed participants to become familiar with the
10
11 general GNAT procedure before completing the critical Sexual Fantasy-GNAT. For each
12
13 GNAT, participants read the on-screen instructions before completing a short practice phase.
14
15 Once ready, they went on to complete the critical phase. Half of the participants completed
16
17 the Sexual Fantasy + Child block first, while the other half completed the Sexual Fantasy +
18
19 Adult block first. Note, the indirect and self-report measures were completed in a
20
21 counterbalanced order between participants.
22
23
24

25 Results

26
27 Given the small samples sizes, emphasis is placed upon the effect sizes when interpreting the
28
29 results of this study, rather than (or in addition to) significance testing. Also, focusing on
30
31 effect sizes allows for the magnitude of the group differences or relationships to be
32
33 highlighted. Thus, for correlations, an r of .10 is considered small; .30 is considered
34
35 moderate; and .50 is considered large (Cohen, 1992). According to Ferguson (2009), these
36
37 same guidelines can be applied to Spearman's Rho coefficients (p. 533). For point-biserial
38
39 correlations, an r_{pb} of .10 is considered small; .24 is considered moderate; and .37 is
40
41 considered large (Rice & Harris, 2005). For Cohen's d , 0.20 is considered small, 0.50 is
42
43 considered moderate, and 0.80 is considered large (Cohen, 1992). Descriptive statistics are
44
45 presented in Table 1.
46
47
48

49 Group differences

50
51
52
53
54
55 ² The GNAT was explicitly designed to assess sexual interest in children, while the SPF/IAT were aimed at
56
57 untangling the 'child/adult'-'sex/not sex' associations thought to underpin distorted cognition. Therefore, only
58
59 the results of the GNATs are reported in the present study.
60

1
2
3 **Sexual Fantasy GNAT.** A 2 (Block: Sexual Fantasy+Child vs. Sexual
4 Fantasy+Adult) x 3 (Group: Extrafamilial vs. Intra/mixed vs. Non-offender) mixed ANOVA
5 was performed on the raw response-latencies, with Block as the within-subjects factor and
6 Group as the between-subjects factor. The main effect for Block was marginally significant,
7 ($F(1,66) = 3.73, p = .058, \eta^2 = .052$), reflecting faster responses on the Adult block ($M =$
8 624ms) compared to the Child block ($M = 641\text{ms}$). No main effect was found for Group,
9 ($F(2,66) = .264, p = .77, \eta^2 = .006$). However, a significant Block x Group disordinal
10 interaction was found ($F(2,66) = 5.71, p = .005, p = .003, \eta^2 = .149$), indicating differential
11 responding across the blocks by group. Follow-up analyses (with Bonferroni correction)
12 revealed that non-offenders' responses were faster in the Adult block ($M = 608.31\text{ms}, SE =$
13 17.04) than the Child block ($M = 645.12\text{ms}, SE = 18.01$) ($p = .01, d = .43$). The intra/mixed
14 group also showed faster response on the Adult block ($M = 626.89\text{ms}, SE = 22.00$) compared
15 to the Child block ($M = 661.21\text{ms}, SE = 23.25$) ($p = .06, d = 0.36$). Conversely, the
16 extrafamilial ISOCs exhibited (non-significant but non-negligible) faster responding on the
17 Child block ($M = 616.71\text{ms}, SE = 18.63$) relative to the Adult block ($M = 637.74\text{ms}, SE =$
18 16.72) ($p = .11, d = 0.22$).

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The pattern of group differences within each block were as predicted (see Table 2). For example, on the Child block, the extrafamilial ISOCs showed faster responses than both the non-offenders ($d = 0.43$) and the intra/mixed ISOCs ($d = 0.44$). However, the non-offenders and intra/mixed ISOCs did not differ ($d = 0.01$). Within the Adult block, a small effect was found when comparing the extrafamilial ISOCs to the non-offenders ($d = 0.21$), while little difference was observed between the extrafamilial and intra/mixed ISOCs ($d = 0.12$). Finally, the non-offenders and intra/mixed ISOCs did not differ ($d = 0.09$).

Insert Table 2 about here

1
2
3 To explore the interaction further, the three groups were compared on a ‘mean
4 difference score’. This also allowed us to examine whether a relative score (akin to a
5 deviance index) could discriminate groups. This index was computed by subtracting the mean
6 response-latencies for the Child block from the mean response-latencies for the Adult block.
7 Positive values reflected faster responding during the Child block relative to the Adult block.
8 Negative values represented faster responding during the Adult block. As expected, the
9 results of a one-way, independent measures ANOVA mirrored the significant interaction
10 found from the previous two-way ANOVA ($F(1,66) = 5.71, p = .005, \eta^2 = .157$). As shown
11 in Table 2, post-hoc analyses (with Bonferroni correction) revealed that extrafamilial ISOCs
12 had a greater mean difference score than the non-offenders ($p = .009, d = -0.83$) and the
13 intra/mixed ISOCs³ ($p = .043, d = -0.89$). The non-offenders and the intra/mixed ISOCs
14 differed to a far lesser extent ($p = .92, d = -0.33$).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 **Control GNAT.** On the control task, a two-way ANOVA on the response-latencies
31 revealed a main effect for Block, $F(1, 66) = 9.70; p = .003, \eta^2 = .086$, reflecting faster
32 responding on the Toy-Child block ($M = 618.83\text{ms}$) than the Adult-Toy block ($M =$
33 649.69ms) across all three groups. This supports the view that all participants would associate
34 toys with children more so than adults. There was no main effect for Group nor was there an
35 interaction between Block and Group, supporting the prediction that the groups would not
36 differ in their association between children and toys. This provides corroborating evidence
37 that the GNAT can be used to assess child-related associations. However, it should be noted
38 that, when observing the effect sizes, extrafamilial ISOCs showed faster responses during the
39 Toy-Child block relative to the intra/mixed ISOCs.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Convergent validity**

53
54
55 ³ The mean difference scores for the intrafamilial group ($M = -34.07$) and the mixed group ($M = -34.47$) were
56 near identical ($d = 0.01$). Moreover, exploratory analyses indicated that the mean difference scores for the
57 extrafamilial group differed from both the intrafamilial ($d = 0.87$) and mixed group ($d = 0.84$). These results
58 justified our collapsing of the two subgroups into one composite comparison group.
59
60

1
2
3 Spearman's Rho correlation analyses revealed that sexual fantasies about children (as
4
5 measured by the Thoughts and Fantasies Questionnaire) were strongly related to the two
6
7 child-related items of the WSFQ (see Table 3). However, none of the child-related sexual
8
9 fantasy measures correlated with the response-latencies for each block of the Sexual Fantasy
10
11 GNAT. However, faster responses on the Child block showed a small relationship with the
12
13 Intimate subscale of the WSFQ ($r_s = -.21$). Also, faster responses on the Adult block showed a
14
15 significant, small relationship with the Impersonal subscale ($r_s = -.26$), as well as a small (non-
16
17 significant) relationship with the Sadomasochistic subscale ($r_s = .20$). More in line with our
18
19 hypothesis, the mean difference score showed a moderate positive relationship with self-
20
21 reported sexual fantasies about children, as measured by the Thoughts and Fantasies
22
23 Questionnaire ($r_s = .31$). Also, the mean difference score showed a small, negative correlation
24
25 with the Sadomasochistic ($r_s = -.26$) and Impersonal subscale of the WSFQ ($r_s = -.21$). This
26
27 suggests that faster responding on Adult block (relative to the Child block) was associated
28
29 with these two sexual fantasy themes.
30
31
32

33
34 **Insert Table 3 about here**
35

36 **Discriminative validity**

37
38 Previous studies have used the area under the curve (AUC) of a receiver operating
39
40 characteristic (ROC) to examine whether child-sex IAT scores can effectively discriminate
41
42 ISOCs from controls (Babchishin et al., 2013; Banse et al., 2010; Gray et al., 2005). AUC
43
44 values range from zero to one. According to Rice and Harris (2005), AUCs of .56, .64, and
45
46 .71 correspond to small (.20), medium (.50), and large (.80) Cohen's d values of effect size
47
48 (Cohen, 1992). Intra/mixed ISOCs were indistinguishable from non-offenders (AUC = .51, p
49
50 = .94). However, extrafamilial ISOCs were discriminated from non-offenders (AUC = .71, p
51
52 = .007). This level of discrimination was greater than when ISOCs as a homogenous group
53
54 were used (AUC = .64). In addition, extrafamilial ISOCs were discriminated from the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 intra/mixed ISOCs ($AUC = .73, p = .01$), as well as the intra/mixed and non-offenders
4
5 combined ($n = 40$) ($AUC = .72, p < .002$). Following the hypothesis that extrafamilial ISOCs
6
7 have a stronger sexual interest in children, these findings suggest the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT
8
9 is able to discriminate abusers with a greater sexual interest in children. This was further
10
11 corroborated by examining how well the GNAT discriminated ISOCs who were 'deviant
12
13 fantasizers' (based on responses from the Thoughts and Fantasies Questionnaire) from non-
14
15 fantasizers. There were 29 deviant fantasizers - of which 21 were extrafamilial and eight were
16
17 intra/mixed - and 15 non-fantasizers. The GNAT, again, showed good discriminative ability
18
19 ($AUC = .70, p = .04$).
20
21
22

23 Discussion

24
25 The main aim of the present study was to investigate whether the GNAT could be
26
27 used as an indirect measure of sexual interest in children. It was hypothesized that
28
29 extrafamilial such individuals would demonstrate faster response-latencies when responding
30
31 to child and sexual fantasy related stimuli (compared to adult and sexual fantasy stimuli) than
32
33 would a composite group of intrafamilial and mixed offenders (who had offended against
34
35 both children and adults), and a group of non-offenders. Our results provided support for this
36
37 hypothesis. In line with previous IAT research, using response-latency indices (i.e., the mean
38
39 difference between the child block and adult block), the extrafamilial group responded in a
40
41 manner indicative of a sexual preference for children. That is, compared to both comparison
42
43 groups, the extrafamilial group demonstrated faster response-latencies on the child block
44
45 relative to the adult block. These results suggest that extrafamilial ISOCs have a stronger
46
47 associative bias for children and sexual fantasy (relative to adults and sexual fantasy),
48
49 compared to non-offenders and intra/mixed ISOCs.
50
51
52

53
54 A unique feature of the GNAT that distinguishes it from the original IAT is its
55
56 capability to assess absolute associations (e.g., between children and sexual fantasy only). As
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 expected, we found that both comparison groups exhibited faster responses on the Adult
4
5 block, while the extrafamilial group showed faster responding on the Child block. Further, an
6
7 examination of the effect sizes indicated that the extrafamilial ISOCs responded faster than
8
9 both comparison groups on the Child block, while the two comparison groups did not differ
10
11 from each other. These results are also in line with our hypotheses. The lack of significance
12
13 in the group differences is likely a result of low power and, thus, highlights the need for
14
15 follow-up research with larger samples. However, it should be noted that the mean difference
16
17 score was able to differentiate extrafamilial ISOCs from both comparison groups to a far
18
19 stronger degree than the absolute child-sexual fantasy association. This could suggest that
20
21 relative scores (akin to a deviance index) may be a better outcome variable to use if one
22
23 wishes to maximize group discrimination. This is similar to what is recommended for PPG
24
25 data (Harris, Rice, Quinsey, Chaplin, & Earls, 1992).
26
27
28

29
30 Similar to Teachman (2007), we wanted to confirm that the GNAT is capable of
31
32 assessing child-related associations. Thus, a control GNAT assessing Child-Toy (versus
33
34 Adult-Toy) associations was constructed. As predicted, all participants showed faster
35
36 responding on the Child-Toy block, corroborating the proposition that the GNAT is a viable
37
38 tool for detecting child-related associations. Although the groups did not significantly differ
39
40 on each block, the effect sizes did suggest that extrafamilial ISOCs were faster than the
41
42 intra/mixed group on the Child-Toy block, perhaps reflecting a general bias towards children.
43
44

45
46 In addition to known-groups validation, convergent validity was examined. Neither of
47
48 the absolute GNAT scores or the mean difference score showed a relationship with the two
49
50 child-related WSFQ items. However, the mean differences score was positively correlated
51
52 with child-related sexual fantasies as measured by the Thoughts and Fantasies Questionnaire.
53
54 The lack of a relationship between the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT and the two WSFQ items may
55
56 be due to a lack of sensitivity due to the ambiguity these items (O'Donohue, Letourneau, &
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Dowling, 1997). Although these two items correlated strongly with the child-related item of
4
5 the Thoughts and Fantasies questionnaire (see Table 3) and are used more frequently by
6
7 ISOCs than non-offenders (Baumgartner et al., 2002), they do not explicitly ask about sexual
8
9 activity with children. Rather, they ask about an ‘innocent’ and ‘someone much younger than
10
11 yourself’. An innocent could be interpreted as someone who is a virgin, which is not
12
13 exclusively equivalent to a child. Moreover, the ISOCs’ mean age ranged from 45-47 years
14
15 old. Thus, ‘someone much younger’ could be interpreted as a young adult such as someone in
16
17 their twenties; not necessarily a child. Future research should test whether the Sexual
18
19 Fantasy-GNAT (or a related variant) correlates with other indices of sexual interest, such as
20
21 PPG scores and sexual interest items from validated risk measures. In sum, these results
22
23 provide partial support for the convergent validity of the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT. However,
24
25 keep in mind that: (1) the size of the relationship between the GNAT mean difference and
26
27 Thoughts and Fantasies Questionnaire was only moderate ($r_s = .31$), and (2) the WSFQ items
28
29 may not have provided a good test of convergent validity given that the two items do not
30
31 explicitly refer to children.
32
33
34
35

36 Responses on the Child block did show a small relationship with the Intimate subscale
37
38 of the WSFQ. This suggests that a stronger associative sexual bias towards children is related
39
40 to more frequent use of intimate sexual fantasies. It could be argued that, for ISOCs, these
41
42 intimate fantasies involve children. However, this cannot be determined as the WSFQ items
43
44 asked about intimate behaviour, not the type of person that the participant envisions engaging
45
46 in the intimate behavior with. This is a something worth following up in future research.
47
48 Faster responses on the Adult block were significantly associated with Impersonal sexual
49
50 fantasies. As noted by Seifert, Boulas, Huss, and Scalora (2015) “experiencing repeated
51
52 sexual fantasies among sexual offenders commonly leads to hypersexuality...Furthermore,
53
54 these persons experiencing hypersexuality often have less relational sexual fantasies” (p.2).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Thus, it could be argued that faster responses on the Adult block are indicative of greater
4
5 hypersexuality as - in accordance with Seifert et al. (2015) - it was related to more frequent
6
7 use of less relational (i.e., impersonal) sexual fantasies. Although this is speculative,
8
9 investigating whether adult-sex associations are associated with greater hypersexuality
10
11 (mediated by Impersonal sexual fantasies) would be an interesting avenue for future research.
12
13

14 Finally, the discriminative validity of the GNAT was examined. When adopting the
15
16 same approach as previous studies using indirect measures (i.e., the ability to distinguish
17
18 ISOCs from non-offenders), a medium effect was observed ($AUC = .64$). However, given
19
20 that the intra/mixed group of offenders showed a very similar response pattern to the non-
21
22 offenders on the GNAT, this approach would likely increase the number of false negatives.
23
24 That is, the intra/mixed ISOCs would be incorrectly identified as *not* being an offender.
25
26 Indeed, when examining the GNAT's ability to discriminate extrafamilial abusers from
27
28 intra/mixed and non-offenders, a larger effect was found ($AUC = .72$). While these findings
29
30 need to be corroborated in future research, they highlight two important points. First, testing
31
32 whether responses on an indirect measure of sexual interest can distinguish who is and is not
33
34 an offender does not account for the heterogeneity among ISOCs. In other words, this
35
36 approach essentially treats all ISOCs as having a sexual preference for children, which is not
37
38 the case (Johnson, 2006; Schmidt, Mokros, & Banse, 2013). Furthermore, not everyone with
39
40 a sexual interest in children is an offender. Recent research suggests that between three and
41
42 nine percent of the general population have a sexual interest in children (Dombert et al.,
43
44 2015; Wurtele, Simons, & Moreno, 2014). Thus, had any of the non-offenders in the present
45
46 study (or in subsequent studies) held a sexual interest in children, they would have been
47
48 misidentified as being an offender.
49
50
51
52

53
54 Second, using an indirect measure to differentiate ISOCs from those who have not
55
56 sexually offended does not actually correspond with the intended use of the task. That is,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 indirect measures (such as the one used in this study) are adapted to measure deviant sexual
4
5 interest. Thus, attempting to detect offender status is not the most effective way to assess the
6
7 validity of an indirect measure of deviant sexual interest (Babchishin et al., 2015). Instead,
8
9 the aim should be to differentiate participants on a feature that more closely relates to a
10
11 sexual interest in children, such as risk category or victim type (as in the present study).
12
13 Another approach is to group participants based on their response on another sexual interest
14
15 measure (e.g., PPG, self-report). This approach was attempted in the present study. Using
16
17 their responses on the child-related item of a sexual fantasy measure, ISOCs were categorized
18
19 as either being 'fantasizers' (eight of whom were intra/mixed offenders) or 'non-fantasizers'.
20
21 The GNAT was able to effectively discriminate fantasizers ($AUC = .70$).
22
23
24

25 **Limitations**

26
27 There are a few limitations in this study that should be noted. First, many of the ISOCs were
28
29 in treatment. It is possible that, due to regularly discussing their sexual interests in treatment,
30
31 some offenders may have formed stronger associations between children and sexual fantasy.
32
33 However, there is no reason to think that extrafamilial ISOCs talk about the topic of sexual
34
35 interest and fantasies in treatment any more than intrafamilial and mixed ISOCs do. Second,
36
37 although the effect sizes for the group differences were promising, the sample sizes were
38
39 small. Thus, to corroborate these preliminary findings, a replication study using larger
40
41 samples is warranted. Third, due to low numbers, a comparison group comprised of
42
43 intrafamilial and mixed ISOCs was used. The existing literature and near-identical GNAT
44
45 scores produced by these two subgroups justified this approach. However, a comparison
46
47 group comprised solely of intrafamilial ISOCs should be recruited and used in follow-up
48
49 studies.
50
51
52

53
54 Fourth, the non-offender group was comprised of students. Previous studies tend to
55
56 use non-sex offenders as a comparison group as they can be better matched to the sex
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 offender sample. Thus, this approach should be adopted in future studies using the GNAT. It
4
5 should be noted that if there were any age-related differences (e.g., differences in processing
6
7 speed) between the ISOCs and students, we would expect to see a greater difference in
8
9 GNAT responses between the intra/mixed group and students. However, this was not
10
11 observed. Fifth, the coding of the ISOCs as 'deviant fantasizers' was only done by the first
12
13 author. In hindsight, it would have been beneficial to have had more researchers involved in
14
15 the coding procedure, thus, allowing for inter-rater reliability to be calculated. Finally, while
16
17 not necessarily a limitation, 'sexual fantasy' was used as the single-target attribute on the
18
19 GNAT. This is because sexual fantasies tend to reflect sexual interests. Thus, the findings do
20
21 not indicate that the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT provides an indirect assessment of participants'
22
23 sexual fantasies; rather, it is seen as providing a proxy for the presence of a sexual interest.
24
25 The issue here, however, is that is not known whether another attribute label would have
26
27 performed better. Therefore, future researchers are encouraged to use alternative labels to see
28
29 if the GNAT performs equally as well (or better) than the one in this study.
30
31
32
33

34 **Conclusion**

35
36 Despite these limitations, the results of this study mirror previous indirect measure
37
38 research and, thus, provide the first indication that a latency-based GNAT can be used to
39
40 assess sexual interest in children. They also highlight the need to consider offender
41
42 heterogeneity when using indirect measures. This study has demonstrated the GNAT's value
43
44 as a research tool, as it offers features that are not available to the traditional IAT. These
45
46 include being able to assess associations towards a single concept and allowing for the
47
48 measurement of absolute associations. In the present study, the latter was shown to be useful
49
50 for examining within-group differences between the each absolute association and, to some
51
52 degree, the differences between the groups on each association. However, from our results, it
53
54 would appear that the mean difference between the single associations (similar to a deviance
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 index) is a better outcome variable for discriminating groups. In all, our preliminary findings
4
5 suggest that the GNAT holds promise as a tool that forensic professionals can use as an
6
7 adjunct to other sexual interest measures.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Allan, M., Grace, R. C., Rutherford, B., & Hudson, S. M. (2007). Psychometric assessment of
6
7 dynamic risk factors for child molesters. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and*
8
9 *Treatment, 19*, 347-367. doi: 10.1177/107906320701900402
10
11
12 Babchishin, K. M., Nunes, K. L., & Hermann, C. A. (2013). The validity of Implicit
13
14 Association Test (IAT) measures of sexual attraction to children: A meta-analysis.
15
16 *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 42*, 487-499. doi:10.1007/s10508-012-0022-8.
17
18
19 Babchishin, K. M., Nunes, K. L., & Kessous, N. (2014). A Multimodal Examination of
20
21 Sexual Interest in Children A Comparison of Sex Offenders and Non-sex Offenders.
22
23 *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 26*, 343-374.
24
25 doi:10.1177/1079063213492343
26
27
28 Babchishin, K. M., Nunes, K. L., Hermann, C. A., & Malcom, J. R. (2015). Implicit sexual
29
30 interest in children: Does separating gender influence discrimination when using the
31
32 Implicit Association Test? *Journal of Sexual Aggression, 21*, 194-208.
33
34 doi:10.1080/13552600.2013.836575
35
36
37 Banse, R., Schmidt, A. F., & Clarbour, J. (2010). Indirect measures of sexual interest in
38
39 child sex offenders: A multimethod approach. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37*,
40
41 319-335. doi:10.1177/0093854809357598.
42
43
44 Barnes-Holmes, D., Barnes-Holmes, Y., Power, P., Hayden, E., Milne, R., & Stewart, I.
45
46 (2006). Do you really know what you believe? Developing the Implicit Relational
47
48 Assessment Procedure (IRAP) as a direct measure of implicit beliefs. *The Irish*
49
50 *Psychologist, 32*, 169-177.
51
52
53 Bartels, R. M., & Gannon, T. A. (2011). Understanding the sexual fantasies of sex offenders
54
55 and their correlates. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 16*, 551-561.
56
57 doi:10.1016/j.avb.2011.08.002
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Baumgartner, J. V., Scalora, M. J., & Huss, M. T. (2002). Assessment of the Wilson Sex
4
5 Fantasy Questionnaire among child molesters and nonsexual forensic offenders.
6
7 *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 14*, 19-30.
8
9 doi:10.1023/A:1013025410090
10
- 11 Beaugard, E., Leclerc, B., & Lussier, P. (2012). Decision-making in the crime-commission
12
13 process: Comparing rapists, child molesters, and victim-crossover sex offenders.
14
15 *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 39*, 1275–1295. doi:10.1177/0093854812453120.
16
17
- 18 Beech, A., Friendship, C., Erikson, M., & Hanson, R. K. (2002). The relationship between
19
20 static and dynamic risk factors and reconviction in a sample of UK child abusers.
21
22 *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 14*, 155-167.
23
24 doi:10.1023/A:1014672231744.
25
26
- 27 Beggs, S. M., & Grace, R. C. (2010). Assessment of dynamic risk factors: An independent
28
29 validation study of the violence risk scale: Sexual offender version. *Sexual Abuse: A*
30
31 *Journal of Research and Treatment, 22*, 234-251. doi: 10.1177/1079063210369014
32
33
- 34 Beggs, S., & Grace, R. C. (2011). Treatment gain for sexual offenders against children
35
36 predicts reduced recidivism: A comparative validity. *Journal of Consulting and*
37
38 *Clinical Psychology, 79*, 182-192. doi.org/10.1037/a0022900.
39
40
- 41 Brown, A. S., Gray, N. S., & Snowden, R. J. (2009). Implicit measurement of sexual
42
43 associations in child sex abusers role of victim type and denial. *Sexual Abuse: A*
44
45 *Journal of Research and Treatment, 21*, 166-180. doi:10.1177/1079063209332234
46
47
- 48 Buhlmann, U., Teachman, B. A., & Kathmann, N. (2011). Evaluating implicit attractiveness
49
50 beliefs in body dysmorphic disorder using the Go/No-go Association Task. *Journal of*
51
52 *Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 42*, 192-197.
53
54 doi:10.1016/j.jbtep.2010.10.003
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Chivers, M. L. (2005). A brief review and discussion of sex differences in the specificity of
4
5 sexual arousal. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy, 20*, 377–390.
6
7 doi:10.1080/14681990500238802.
8
- 9
10 Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 155-159.
11
12 doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155
13
- 14 Dawson, D. L., Barnes-Holmes, D., Gresswell, D. M., Hart, A. J., & Gore, N. J. (2009).
15
16 Assessing the implicit beliefs of sexual offenders using the implicit relational
17
18 assessment procedure a first Study. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and*
19
20 *Treatment, 21*, 57-75. doi:10.1177/1079063208326928
21
22
- 23 Dombert, B., Schmidt, A. F., Banse, R., Briken, P., Hoyer, J., Neutze, J., & Osterheider, M.
24
25 (2015). How common is males' self-reported sexual interest in prepubescent children?
26
27 *Journal of Sex Research*. Online version. doi:10.1080/00224499.2015.1020108
28
29
- 30 Ferguson, C. J. (2009). An effect size primer: A guide for clinicians and researchers.
31
32 *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40*, 532–538.
33
34 doi:10.1037/a0015808
35
- 36 Firestone, P., Bradford, J. M., Greenberg, D. M., & Serran, G. A. (2000). The relationship of
37
38 deviant sexual arousal and psychopathy in incest offenders, extrafamilial child
39
40 molesters, and rapists. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law,*
41
42 *28*, 303-308.
43
44
- 45 Gannon, T., Terriere, R., & Leader, T. (2012). Ward and Siegert's Pathways Model of child
46
47 sexual offending: A cluster analysis evaluation. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 18*, 129-
48
49 153. doi:10.1080/10683160903535917
50
51
- 52 Gray, N. S., Brown, A. S., MacCulloch, M. J., Smith, J., & Snowden, R. J. (2005). An
53
54 implicit test of the associations between children and sex in pedophiles. *Journal*
55
56 *of Abnormal Psychology, 114*, 304-308. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.114.2.304
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual
4
5 differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test. *Journal of*
6
7 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1464-1480. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464
8
9
10 Gress, C. L. Z., Anderson, J. O., & Laws, D. R. (2013). Delays in attentional processing
11
12 when viewing sexual imagery: The development and comparison of two
13
14 measures. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 18, 66–82. doi:10.1111/j.2044-
15
16 8333.2011.02032.x
17
18
19 Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005). The characteristics of persistent sexual
20
21 offenders: a meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical*
22
23 *Psychology*, 73, 1154-1163. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1154
24
25
26 Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., Quinsey, V. L., & Chaplin, T. C. (1996). Viewing time as a
27
28 measure of sexual interest among child molesters and normal heterosexual men.
29
30 *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 34, 389-394. doi:10.1016/0005-7967(95)00070-4.
31
32
33 Hempel, I. S., Buck, N. M. L., Goethals, K. R., & Van Marle, H. J. C. (2013). Unraveling
34
35 sexual associations in contact and noncontact child sex offenders using the single
36
37 category–implicit association test. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and*
38
39 *Treatment*, 25, 444-460. doi:10.1177/1079063212464660
40
41
42 Hudson, S. M., Wales, D. S., Bakker, L., & Ward, T. (2002). Dynamic risk factors: The Kia
43
44 Marama evaluation. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 14, 103-
45
46 119. doi:10.1023/A:1014616113997
47
48
49 Imhoff, R., Schmidt, A. F., Weis, S., Young, A. W., & Banse, R. (2012). Vicarious Viewing
50
51 Time: Prolonged response latencies for sexually attractive targets as a function of
52
53 task- or stimulus-specific processing. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41, 1389-1401.
54
55 doi: 10.1007/s10508-011-9879-1
56
57
58 Johnson, S.A. (2007). *Physical abusers and sexual offenders: Forensic and clinical*

- 1
2
3 *strategies*. Boca Rotan, Florida: CRC/Taylor & Francis.
- 4
5 Kalmus, E., & Beech, A. R. (2005). Forensic assessment of sexual interest: A review.
6
7 *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 10*, 193-217. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2003.12.002
8
- 9
10 Karpinski, A., & Steinman, R. B. (2006). The single category implicit association test as a
11
12 measure of implicit social cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social*
13
14 *Psychology, 91*, 16-32. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.1.16
15
- 16
17 Knowles, S. E., & Townsend, E. (2012). Implicit and explicit attitudes toward self harm:
18
19 Support for a functional model. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental*
20
21 *Psychiatry, 43*, 730-736. doi:10.1016/j.jbtep.2011.10.007
22
- 23
24 Laws, D. R., & Gress, C. L. Z. (2004). Seeing things differently: The viewing time
25
26 alternative to penile plethysmography. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 9*,
27
28 183-196. doi:10.1348/1355325041719338
- 29
30 Michaud, P., & Proulx, J. (2009). Penile-response profiles of sexual aggressors during
31
32 phallometric testing. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 21*,
33
34 308–334. doi: 10.1177/1079063209342073.
35
- 36
37 Mihailides, S., Devilly, G. J., & Ward, T. (2004). Implicit cognitive distortions and sexual
38
39 offending. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 16*, 333-350.
40
41 doi:10.1023/B:SEBU.0000043327.10168.5b
42
- 43
44 Mokros, A., Gebhard, M., Heinz, V., Marschall, R. W., Nitschke, J., Glasgow, D. V., Gress,
45
46 C. L., & Laws, D. R. (2013). Computerized assessment of pedophilic sexual interest
47
48 through self-report and viewing time: reliability, validity, and classification accuracy
49
50 of the affinity program. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 25*, 230-
51
52 258. doi: 10.1177/1079063212454550.
53
- 54
55 Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2001). The Go/No-go association task. *Social Cognition, 19*,
56
57 625–666. doi:10.1521/soco.19.6.625.20886
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nosek, B. A., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2007). The Implicit Association Test at
4
5 age seven: A methodological and conceptual review. In J. A. Bargh (Ed.), *Social*
6
7 *Psychology and the unconscious: The automaticity of higher mental processes* (pp.
8
9 265–292). New York: Psychology Press.
- 10
11
12 Nunes, K. L., Firestone, P., & Baldwin, M. W. (2007). Indirect assessment of cognitions of
13
14 child sexual abusers with the Implicit Association Test. *Criminal Justice and*
15
16 *Behavior*, 34, 454-475. doi:10.1177/0093854806291703
- 17
18 Ó Ciardha, C. (2010). *The use of implicit cognitive measures in the assessment of sexual*
19
20 *offenders* (Doctoral thesis). University of Dublin, Trinity College, Dublin Ireland.
- 21
22
23 O'Donohue, W., Letourneau, E. J., & Dowling, H. (1997). Development and preliminary
24
25 validation of a paraphilic sexual fantasy questionnaire. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of*
26
27 *Research and Treatment*, 9, 167-178. doi:10.1007/BF02675062
- 28
29
30 Olver, M. E., Wong, S. C., Nicholaichuk, T., & Gordon, A. (2007). The validity and
31
32 reliability of the Violence Risk Scale-Sexual Offender version: Assessing sex
33
34 offender risk and evaluating therapeutic change. *Psychological Assessment*, 19, 318-
35
36 329. doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.19.3.318
- 37
38
39 Price, S. A., Beech, A. R., Mitchell, I., & Humphreys, G. W. (2013a). Measuring deviant
40
41 sexual interest using the emotional Stroop task. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40,
42
43 970-987 doi: 10.1177/0093854813476264.
- 44
45
46 Quinsey, V. L., Chaplin, T. C., & Carrigan, W. F. (1979). Sexual preferences among
47
48 incestuous and nonincestuous child molesters. *Behavior Therapy*, 10, 562-565.
49
50 doi:10.1016/S0005-7894(79)80057-X
- 51
52
53 Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (2005). Comparing effect sizes in follow-up studies: ROC Area,
54
55 Cohen's i , and r . *Law and Human Behavior*, 29, 615-620.
56
57 doi:10.1007/s10979-005-6832-7
- 58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Rullo, J., Strassberg, D. S., & Israel, E. (2010). Category-specificity in sexual interest in gay
4
5 men and lesbians. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39, 874–879.
6
7 doi: 10.1007/s10508-009-9497-3
8
- 9
10 Seifert, K., Boulas, J., Huss, M. T., & Scalora, M. J. (2015). Response bias on self-report
11
12 measures of sexual fantasies among sexual offenders. *International Journal of*
13
14 *Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. doi: 10.1177/0306624X15593748.
15
- 16 Seto, M. C., & Lalumière, M. L. (2001). A brief screening scale to identify pedophilic
17
18 interests among child molesters. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*,
19
20 13, 15-25. doi:10.1177/107906320101300103.
21
- 22
23 Schmidt, A. F., Babchishin, K. M., & Lehmann, R. J. (in press). A meta-analysis of viewing
24
25 time measures of sexual interest in children. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. Retrieved
26
27 from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304526820_A_Meta-](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304526820_A_Meta-Analysis_of_Viewing_Time_Measures_of_Sexual_Interest_in_Children)
28
29 [Analysis_of_Viewing_Time_Measures_of_Sexual_Interest_in_Children](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304526820_A_Meta-Analysis_of_Viewing_Time_Measures_of_Sexual_Interest_in_Children)
30
31
- 32 Schmidt, A. F., Mokros, A., & Banse, R. (2013). Is pedophilic sexual preference continuous?
33
34 A taxometric analysis based on direct and indirect measures. *Psychological*
35
36 *Assessment*, 25, 1146-1153. doi:10.1037/a0033326
37
- 38 Schmidt, A. F., Gykiere, K., Vanhoeck, K., Mann, R. E., & Banse, R. (2014). Direct and
39
40 indirect measures of sexual maturity preferences differentiate subtypes of child sexual
41
42 abusers. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 26, 107-128.
43
44 doi:10.1177/1079063213480817
45
- 46
47 Sjostedt, G., Langstrom, N., Sturidsson, K., & Grann, M. (2004). Stability of modus operandi
48
49 in sexual offending. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31, 609-623.
50
51 doi:10.1177/009385480426 7094
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Snowden, R. J., Craig, R. L., & Gray, N. S. (2011). Indirect behavioral measures of cognition
4
5 among sexual offenders. *Journal of Sex Research, 2*, 192-217.
6
7 doi:10.1080/00224499.2011.557750
8
- 9
10 Snowden, R. J., Gray, N. S., Brown, A. S., & Power, S. (2007). *Measuring implicit*
11
12 *cognitions in sexual offenders using the Go/No-Go Task*. Unpublished dissertation.
13
- 14 Stinson, J. D., & Becker, J. V. (2008). Assessing sexual deviance: A comparison of
15
16 physiological, historical, and self-report measures. *Journal of Psychiatric*
17
18 *Practice, 14*, 379-388. doi:10.1097/01.pra.0000341892.51124.85
19
- 20 Teachman, B. A. (2007). Evaluating implicit spider fear associations using the Go/No-go
21
22 Association Task. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 38*,
23
24 156-167. doi:10.1016/j.jbtep.2006.10.006
25
- 26
27 Thornton, D., & Laws, D. R. (2009). *Cognitive approaches to the assessment of sexual*
28
29 *interest in sexual offenders*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley Blackwell.
30
- 31 Ward, T., & Beech, A. (2006). An integrated theory of sexual offending. *Aggression and*
32
33 *Violent Behavior, 11*, 44-63. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2005.05.002
34
- 35
36 Williams, B. J., & Kaufmann, L. M. (2012). Reliability of the Go/No Go association
37
38 task. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 879-891.
39
40 doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.03.001
41
- 42
43 Wilson, G. D. (1978). *The secrets of sexual fantasy*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons.
44
- 45 Wurtele, S. K., Simons, D., & Moreno, T. (2014). Sexual interest in children among an online
46
47 sample of men and women: Prevalence and correlates. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of*
48
49 *Research and Treatment, 26*, 546–568. doi:10.1177/1079063213503688
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix

Critical and distracter words used for the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT and control GNAT

Sexual Fantasy-GNAT		Control GNAT	
<i>Sexual Fantasy</i>	<i>Matched Distracter</i>	<i>Toy</i>	<i>Matched distracter</i>
Sex	Sit	Teddy	Tangy
Orgy	Oven	Yoyo	Yolk
Blowjob	Blended	Lego	Lens
Bondage	Bombing	Dolly	Dirty
Threesome	Textbooks	Frisbee	Fallacy
Fetish	Fading	Marbles	Margins
Naked	Navel	Barbie	Barley
Spanking	Skipping	Football	Feedback
Orgasm	Orange	Slinky	Sleepy
Ejaculate	Easygoing	Dollhouse	Doorbells
Stripping	Screening	Dominoes	Drawback
Anal	Atom	Skateboard	Straighten
Whipping	Whirling	Playstation	Progressive
Doggystyle	Documented	Jigsaw	Jagged
Foreplay	Foregone	Kite	Keel

Table 1: Demographic, offense, and risk-related information for the extrafamilial ISOCs, intra/mixed ISOCs, and non-offenders

Variable	Extrafamilial (EF) (<i>n</i> = 29)	Intra/mixed (I/M) (<i>n</i> = 15)	Non- offenders (<i>n</i> = 26)	EF vs. I/M comparisons (Cohen's <i>d</i>)
Ethnicity				
Caucasian	86 %	67%	81%	
Black	7%	27%	0%	
N. American	3%	7%	0%	
Asian	3%	0%	8%	
Other	0%	0%	11%	
Relationship status:				
In a relationship				
Single	3%	0%	35%	
Divorced	69%	73%	65%	
Widowed	24%	27%	0%	
	3%	0%	0%	
<i>M</i> _{age} (<i>SD</i>) at first sexual offense ^a	18 (5.72)	18 (5.52)	n/a	0.07
Victim gender:				
Male	31%	6.7%	n/a	0.57
Female	24.1%	80%	n/a	1.27
Both	44.8%	13.3%	n/a	0.66
Offense history:				
Prior sexual	89.7%	93.3%	n/a	0.12
Prior violent	20.7%	40.0%	n/a	0.42
Prior non-violent, non-sexual	44.8%	66.7%	n/a	0.14
Static-99R - <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) ^b	5.6 (1.2)	5.8 (1.9)	n/a	0.12

Note. ^a *n* = 1 extrafamilial participant missing data. ^b *n* = 1 extrafamilial participant missing data.

** = *p* < .001, * = *p* < .05

Table 2: Differences between groups on each block and mean difference score for both the Sexual Fantasy-GNAT and Control-GNAT

Measure	Extrafamilial <i>n</i> =29	Intra/Mixed <i>n</i> = 15	Non-offender <i>n</i> =25	EF vs. I/M	EF vs. NO	I/M vs. NO
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>d</i> (95% CI)	<i>d</i> (95% CI)	<i>d</i> (95% CI)
Fantasy-GNAT						
Child block (ms)	616.71 (69.42)	661.21 (125.85)	645.12 (86.28)	0.48 (-0.15, 1.11)	0.37 (-0.17, 0.91)	<u>-0.16</u> (-0.79, 0.48)
Adult block (ms)	637.74 (88.57)	626.89 (112.55)	608.31 (58.55)	<u>-0.11</u> (-0.74, 0.51)	<u>-0.39</u> (-0.93, 0.15)	<u>-0.23</u> (-0.87, 0.42)
Mean difference	21.03 (59.31)	-34.31 (67.79)	-36.81 (79.62)	* <u>-0.89</u> (-1.54, -0.24)	* <u>-0.83</u> (-1.39, -0.28)	<u>-0.33</u> (-0.67, 0.61)
Toy-GNAT						
Child block (ms)	593.28 (65.07)	651.62 (134.81)	622.59 (68.79)	0.62 (-0.02, 1.26)	0.44 (-0.10, 0.98)	<u>-0.29</u> (-0.94, 0.35)
Adult block (ms)	641.99 (83.38)	662.84 (126.52)	644.27 (79.92)	0.21 (-0.42, 0.83)	0.03 (-0.51, 0.56)	<u>-0.19</u> (-0.83, 0.46)
Mean difference	48.71 (72.01)	1.90 (90.11)	32.67 (77.94)	<u>-0.59</u> (-1.23, 0.04)	<u>-0.21</u> (-0.75, 0.32)	0.37 (-0.27, 1.02)

Note. EF = Extrafamilial, I/M = Intra/Mixed, NO = Non-offender. * *p* <.01

Table 3: Spearman's Rho Correlations between Sexual Fantasy-GNAT outcomes and self-reported sexual fantasies

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Child block	-					
2. Adult block	.64***	-				
3. Mean difference	-.41***	.37**	-			
4. Sexual fantasies about children ^a	.06	.14	.31*	-		
5. Seducing an innocent (WSFQ)	-.01	.01	.03	.40**	-	
6. Sex with someone much younger (WSFQ)	-.04	.05	.15	.62***	.51***	
7. Impersonal subscale (WSFQ)	-.11	-.26*	-.21	-.28*	.57***	.47***
8. Intimate subscale (WSFQ)	-.21	-.17	-.01	-.14	.38**	.16
9. Sadomasochistic subscale (WSFQ)	-.01	-.20	-.26*	-.15	.40**	.20
10. Exploratory subscale (WSFQ)	-.11	-.10	-.01	-.31*	.59***	.35*

* = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$

Note: ^a Point-biserial correlation as dichotomous and continuous data were used.

WSFQ = Wilson Sex Fantasy Questionnaire